

***WASHINGTON ALTERNATE ASSESSMENT SYSTEM  
(WAAS) PORTFOLIO TECHNICAL REPORT  
2008***

*Prepared for the  
OFFICE OF THE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION*

*by*



*October 2008*

**Table of Contents**

*I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY*----- 4

*II. INTRODUCTION TO 2008 WAAS-PORTFOLIO* ----- 5

    Participation Criteria----- 6

    Program Purpose----- 6

    Target Population & Participation Rates----- 6

    Changes in 2008 WAAS-Portfolio ----- 7

*III. PORTFOLIO DEVELOPMENT* ----- 8

*IV. WAAS-PORTFOLIO PROCESSES* ----- 9

    Portfolio Selection----- 9

    Pre-Range-Finding and Range-Finding----- 9

    Summer Scoring Institute----- 10

*V. WAAS SCORING SCHEME AND PROCEDURES* ----- 11

    General Scoring Scheme ----- 11

    Second Scoring and Resolution ----- 13

    Calculation of Final Scores ----- 14

*VI. TECHNICAL QUALITIES OF SCORING* ----- 14

    Scoring of Qualifying Sets ----- 15

    Inter-Rater Agreement ----- 15

    Scoring of Validity Sets----- 16

*VII. CONSTRUCT VALIDITY*----- 25

*VIII. SUMMARY OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE*----- 32

    Analysis of Performance Scores ----- 32

    Analysis of Contexts Scores ----- 33

    Total Score Distribution ----- 33

    Mean Score Summary----- 33

*IX. PERFORMANCE ON THE WAAS RELATIVE TO STANDARDS*----- 46

*APPENDIX A. 2008 WAAS SCORING HANDBOOK*----- 49

*APPENDIX B. WAAS PORTFOLIO SCORING SUMMARY SHEET—2008* ----- 60

*APPENDIX C. WAAS PORTFOLIO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARD DESCRIPTIONS* ----- 62

## List of Tables and Figures

Table 2.2 Number of Participants in the WAAS-Portfolio from 2002 to 2008 .....	7
Table 6.1 Results of Qualifying Sets.....	17
Table 6.1 Results of Qualifying Sets (Continued).....	18
Table 6.2 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 3 .....	19
Table 6.3 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 4 .....	19
Table 6.4 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 5 .....	19
Table 6.5 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 6 .....	20
Table 6.6 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 7 .....	20
Table 6.7 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 8 .....	20
Table 6.8 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 10 .....	21
Table 6.9 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 11 .....	21
Table 6.10 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 12 .....	21
Table 6.11 Overall Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers .....	22
Table 6.12 Scoring Results on the Validity Sets .....	23
Table 6.12 Scoring Results on the Validity Sets (Continued).....	24
Table 7.1 Grade 3 Sub-score Correlations .....	26
Table 7.2 Grade 4 Sub-score Correlations .....	26
Table 7.3 Grade 5 Sub-score Correlations .....	26
Table 7.4 Grade 6 Sub-score Correlations .....	27
Table 7.5 Grade 7 Sub-score Correlations .....	27
Table 7.6 Grade 8 Sub-score Correlations .....	27
Table 7.7 Grade 10 Sub-score Correlations .....	28
Table 7.8 Grade 11 Sub-score Correlations .....	28
Table 7.9 Grade 12 Sub-score Correlations .....	29
Table 7.10 Initial Principal Component Analysis for All Grades .....	30
Table 7.11 Factor Loadings in Fixed-Number Factor Analysis with Orthogonal Varimax Rotation.....	31
Table 8.1 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Score Distributions .....	34
Table 8.1 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Score Distributions (Continued).....	35
Table 8.1 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Score Distributions (continued).....	36
Table 8.2 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Score Distribution Based on the Entire Population.....	37
Table 8.3 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Total Score Distributions.....	38
Table 8.3 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Total Score Distributions (Continued) .....	39
Table 8.3 2008 WAAS- Portfolio Total Score Distributions (Continued) .....	40
Table 8.3 2008 WAAS- Portfolio Total Score Distributions (Continued) .....	41
Table 8.3 2008 WAAS- Portfolio Total Score Distributions (Continued) .....	42
Table 8.4 Mean Total Score Summary for All Grades and Contents .....	43
Table 8.4 Mean Total Score Summary for All Grades and Contents (Continued) .....	44
Table 8.4 Mean Total Score Summary for All Grades and Contents (Continued) .....	45
Table 9.3 Summary of Distribution by Performance Level on 2008 WAAS-Portfolio .....	47
Table 9.4 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Performance Distribution by Gender.....	48

## I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) Portfolio was administered operationally for the eighth year in spring 2008. In compliance with professional standards that test developers produce a technical manual to document the technical quality of an assessment and evidence for the reliability and validity of test scores (*Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*, AERA/APA/NCME, 1999), this manual summarizes the technical information for the 2008 WAAS-Portfolio.

The 2008 WAAS-Portfolio test administration window began the first day of the 2007 school year. The last day to collect evidence for grade 12 was March 21, 2008 due to early scoring in May. For grade 3 to 11, the last day to collect evidence was March 31, 2008. All application materials were sent to Pearson Scoring Center. Received portfolios were scored during the Summer Scoring Institute that encompassed two scoring sessions. Alignment scoring was conducted from June 2 to June 16 with Pearson Professional Scorers. Performance scoring immediately followed from June 16 to June 21 with selected Washington teachers as scorers. Scored portfolios were returned to school districts in June for grade 12 and in August for the remaining grades. As WAAS-Portfolio continues to evolve, the participation rate continues to grow. The total number of WAAS-portfolios submitted increased from 5143 in 2007 to 5509 in 2008 (approximately 9% increase). Among the participants, 3545 (64%) were self-reported males and 1964 (36%) were self-reported females.

WAAS-Portfolio entries were scored to their alignment to Grade Level Expectations (GLE) again this year. In this Part I of the rubric, scoring measures the alignment of targeted skill to the Grade Level Expectation and the extent to which the evidence aligns to the Targeted Skill. Part II of the rubric measures performance of the targeted skills and its generalization or transference to various contexts. Four content areas (reading, writing, math, and science) are assessed. Across grades, the percent of portfolios that passed alignment was 36.49% for reading, 33.91% for writing, 45.65% for math, and 21.17% for science.

The technical quality of scores such as scorer reliability remains consistent to 2007. As in previous years, the inter-rater reliability is generally higher among performance scores than contexts/generalization scores. Strong content-specific correlation patterns and factor structure is observed in the 2008 WAAS-Portfolios. A portion of the portfolios were identified as failing to align

with their correlating Grade Level Expectation. Nonalignment directly affected the overall score average and the percentage of WAAS-portfolios classified as meeting the standard. However, for portfolios showing sufficient evidences of skills, the majority received high performance ratings. The percentage of WAAS-portfolios meeting standard decreased across all grades and content domains this year most likely due to alignment issues.

## II. INTRODUCTION TO 2008 WAAS-PORTFOLIO

The WAAS-Portfolio is a state-level assessment in the Washington State Assessment System. As the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL), the WAAS-Portfolio meets the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB), Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA), and Washington state law that require inclusion of students with disabilities in standards-based instruction and the state-level assessment program. The WAAS-Portfolio program is designed for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, which includes a small number of students whose cognitive impairments prevent them from attaining grade-level achievement standards, even with the best instruction and most extensive accommodations. These students are allowed to demonstrate their skills and knowledge through a collection of their work in an individualized portfolio. Four content areas are assessed through the WAAS. Table 2.1 below shows the content assessed across all grade levels.

Table 2.1 Content Areas Assessed Across All Grade Levels

	<b>Reading</b>	<b>Writing</b>	<b>Math</b>	<b>Science</b>
<b>Grade 3</b>	√		√	
<b>Grade 4</b>	√	√	√	
<b>Grade 5</b>	√		√	√
<b>Grade 6</b>	√		√	
<b>Grade 7</b>	√	√	√	
<b>Grade 8</b>	√		√	√
<b>High School</b>	√	√	√	√

## **Participation Criteria**

While students receiving special education services have the option to participate in various state-level assessment programs, certain participation criteria apply for WAAS-Portfolio participation. According to the WAAS-Portfolio participation criteria, students with the most significant cognitive disabilities are impacted in all content areas. Students who participate in this assessment have a wide range of learning abilities. Those learning behaviors can range from the abstract symbolic students who are able to read sight words and picture symbols, write using sight words or picture symbols, counts objects and recognize symbolic numbers, and comprehend modified texts. The early and pre-symbolic learners also participate in the WAAS-Portfolio. These learners recognize pictures and may use a range of pictures/objects to communicate ideas. They use objects or gestures to communicate, rely on immediate context. A very small number of students in this category have limited consciousness and/or communication.

## **Program Purpose**

The purpose of the WAAS-Portfolio is the following:

- To provide an appropriate method of measuring performance on GLEs for students who are not able to participate in the general education assessment (WASL) even with accommodations
- To ensure that students will be able to generalize their academic skills to the maximum extent possible
- To meet federal requirements (IDEA/NCLB) that the assessment align to academic content standards, promote access to the general curriculum, and reflect the highest achievement standards possible. [NCLB, 2002, 34 C.F.R. § 200.1(d)]

## **Target Population & Participation Rates**

Federal guidelines indicate that states should develop alternate assessment participation guidelines so up to 1% of the student population can be counted as “proficient” for the purposes of AYP based on the alternate assessment judged against alternate achievement standards.

As shown in Table 2.2, the participation rate of the WAAS-Portfolio remains consistent in almost all grade levels except for high school. The increase in number of portfolios submitted in 2008 is mainly due to the increase in high school participation which rose from 903 in 2007 to 1111 in 2008. In 2008, 5509 students participated in the WAAS-Portfolio program. In 2002, only 427

portfolios across all grades were submitted. The number almost quadrupled in 2003 to 1646, and then nearly doubled to 3279 in 2005. The number reached a new high in 2008.

Table 2.2 Number of Participants in the WAAS-Portfolio from 2002 to 2008

Grade	Number of 2002 Participants	Number of 2003 Participants	Number of 2004 Participants	Number of 2005 Participants	Number of 2006 Participants	Number of 2007 Participants	Number of 2008 Participants
3					720	774	810
4		695	726	780	801	785	790
5			389	605	685	724	709
6					630	616	722
7		425	531	678	680	625	661
8		174	440	589	680	716	706
HS		352	503	627	532	903	1,111
Total	427	1,646	2,589	3,279	4,728	5,143	5,509

## 2008 WAAS-Portfolio

As the WAAS-Portfolio continues to evolve, changes are made to strengthen its capacity and ability to appropriately assess students' learning and progress. A major shift of 2008 WAAS-Portfolio from the previous year is the development of GLE extensions in each content area. The GLE extensions describe access, prerequisite and enabling skills derived from the grade level expectations (GLEs). The GLE extensions are reduced in complexity. In 2008, the targeted skills' alignment to student's assigned grade-level content is examined closely to assure the validity of the measure. Furthermore, two targeted skills are required in each content area to enhance the depth

and breadth of the measurement. Detailed scoring rules are described in the subsequent sections and Appendix A.

A number of additional resources and documents can be downloaded from <http://www.k12.wa.us/SpecialEd/assessment.aspx>.

### **III. PORTFOLIO DEVELOPMENT**

The implementation of the WAAS-portfolio is dependent on the interaction between the assessed student and the teacher who assists the student with portfolio construction. The teacher and the student must be cognizant of the components and types of evidence that are required and/or recommended for inclusion in the portfolio. The student must be able to demonstrate observable/measurable skills to produce evidence for inclusion in the portfolio.

The teacher must be able to write measurable targeted skills/goals that provide opportunities for the student to participate and progress in the general education curriculum. Staff members must also be able to plan academic content-based activities and select 2 targeted skills linked to Grade Level Expectations through the GLE extensions that will be measured in each content area entry. Additionally, the assessment team that collects data on the student's progress targeted skills over time. This data collection also includes the student's the ability to generalize and use these skills.

Each WAAS-portfolio should contain a table of contents and each entry should include an entry cover sheet for each targeted skill. Each entry cover sheet documents the GLE, GLE extension, and targeted skill with goal and criterion. Behind each content entry cover sheet, the student includes the data sheet that summarizes the evidence. Each content entry consists of 3 pieces of student generated work, each with a supporting evidence sheet explaining the student work.



## **IV. WAAS-PORTFOLIO PROCESSES**

### **Portfolio Selection for Scoring**

WAAS-Portfolio selection for scoring occurred from April 21 to April 25, 2008 at Pearson, Iowa City, IA. The participants were three Pearson Scoring Directors and two ILLSA representatives. Portfolios were chosen to reflect portfolio samples needed for training table leaders and scorers. Approximately 200 portfolios were chosen to present to the WAAS-portfolio OSPI Specialist during pre-range-finding.

Fourteen districts were predetermined as a statistically sampling to pull portfolios for this process. Approximately 1500 portfolios were available in grades 3-11 for selection for alignment and performance training sets.

### **Pre-Range-Finding and Range-Finding**

Pre-range-finding occurred from April 28 to May 2, 2008 at Pearson, Iowa City, Iowa. Portfolios chosen during the portfolio selection process were reviewed by OSPI's Alternate Assessment Specialist, two Pearson Scoring Directors and an ILLSA representative. The pre-range finding objective was to review the portfolios and choose portfolio entries that would be reviewed by the range-finding committee to serve as training sets for scoring. WAAS-portfolio entries were also chosen for the anchor, practice, qualifying and validity sets for both alignment and performance scoring.

The WAAS- portfolio-range finding occurred in Auburn, Washington over a one week period from May 12<sup>th</sup> to 16<sup>th</sup>. During the first day and a half, a group of representatives from Pearson as well as Washington educators were led by Pearson staff to review the anchor, practice, qualifying, and validity sets for alignment and performance scoring. After this review, the training sets were solidified and two sets of training materials, one for alignment and one for performance scoring were assembled. This range-finding committee then scored the 12<sup>th</sup> grade portfolios with an n-count of 231.

## Summer Scoring Institute

WAAS-Portfolio scoring was divided between two groups. The first consisted of Pearson professional scorers who scored Part I of the entries for alignment. These scorers were trained with anchor sets and practice sets and were required to qualify. Scorers who did not qualify after the first qualifying portfolio were given an opportunity to score a second qualifying portfolio. Those with high scores and/or previous supervisory experience were chosen to be supervisors. This group scored from June 2<sup>nd</sup> until June 18<sup>th</sup>.

The second group consisted of Washington educators who scored the portfolios for Part II, performance and context. These scorers were trained with anchor and practice sets and were required to qualify to score. As with alignment scoring, teachers who did not qualify after the first qualifying portfolio were given an opportunity to score a second qualifying portfolio. Scoring supervisors or table leaders were chosen from previous Washington educators who had previous experience in scoring and/or as table leader. Washington educators scored Part II from June 16<sup>th</sup> until June 20<sup>th</sup>.

During the Summer Scoring Institute, each scorer was assigned to a table with table leaders/supervisors randomly assigned to the tables. Pearson scoring directors served as trainers and an ILSSA representative served as a resolution scorer for alignment scoring.

The WAAS-Portfolio Scoring Handbook describes the scoring procedures (Appendix A). All scorers completed first and second scoring. The scorer logged the portfolio on the Batch Tracking Log. Teacher scorers were not allowed to score a portfolio from their own school districts or from their tablemates' school districts. Performance scorers used the Scoring Summary Sheets (Appendix B) to record scores and then fill in the scoring monitors. After scoring the portfolio, the scorers placed the monitor in a tray on the table leader's desk and if the portfolio had only a first score monitor, placed the completed portfolio in a box labeled "To Be Filed" or if the portfolio had a second score monitor, in a box labeled "To Be Second Scored". If the portfolio required a second score, it was then placed at a different table to be second scored, so a second team of scorers completed the second score.

For both alignment scoring and performance scoring, table leaders/supervisors and scorers completed three validity sets during the course of scoring. The scoring directors and the OSPI specialist also reviewed all reliability statistics, including validity agreement, each afternoon.

## V. WAAS-PORTFOLIO SCORING PROCEDURES

### General Scoring Procedures

The WAAS-portfolio has two parts to score—1) alignment of skills and evidence of alignment, 2) performance and generalization. As shown on the first page of the 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Scoring Handbook (Appendix A), Part I contains two scores that examine the degree to which the targeted skill is aligned to GLE (Score A), and how well evidence is aligned to the targeted skill (Score B). Part II measures evidence of performance on targeted skills (Score C) and contexts or generalization of the skills (Score D).

Part I examines the alignment on the specific targeted skills to the GLEs. The alignment is determined from examination of the targeted skill and the student generated evidence in each of the portfolio entries for reading, writing, mathematics, and science. The Part I, Score A, determines the targeted skill alignment to the GLE:

- 4= Full alignment
- 3= Near alignment
- 2= Little alignment
- 1=No alignment
- IE=Insufficient evidence

Part 2 examines the alignment of the evidence to the specific targeted skills. Again, the alignment is determined by examining the targeted skill and the student generated evidence in each of the portfolio entries for reading, writing, mathematics, and science. The Part I, Score B, determines the evidence alignment to the targeted skill:

- 4= All evidence aligned
- 3= Most evidence aligned

- 2= Some evidence aligned
- 1= Very little evidence aligned
- IE=Insufficient evidence

Again, Part II scoring examines performance of the targeted skill (Score C), and generalization of the skill to a variety of contexts (Score D).

For Part II, Score C, one performance score is given to each targeted skill. That score is derived from the following scale:

- 4= Student exceeded the goal
- 3= Student met the goal
- 2= Student approached the goal
- 1=Student is not approaching the goal
- IE= Insufficient evidence

In Part II, Score D, one generalization score is given to each targeted skill. That score is derived from the following scale:

- 2=Student generalized the skill in three contexts
- 1=Student generalized the skill in two contexts
- IE =Insufficient Evidence; student generalizes the skill in one context

Each score is derived for each content area for all content required at a grade level. This policy produces two separate scores for students in grades 3 and 6 (reading and mathematics), three separate scores for students in grades 4 and 7(reading, writing, and mathematics), three separate scores for students in grades 5 and 8 (reading, mathematics, and science), and four separate scores for grade 10 (reading, writing, mathematics, and science). Grades 11 and 12 will have either reading or writing or mathematics scores, depending upon which content areas the student still needs to meet the state's graduation requirements.

## Second Scoring and Resolution

During the Summer Scoring Institute, the first and second scoring monitors were compared through the ePS system. For grades 3–8, approximately 25% of the portfolios were second scored, but no resolution was required. In all cases, regardless of adjacency, the first score was used as the student’s final score.

For high school (grades 10-12), all portfolios were second scored. The system checked each score for adjacency. If resolution was required, all scores within that content level were resolved. For example, if reading performance scores (C) were adjacent and reading contexts/generalization scores were not, all scores within the content required resolution. If the two scores were adjacent and no resolution was required, scores from the two raters were added together. If a third read (or resolution score) was required, the resolution score replaced the two disagreed scores, and the third read score was doubled.

Supervisors/table leaders back read each scorer every day. The scorers who had lower reliability or validity scores were back read more often. Table leaders used back reading as a method for monitoring scorer’s accuracy. For alignment scoring, scorers were trained to look-up all Grade Level Expectation Extensions (GLE extensions) to make sure the targeted skill aligned to that extension. If a scorer found that any targeted skill did not align to the GLE extension, they could not assign a score without the entry reviewed by one of the scoring directors or the ILSSA representative. All 3, 2, 1, IE scores for Scores A and B were reviewed.

Inter-rater reliability statistics were calculated each day of performance scoring. Individual scorer retraining occurred for those scorers with less than 66% exact or adjacent scores on validity portfolios.

Supervisors/table leaders and scorers were asked to score a validity portfolio, which was a portfolio that had been previously scored by OSPI and Pearson. The OSPI specialist and the scoring directors reviewed the results for scorers and table leaders who had less than 66% exact matches and adjacent scores. Scorers with lower percentages of inter-rater agreement were not retrained.

## Calculation of Final Scores

Calculation of the final scores on 2008 WAAS differs by grade levels. The algorithms are described below.

### Elementary and Middle School (Grade 3 to 8)

For Grade 3 to 8, the final reported scores were generated by adding the performance (C) and generalization (D) scores of the two targeted skills in each content area. The highest possible final score for each targeted skill was therefore 6 (4 points on Score C plus 2 points on Score D). The final reported score on a specific content was the sum score of the two targeted skills. For grades 3 to 8, the summed scores on the two skills ranged from 0 to 12 (6 points for each targeted skill). For example, if a participating portfolio received Score C of 3 and Score D of 2 on Reading targeted skill 1 and Score C of 4 and Score D of 2 on Reading targeted skill 2, the final score on Reading would be  $3+2+4+2=11$ .

### High School (Grade 10 to 12)

High school, on the other hand, followed a different final score reporting procedure. Scores from the two raters were either added together in the case of exact or adjacent match or resolved and doubled when third read was required. This resulted in a score range twice the size that of grade 3 to 8, where only the first rater's score was used. In other words, the highest possible score for each targeted skill in high school was 12. The total score on a specific content ranged from 0 to 24 (12 for each targeted skill).

## VI. TECHNICAL QUALITIES OF SCORING

In this section, qualities of the 2008 WAAS-PORTFOLIO portfolio scores are examined through the analysis of variance between and within scorers. Three methods are used to examine the quality of WAAS-Portfolio scoring. The first method is the scorers' performance on the qualifying

sets. The second is the inter-rater agreement among scorers. The third method for evaluation of scoring quality is to examine the scoring of pre-selected validity papers.

## **Scoring of Qualifying Sets**

Before actually scoring the portfolios for either alignment (Part I) or performance (Part II), scorers, both supervisors/table leaders and scorers, were asked to score independently either one or two qualifying sets to determine if they fully grasped the scoring criteria and if they could assign scores accurately and consistently according to the specifications of WAAS-Portfolio. Each of two pre-selected qualifying sets contained targeted skills to be scored. Scorers were required to achieve at least a 66% score on one of the two qualifying sets to begin scoring. Scorers not meeting the established criteria by the end of the training sessions or after scoring the two qualifying sets were to be dismissed. The result is shown in Table 6.1. All scorers qualified after two sets.

## **Inter-Rater Agreement**

Inter-rater agreement is an important source of evidence for the reliability of test scores. When two trained judges agree with the independent score given to a student's work, it supports the concept that the score is "correct" for that student's work. The percent of agreement between scorers is examined to determine the degree to which judges give equivalent scores to the same student work. For 2008 WAAS-Portfolio scoring, inter-rater agreement of the first and second scorers was monitored on daily basis. Tables 6.2–6.11 summarize the extent of agreement among the first and second scorers for performance and contexts, C and D, in Part II. As shown in Table 6.11, the overall percentage of exact agreement or of adjacent scores for the performance on targeted skills (Score C) is fairly high, ranging from 92.51% to 95.72%. This high range is also true when the analysis is performed independently for each grade (Tables 6.2–6.10). Agreement rate is generally higher for reading and mathematics than writing and science.

On the other hand, contexts/generalization of targeted skills (Score D) generally exhibits lower inter-rater agreement relative to performance scores. The exact agreement for contexts/generalization score range from 61.11% to 83.16%. While contexts/generalization scoring seems to be less reliable than performance scoring, the majority of the contexts/generalization

scores do exhibit exact agreement regardless of grade level and content area. Referring again to the overall result in Table 6.11, although rates of perfect agreement for contexts/generalization scores are not as high as performance skill scores, they still range from 72% to 77% across the four contents. The overall agreement for contexts/generalization, however, has improved from 2007 to 2008. The lower rates of exact agreement in contexts/generalization scoring may be attributed to different interpretations of the scoring definition and rubrics by the raters. While variation in inter-rater agreement does exist among different subjects and score dimensions, the scores appear to be reliable.

### **Scoring of Validity Sets**

Results from the scoring the validity sets was also monitored. Three validity sets (V1, V2, and V3) were administered to all scorers and table leaders at three different times throughout each of the scoring sessions, alignment and performance.

Scoring validity sets was an established process used as a quality check to ensure that scorers had not drifted in their understanding of the scoring criteria and were continuing to score accurately. Validity sets, like qualifying sets, were chosen from the portfolios scored by the per-range-finding committee and were developed by Pearson and approved by OSPI. All validity sets were distributed at the same time to all scorers and table leaders; validity sets were scored independently.

Validity sets scoring results are presented in Table 6.12. The percentage of exact and adjacent agreement with the pre-scored validity sets was satisfactory among all scorers.



Table 6.1 Results of Qualifying Sets

Alignment Scoring (Part I)			Performance Scoring (Part II)		
Rater ID	Qualifying Set 1	Qualifying Set 2	Rater ID	Qualifying Set 1	Qualifying Set 2
2023	90%		3300	91%	
3028	70%		4400	100%	
4023	90%		1100	83%	
1020	95%		2200	100%	
2020	80%		1010	100%	
3020	80%		3030	100%	
4020	90%		4040	100%	
1021	90%		2020	100%	
1022	90%		1101	100%	
1023	85%		1102	100%	
1024	85%		1103	100%	
1025	85%		1104	100%	
1026	80%		1105	91%	
1028	90%		1106	91%	
1029	75%		1107	91%	
1030	70%		1108	91%	
2021	95%		1109	100%	
2022	90%		1110	100%	
2025	80%		1111	91%	
2026	80%		2201	91%	
2027	75%		2202	91%	
2028	75%		2203	91%	
3021	95%		2204	83%	
3022	95%		2205	100%	
3023	90%		2206	91%	
3024	80%		2207	100%	
3025	85%		2208	100%	
3027	70%		2209	100%	
3029	60%	65%	2210	100%	
4022	95%		2211	100%	
4024	80%		2212	83%	
4025	85%		3301	100%	
4026	75%		3302	100%	
4027	70%		3303	100%	
4028	55%	80%	3304	100%	
			3305	100%	
			3306	100%	
			3307	100%	
			3308	100%	
			3309	100%	

Table 6.1 Results of Qualifying Sets (Continued)

Alignment Scoring (Part I)			Performance Scoring (Part II)		
Rater ID	Qualifying Set 1	Qualifying Set 2	Rater ID	Qualifying Set 1	Qualifying Set 2
			3310	100%	
			3311	91%	
			3312	100%	
			4401	100%	
			4402	100%	
			4403	100%	
			4404	100%	
			4405	100%	
			4406	100%	
			4407	100%	
			4408	75%	
			4409	100%	
			4410	91%	
			4411	100%	

Table 6.2 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 3

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	84.07%	NA	80.35%	NA	83.16%	NA	77.18%	NA
Adjacent	12.20%	NA	19.10%	NA	16.84%	NA	22.82%	NA
Non-Adjacent	3.73%	NA	0.55%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.3 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 4

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	86.80%	74.68%	78.18%	NA	78.52%	82.03%	75.13%	NA
Adjacent	10.74%	14.68%	17.73%	NA	21.48%	17.97%	24.87%	NA
Non-Adjacent	2.46%	10.64%	4.09%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.4 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 5

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	82.61%	NA	83.85%	76.80%	76.77%	NA	71.00%	71.90%
Adjacent	9.52%	NA	11.09%	10.05%	23.23%	NA	29.00%	28.10%
Non-Adjacent	8.07%	NA	5.07%	13.15%	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.5 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 6

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	84.83%	NA	78.35%	NA	72.16%	NA	76.67%	NA
Adjacent	13.45%	NA	20.22%	NA	27.84%	NA	23.33%	NA
Non-Adjacent	1.72%	NA	1.43%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.6 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 7

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	84.38%	82.11%	85.68%	NA	78.71%	79.83%	79.80%	NA
Adjacent	14.42%	10.28%	10.02%	NA	21.29%	20.17%	20.20%	NA
Non-Adjacent	1.20%	7.61%	4.30%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.7 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 8

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	80.14%	NA	80.82%	79.66%	76.86%	NA	65.82%	63.39%
Adjacent	12.97%	NA	7.27%	16.53%	23.14%	NA	34.18%	36.61%
Non-Adjacent	6.89%	NA	10.91%	3.81%	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.8 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 10

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	80.37%	78.51%	84.51%	75.14%	77.87%	67.09%	75.61%	72.62%
Adjacent	10.12%	15.70%	8.63%	19.91%	22.13%	32.91%	24.39%	27.38%
Non-Adjacent	9.51%	5.78%	6.86%	4.95%	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.9 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 11

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	80.00%	85.00%	86.15%	NA	81.25%	61.11%	78.10%	NA
Adjacent	10.83%	10.00%	10.22%	NA	18.75%	38.89%	21.90%	NA
Non-Adjacent	9.17%	5.00%	3.63%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.10 Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers for Grade 12

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	87.78%	78.60%	84.48%	NA	78.83%	77.45%	72.10%	NA
Adjacent	8.89%	15.40%	11.35%	NA	21.17%	22.55%	27.90%	NA
Non-Adjacent	3.33%	6.00%	4.17%	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.11 Overall Percentage Agreement between First and Second Scorers

Extent of Agreement	C: Performance of target skills				D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
Perfect Agreement	84.27%	77.88%	83.27%	80.38%	77.01%	71.85%	75.51%	73.34%
Adjacent	11.45%	14.63%	10.21%	12.62%	22.99%	28.15%	24.49%	26.66%
Non-Adjacent	4.28%	7.49%	6.52%	6.99%	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note: NA is not applicable

Table 6.12 Scoring Results on the Validity Sets

Alignment Scoring (Part I)				Performance Scoring (Part II)			
Rater ID	V1 (%)	V2 (%)	V3 (%)	Rater ID	V1 (%)	V2 (%)	V3 (%)
2023	100	80	90	3300	83	91	91
3028	95	85	85	4400	100	91	58
4023	80	70	90	1100	100	83	91
1020	65	70	90	2200	83	91	75
2020	70	80	85	1010	100	100	66
3020	90	65	80	3030	91	75	100
4020	95	75	90	4040	75	91	83
1021	85	75	85	2020	91	83	58
1022	80	70	100	1101	100	75	91
1023	85	85	85	1102	100	100	100
1024	80	65	80	1103	100	66	100
1025	65	60	75	1104	100	91	100
1026	85	50	75	1105	100	100	100
1028	90	75	80	1106	100	91	100
1029	80	70	100	1107	100	100	91
1030	75	70	95	1108	100	83	66
2021	75	55	85	1109	100	83	100
2022	70	85	70	1110	100	91	100
2025	95	75	85	1111	100	91	100
2026	75	80	85	2201	66	75	58
2027	100	90	90	2202	66	83	83
2028	75	70	75	2203	91	75	100
3021	95	70	75	2204	100	83	100
3022	90	70	80	2205	83	83	100
3023	95	65	90	2206	58	83	91
3024	85	90	65	2207	100	91	83
3025	100	90	85	2208	100	83	100
3027	75	80	85	2209	83	83	91
3029	70	65	85	2210	100	91	83
4022	95	80	90	2211	100	83	100
4024	95	80	75	2212	83	91	100
4025	95	75	85	3301	100	75	100
4026	45	85	70	3302	91	100	100
4027	100	65	85	3303	91	83	91
4028	80	70	85	3304	100	83	100
				3305	100	91	100
				3306	100	91	100
				3307	100	91	100
				3308	91	91	100
				3309	100	91	100
				3310	100	91	100

Table 6.12 Scoring Results on the Validity Sets (Continued)

Alignment Scoring (Part I)				Performance Scoring (Part II)			
Rater ID	V1 (%)	V2 (%)	V3 (%)	Rater ID	V1 (%)	V2 (%)	V3 (%)
				3311	100	75	83
				3312	100	83	100
				4401	100	91	100
				4402	100	91	100
				4403	100	91	100
				4404	75	75	100
				4405	83	75	100
				4406	91	91	91
				4407	100	91	100
				4408	100	66	100
				4409	100	91	100
				4410	100	83	83
				4411	83	91	100



## VII. CONSTRUCT VALIDITY

Common approaches to investigate construct validity of an assessment are to examine inter-dimension correlations and factor structure. The correlation method provides information about the relationships among the score dimensions. In WAAS, the reason of providing individual score for each content area is based on the belief that they are independent from each other and should not be considered as one general knowledge or skill. For example, reading and mathematics are two different content areas and should be evaluated separately. Thus, the expectation is to observe low score correlations between various content areas but higher correlations between Score C and D within a content area (e.g., Reading). However, correlations of Score C and D within a content area should be at moderate level (e.g., .40- .70) so the two part scoring (C and D) can be justified. A high correlation (e.g., .8 or above) between Score C and D within the same content area would suggest redundancy of the two-part scoring scheme. As in the analysis of correlation patterns, the factor analytical method explores the structure of an assessment through the correlations among the sub-scores. High correlations among the scores would result in smaller number of factors because of similarity and redundancy in score dimensions. Independent score dimensions, on the other hand, would result in multiple-factor structure which justifies multiple scoring schemes as in WAAS.

Tables 7.1 to 7.9 show the correlations among the sub-scores in Part II for all the grades. As expected, scores between various content areas generally have weak inter-correlations. For example, Reading Score C and Math Score C are usually weakly correlated. This result supports the individual score reporting for each content area. If the correlations between different content areas were high, independent content scoring might be unnecessary. On the contrary, correlations within each content area (between Score C and Score D) are generally higher than the correlations between two different contents. For example, correlations between Reading Score C and Reading Score D are higher than the correlation between Reading and Math performance score C. Such patterns of correlations can be observed across all grades. In addition, Correlations between Score C and Score D within the same content area are moderate but not exceedingly high (centered around .63 with a range from .39 to .82). These patterns are consistent across all grades. They suggest a strong content-specific factor structure and justify the individual content scoring (Reading, Writing, Math and Science) and two part scoring (C and D) for WAAS.

Table 7.1 Grade 3 Sub-score Correlations

Dimension		C: Performance		D: Contexts	
		Reading	Math	Reading	Math
C: Performance	Reading	1.00			
	Math	0.21	1.00		
D: Contexts	Reading	<b>0.47</b>	0.12	1.00	
	Math	0.07	<b>0.39</b>	0.10	1.00

Table 7.2 Grade 4 Sub-score Correlations

Dimension		C: Performance			D: Contexts		
		Reading	Writing	Math	Reading	Writing	Math
C: Performance	Reading	1.00					
	Writing	0.12	1.00				
	Math	0.23	0.28	1.00			
D: Contexts	Reading	<b>0.55</b>	0.09	-0.04	1.00		
	Writing	0.07	<b>0.51</b>	0.13	0.04	1.00	
	Math	0.11	0.05	<b>0.49</b>	-0.06	0.12	1.00

Table 7.3 Grade 5 Sub-score Correlations

Dimension		C: Performance			D: Contexts		
		Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
C: Performance	Reading	1.00					
	Math	0.11	1.00				
	Science	0.05	0.14	1.00			
D: Contexts	Reading	<b>0.52</b>	0.10	-0.02	1.00		
	Math	-0.08	<b>0.61</b>	0.10	0.08	1.00	
	Science	0.15	0.05	<b>0.63</b>	0.05	0.08	1.00

Table 7.4 Grade 6 Sub-score Correlations

Dimension		C: Performance		D: Contexts	
		Reading	Math	Reading	Math
C: Performance	Reading	1.00			
	Math	0.04	1.00		
D: Contexts	Reading	<b>0.70</b>	0.27	1.00	
	Math	0.08	<b>0.60</b>	0.00	1.00

Table 7.5 Grade 7 Sub-score Correlations

Dimension		C: Performance			D: Contexts		
		Reading	Writing	Math	Reading	Writing	Math
C: Performance	Reading	1.00					
	Writing	0.04	1.00				
	Math	0.18	0.18	1.00			
D: Contexts	Reading	<b>0.66</b>	0.02	0.11	1.00		
	Writing	0.03	<b>0.55</b>	0.13	-0.02	1.00	
	Math	0.08	0.20	<b>0.68</b>	0.01	0.03	1.00

Table 7.6 Grade 8 Sub-score Correlations

Dimension		C: Performance			D: Contexts		
		Reading	Math	Science	Reading	Math	Science
C: Performance	Reading	1.00					
	Math	0.29	1.00				
	Science	0.21	0.24	1.00			
D: Contexts	Reading	<b>0.72</b>	0.29	0.16	1.00		
	Math	0.35	<b>0.78</b>	0.32	0.18	1.00	
	Science	0.07	0.12	<b>0.54</b>	0.18	0.19	1.00

Table 7.7 Grade 10 Sub-score Correlations

Dimension		C: Performance				D: Contexts			
		Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
C: Performance	Reading	1.00							
	Writing	0.13	1.00						
	Math	-0.04	0.12	1.00					
	Science	0.16	0.06	0.19	1.00				
D: Contexts	Reading	<b>0.74</b>	0.02	-0.09	0.15	1.00			
	Writing	0.06	<b>0.72</b>	0.05	-0.18	0.04	1.00		
	Math	0.10	0.07	<b>0.64</b>	-0.04	0.15	0.00	1.00	
	Science	-0.09	-0.16	0.24	<b>0.63</b>	0.16	-0.21	0.03	1.00

Table 7.8 Grade 11 Sub-score Correlations

Dimension		C: Performance			D: Contexts		
		Reading	Writing	Math	Reading	Writing	Math
C: Performance	Reading	1.00					
	Writing	0.12	1.00				
	Math	0.32	0.11	1.00			
D: Contexts	Reading	<b>0.63</b>	0.35	0.33	1.00		
	Writing	-0.01	<b>0.75</b>	0.16	0.53	1.00	
	Math	-0.09	0.26	<b>0.73</b>	0.41	0.45	1.00

Table 7.9 Grade 12 Sub-score Correlations

Dimension		C: Performance			D: Contexts		
		Reading	Writing	Math	Reading	Writing	Math
C: Performance	Reading	1.00					
	Writing	0.00	1.00				
	Math	-0.24	0.44	1.00			
D: Contexts	Reading	<b>0.78</b>	-0.18	-0.42	1.00		
	Writing	0.22	<b>0.82</b>	0.46	-0.19	1.00	
	Math	0.14	0.53	<b>0.74</b>	-0.41	0.58	1.00

Exploratory factor analyses were also performed to further investigate the nature of the inter-correlations across the content performance scores (C) and contexts/generalization scores (D). A principle components analysis was conducted using SAS (Statistical Analysis Software, v 9.1). The number of factors was determined using two criteria:

- eigenvalues greater than 1
- a screde test for the eigenvalues

Eigenvalues indicates the degree a factor explains the variances among the scores. A value larger than one suggests a dominating factor. Table 7.10 lists the eigenvalues and proportion of variance explained of all the extracted components. The result is a multi-factor solution that matched the number of content domains in each grade. That is, the number of factors with eigenvalue larger than 1 are the same as the number of content skills measured in each grade. Extracted factors with eigenvalue larger than 1 explain approximately 80% percent of the total variance on average. This result is consistent with the analysis of the inter-correlations.

The content-specific, multi-factor structure was further investigated by examining the loadings on the factors. The number of factors was fixed to four since four contents measured. An Orthogonal Varimax rotation approach was applied in the analysis.

Patterns of factor loadings in Table 7.11 clearly reflect content-specific factorial structure as loadings are similar within the same content domain. For example, grade 8 reading scores (both C and D scores) have high loadings on factor 1. Science scores seem to load on factor 2, and math scores load on factor 3. Similar patterns are observed at all grade levels.

Table 7.10 Initial Principal Component Analysis for All Grades

Component	Eigenvalue	Proportion	Component	Eigenvalue	Proportion
<b>Grade 3</b>			<b>Grade 7</b>		
1	1.87	.47	1	1.84	.31
2	1.06	.27	2	1.53	.25
3	.69	.17	3	1.34	.22
4	.38	.10	4	.59	.10
<b>Grade 4</b>			5	.47	.08
1	2.08	.35	6	.24	.04
2	1.39	.23	<b>Grade 8</b>		
3	1.17	.19	1	2.11	.35
4	.74	.12	2	1.94	.32
5	.33	.05	3	1.23	.20
6	.29	.05	4	.31	.05
<b>Grade 5</b>			5	.21	.04
1	2.32	.39	6	.20	.03
2	1.56	.26	<b>High School</b>		
3	1.11	.19	1	3.40	.43
4	.46	.08	2	2.01	.25
5	.35	.06	3	1.30	.16
6	.20	.03	4	.74	.09
<b>Grade 6</b>			5	.35	.04
1	1.78	.44	6	.17	.02
2	1.60	.40	7	.04	<.01
3	.37	.09	8	.00	<.0001
4	.25	.06			

Table 7.11 Factor Loadings in Fixed-Number Factor Analysis with Orthogonal Varimax Rotation

Grade	Score Dimension		Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
3	Part C: Evidence of Performance	Reading	.27	.02	.23	.94
		Math	.07	.19	.96	.22
	Part D: Contexts/Generalization	Reading	.97	.05	.06	.24
		Math	.04	.98	.17	.02
4	Part C: Evidence of Performance	Reading	.87	.04	.30	-.01
		Writing	.20	.79	.41	-.06
		Math	.05	.06	.93	.21
	Part D: Contexts/Generalization	Reading	.92	.10	-.16	.02
		Writing	-.01	.93	-.13	.12
		Math	.01	.07	.18	.97
5	Part C: Evidence of Performance	Reading	.10	.00	.90	.35
		Math	.13	.92	.19	-.21
		Science	.91	.15	.06	.11
	Part D: Contexts/Generalization	Reading	.06	.02	.43	.86
		Math	.18	.87	-.22	.30
		Science	.92	.12	.06	-.02
6	Part C: Evidence of Performance	Reading	.92	.03	-.01	.39
		Math	.00	.36	.93	.05
	Part D: Contexts/Generalization	Reading	.39	-.01	.06	.92
		Math	.03	.93	.36	-.01
7	Part C: Evidence of Performance	Reading	-.02	.86	-.19	.21
		Writing	.89	.19	-.12	.15
		Math	.04	.08	.26	.93
	Part D: Contexts/Generalization	Reading	.09	.89	.17	-.08
		Writing	.93	-.10	.09	-.10
		Math	-.02	.00	.93	.26
8	Part C: Evidence of Performance	Reading	.94	-.07	.05	.02
		Math	.02	.19	.86	.42
		Science	.01	.89	.13	.35
	Part D: Contexts/Generalization	Reading	.95	-.04	.04	-.01
		Math	.08	.02	.96	-.18
		Science	-.13	.95	.05	-.20
High School	Part C: Evidence of Performance	Reading	-.26	.11	.88	-.20
		Writing	-.05	-.23	.03	.90
		Math	.95	-.21	-.19	-.11
		Science	-.25	.94	.11	-.13
	Part D: Contexts/Generalization	Reading	-.11	.16	.94	-.02
		Writing	-.15	-.04	-.22	.87
		Math	.95	-.21	.19	-.11
		Science	-.16	.94	.17	-.16

## VIII. SUMMARY OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE

In this section, students' performances are examined by analyzing the score distributions of all content areas across all grade levels. Also, average scores are examined to provide information about how students performed on WAAS-Portfolio.

The score distributions reported in Table 8.1 are based on the data captured in the demographic sheets. These data represent the final post-record results for the WAAS-Portfolio. Table 8.1 provides a summary of the percentage of students earning each of the score points across the four content areas. In this table, portfolios identified as not-aligned with GLE (NA), refused (RF), or aligned with GLE but showed insufficient evidence of alignment or proficiency (IE) were combined into the same category. As a result, large percentages of portfolios fell into the NA/RF/IE category across all content areas. In the actual scoring and report, only portfolios with insufficient evidence (IE) in Part II were given scores of "0". Cases failed to show alignment or refused were not given actual scores but instead reported as not aligned or refused. Table 8.2 shows the score distribution based on the entire WAAS-Portfolio population and includes all grade levels. A breakdown of the score category "0" in Table 8.1 is provided.

### Analysis of Performance Scores

In general, scores of performance on targeted skills (Score C) follow a bimodal pattern where portfolios were either scored as IE, RF, NA, or 4. These score categories account for approximately 70% to 80% of the score distribution. If we exclude the IE,RF,NA portfolios and examine only the portfolios that are aligned to the GLE and that had evidence aligned to the targeted skills (Part I, Scores A and B), the majority of portfolios received scores of 3 or 4. In 2001, only 5.2% of the portfolios in mathematics were scored with a score of 4. Percentages of high scores were low in other content domains, as well, in earlier years. The distributions of the performance scores gradually changed over the past few years with more students earning higher scores of 3 or 4. In 2007, the percentages of portfolios earning the highest score ranged from 41.99% to 55.84% across all subjects and grades. This year, the percentages of portfolios receiving the highest score declined due to larger number of portfolios being classified as IE and NA.



## **Analysis of Contexts Scores**

Scores on contexts (Score D) also show good generalization of content skills. Similar to the performance scores, a bimodal distribution can be observed for all grades across all content areas. As indicated in Table 8.2, more portfolios received a score of zero (IE) in generalization of a single context (Score D) than in performance of targeted skills (Score C). In other words, insufficient evidence of contexts/generalization of content skills is more common than insufficient evidence observed in performance skills. However, if one examines only the portfolios demonstrating good alignment scores (Part I, Scores A and B), many of them did successfully demonstrate contexts/generalization of content skills in a variety of settings.

## **Total Score Distribution**

With the observed bimodal distribution in both performance and contexts scores, the total score shows a similar distributional pattern. Table 8.3 summarizes the distribution of total scores for all grades and contents. It shows the number and percentage of students at each score point. As described, portfolios failed to show alignment or refused were not scored. Therefore, total score distribution in Table 8.3 only includes portfolios that showed good alignment. A total score of “0” was resulted from insufficient evidence (IE) in Part II.

## **Mean Score Summary**

Student performance is also examined by generating the average total scores for all content areas across all grades. This analysis is performed at various levels. Table 8.4 presents the mean score summary based on all WAAS-Portfolio participants and grade-specific populations. Gender and ethnic sub-group analysis is also presented.

Table 8.1 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Score Distributions

Score Point	Part C: Performance of Skills				Part D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
<b>Grade 3</b>								
0 <sup>1</sup>	35.97	NA <sup>2</sup>	24.47	NA	43.39	NA	29.91	NA
1	6.67	NA	4.08	NA	7.42	NA	11.74	NA
2	3.46	NA	2.97	NA	49.20	NA	58.34	NA
3	15.33	NA	20.40	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	38.57	NA	48.08	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Grade 4</b>								
0	44.68	54.05	30.51	NA	51.39	58.23	36.08	NA
1	6.20	3.80	4.05	NA	7.72	6.46	13.42	NA
2	2.66	1.90	3.92	NA	40.89	35.32	50.51	NA
3	15.82	13.42	21.65	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	30.63	26.84	39.87	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Grade 5</b>								
0	53.46	NA	38.93	50.92	62.34	NA	47.81	60.08
1	8.46	NA	7.48	7.90	8.89	NA	13.26	10.44
2	3.67	NA	4.37	4.23	28.77	NA	38.93	29.48
3	14.39	NA	16.78	14.25	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	20.03	NA	32.44	22.71	NA	NA	NA	NA

Values in cells represent percentages.

<sup>1</sup> In this table, the score category of 0 includes portfolios failed to show alignment, had insufficient evidence of proficiency, or was refused. A breakdown analysis is provided in Table 8.2 at population level.

<sup>2</sup> Not applicable

Table 8.1 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Score Distributions (Continued)

Score Point	Part C: Performance of Skills				Part D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
<b>Grade 6</b>								
0 <sup>3</sup>	69.49	NA <sup>4</sup>	53.54	NA	78.5	NA	64.77	NA
1	8.60	NA	8.88	NA	6.8	NA	17.06	NA
2	2.22	NA	4.99	NA	14.7	NA	18.17	NA
3	7.63	NA	13.18	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	12.07	NA	19.42	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Grade 7</b>								
0	56.60	61.00	52.96	NA	66.77	64.95	58.42	NA
1	8.95	4.10	5.16	NA	7.28	6.07	10.93	NA
2	1.97	1.21	2.28	NA	25.95	28.98	30.65	NA
3	10.77	10.17	13.66	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	21.70	23.52	25.95	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Grade 8</b>								
0	68.27	NA	68.41	59.92	75.21	NA	76.35	66.86
1	6.66	NA	7.37	6.23	7.22	NA	8.07	7.22
2	1.56	NA	2.97	1.27	17.56	NA	15.58	25.92
3	8.07	NA	6.37	9.92	NA	NA	NA	NA
4	15.44	NA	14.87	22.66	NA	NA	NA	NA

Values in cells represent percentages.

<sup>3</sup> In this table, the score category of 0 includes portfolios that failed to show alignment, had insufficient evidence of proficiency, or that included an indicator of “refused.” A breakdown analysis is provided at population level in Table 8.2.

<sup>4</sup> Not Applicable

Table 8.1 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Score Distributions (continued)

Score Point	Part C: Performance of Skills				Part D: Contexts/Generalization			
	Reading	Writing	Math	Science	Reading	Writing	Math	Science
<b>Grade 10</b>								
0 <sup>5</sup>	60.90	68.93	63.21	64.76	69.40	73.42	73.88	72.18
2	6.49	3.71	8.35	4.33	8.04	5.87	7.26	6.65
3	0.00	0.31	0.15	0.15	0.62	1.24	1.85	1.85
4	2.32	1.85	1.85	1.39	21.95	19.47	17.00	19.32
5	0.62	0.31	0.31	0.46	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	9.58	7.73	9.58	9.74	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	1.08	1.55	1.39	1.55	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	19.01	15.61	15.15	17.62	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Grade 11</b>								
0	76.75	74.12	71.49	NA <sup>6</sup>	82.02	76.32	80.26	NA
2	4.82	2.63	6.58	NA	6.14	8.77	6.14	NA
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA	0.00	0.44	0.88	NA
4	0.88	1.32	0.44	NA	11.84	14.47	12.72	NA
5	0.00	0.44	0.44	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	8.33	7.89	5.70	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	0.00	1.32	1.75	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	9.21	12.28	13.60	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
<b>Grade 12</b>								
0	74.67	62.88	81.66	NA	77.73	64.19	83.41	NA
2	3.06	1.31	1.31	NA	5.24	6.55	4.80	NA
3	0.00	0.00	0.00	NA	1.31	3.49	1.31	NA
4	1.75	2.18	1.75	NA	15.72	25.76	10.48	NA
5	0.44	0.87	0.44	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
6	3.93	5.68	3.49	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
7	0.87	3.93	0.87	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
8	15.28	23.14	10.48	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

Values in cells represent percentages.

<sup>5</sup> In this table, the score category of 0 includes portfolios failed to show alignment, had insufficient evidence of proficiency, or was refused. A breakdown analysis is provided at population level in Table 8.2.

<sup>6</sup> Not Applicable

Table 8.2 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Score Distribution Based on the Entire Population

score	C: Performance of Targeted Skills								D: Contexts/Generalization							
	Reading		Writing		Math		Science		Reading		Writing		Math		Science	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
<b>1</b>	331	6.02	57	2.23	268	4.87	100	3.97	332	6.04	91	3.56	547	9.95	125	4.96
<b>2</b>	175	3.18	56	2.19	230	4.18	67	2.66	1404	25.54	543	21.27	1662	30.23	435	17.27
<b>3</b>	534	9.71	175	6.85	686	12.48	172	6.83	7	0.13	17	0.67	17	0.31	12	0.48
<b>4</b>	1056	19.21	387	15.16	1367	24.86	330	13.10	205	3.73	218	8.54	163	2.97	126	5.00
<b>5</b>	5	0.09	5	0.20	4	0.07	3	0.12								
<b>6</b>	90	1.64	81	3.17	83	1.51	63	2.50								
<b>7</b>	9	0.16	22	0.86	15	0.27	10	0.40								
<b>8</b>	179	3.26	182	7.13	153	2.78	115	4.57								
<b>IE</b>	1987	36.14	790	30.94	1470	26.74	649	25.76	2418	43.98	886	34.70	1886	34.31	811	32.20
<b>NA</b>	531	9.66	488	19.11	547	9.95	239	9.49	531	9.66	488	19.11	547	9.95	239	9.49
<b>RF</b>	601	10.93	310	12.14	675	12.28	771	30.61	601	10.93	310	12.14	675	12.28	771	30.61

**IE**=Insufficient Evidence, a score of 0 was assigned

**NA**=Not Aligned

**RF**=Refused

Table 8.3 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Total Score Distributions

Score	Reading		Writing		Math		Science	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Grade 3</b>								
0 <sup>7</sup>	150	19.08	NA <sup>8</sup>	NA	109	13.92	NA	NA
1	28	3.56	NA	NA	17	2.17	NA	NA
2	16	2.04	NA	NA	5	0.64	NA	NA
3	13	1.65	NA	NA	18	2.30	NA	NA
4	26	3.31	NA	NA	33	4.21	NA	NA
5	49	6.23	NA	NA	31	3.96	NA	NA
6	97	12.34	NA	NA	91	11.62	NA	NA
7	20	2.54	NA	NA	22	2.81	NA	NA
8	17	2.16	NA	NA	30	3.83	NA	NA
9	38	4.83	NA	NA	39	4.98	NA	NA
10	70	8.91	NA	NA	107	13.67	NA	NA
11	62	7.89	NA	NA	79	10.09	NA	NA
12	200	25.45	NA	NA	202	25.80	NA	NA
<b>Grade 4</b>								
0	203	26.85	264	35.44	136	18.09	NA	NA
1	26	3.44	32	4.30	12	1.60	NA	NA
2	8	1.06	3	0.40	5	0.66	NA	NA
3	10	1.32	7	0.94	18	2.39	NA	NA
4	29	3.84	43	5.77	33	4.39	NA	NA
5	50	6.61	45	6.04	50	6.65	NA	NA
6	117	15.48	126	16.91	92	12.23	NA	NA
7	30	3.97	11	1.48	31	4.12	NA	NA
8	13	1.72	7	0.94	22	2.93	NA	NA
9	26	3.44	23	3.09	48	6.38	NA	NA
10	76	10.05	43	5.77	82	10.90	NA	NA
11	46	6.08	30	4.03	57	7.58	NA	NA
12	122	16.14	111	14.90	166	22.07	NA	NA
<b>Grade 5</b>								
0	217	32.05	NA	NA	158	23.41	224	33.48
1	27	3.99	NA	NA	37	5.48	41	6.13
2	6	0.89	NA	NA	12	1.78	7	1.05
3	19	2.81	NA	NA	22	3.26	18	2.69
4	40	5.91	NA	NA	50	7.41	47	7.03
5	56	8.27	NA	NA	44	6.52	40	5.98
6	93	13.74	NA	NA	85	12.59	111	16.59
7	19	2.81	NA	NA	31	4.59	25	3.74
8	14	2.07	NA	NA	15	2.22	23	3.44
9	22	3.25	NA	NA	32	4.74	13	1.94
10	48	7.09	NA	NA	50	7.41	27	4.04
11	33	4.87	NA	NA	38	5.63	29	4.33
12	83	12.26	NA	NA	101	14.96	64	9.57

<sup>7</sup> Final total score of 0 only includes portfolios that showed insufficient evidence of proficiency. Portfolios not aligned with GLE or refused were reported accordingly without providing final scores.

<sup>8</sup> Not Applicable.

Table 8.3 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Total Score Distributions (Continued)

Score	Reading		Writing		Math		Science	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Grade 6</b>								
0 <sup>9</sup>	347	50.51	NA <sup>10</sup>	NA	269	39.39	NA	NA
1	53	7.71	NA	NA	48	7.03	NA	NA
2	9	1.31	NA	NA	17	2.49	NA	NA
3	15	2.18	NA	NA	30	4.39	NA	NA
4	28	4.08	NA	NA	87	12.74	NA	NA
5	44	6.40	NA	NA	35	5.12	NA	NA
6	68	9.90	NA	NA	63	9.22	NA	NA
7	29	4.22	NA	NA	23	3.37	NA	NA
8	13	1.89	NA	NA	11	1.61	NA	NA
9	10	1.46	NA	NA	12	1.76	NA	NA
10	20	2.91	NA	NA	31	4.54	NA	NA
11	10	1.46	NA	NA	13	1.90	NA	NA
12	41	5.97	NA	NA	44	6.44	NA	NA
<b>Grade 7</b>								
0	211	33.60	271	43.57	205	33.06	NA	NA
1	41	6.53	33	5.31	28	4.52	NA	NA
2	13	2.07	6	0.96	7	1.13	NA	NA
3	12	1.91	4	0.64	21	3.39	NA	NA
4	32	5.10	28	4.50	45	7.26	NA	NA
5	40	6.37	30	4.82	30	4.84	NA	NA
6	90	14.33	119	19.13	119	19.19	NA	NA
7	30	4.78	14	2.25	14	2.26	NA	NA
8	11	1.75	12	1.93	10	1.61	NA	NA
9	13	2.07	5	0.80	11	1.77	NA	NA
10	33	5.25	27	4.34	40	6.45	NA	NA
11	23	3.66	23	3.70	12	1.94	NA	NA
12	79	12.58	50	8.04	78	12.58	NA	NA
<b>Grade 8</b>								
0	332	50.30	NA	NA	342	51.98	277	42.95
1	44	6.67	NA	NA	53	8.05	36	5.58
2	9	1.36	NA	NA	9	1.37	4	0.62
3	19	2.88	NA	NA	15	2.28	9	1.40
4	39	5.91	NA	NA	39	5.93	49	7.60
5	26	3.94	NA	NA	34	5.17	18	2.79
6	61	9.24	NA	NA	76	11.55	120	18.60
7	10	1.52	NA	NA	12	1.82	14	2.17
8	9	1.36	NA	NA	3	0.46	10	1.55
9	8	1.21	NA	NA	11	1.67	18	2.79
10	22	3.33	NA	NA	16	2.43	26	4.03
11	11	1.67	NA	NA	10	1.52	6	0.93
12	70	10.61	NA	NA	38	5.78	58	8.99

<sup>9</sup> Final total score of 0 only includes portfolios that showed insufficient evidence of proficiency. Portfolios not aligned with GLE or refused were reported accordingly without providing final scores.

<sup>10</sup> Not Applicable.

Table 8.3 2008 WAAS- Portfolio Total Score Distributions (Continued)

Score	Reading		Writing		Math		Science	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Grade 10</b>								
0 <sup>11</sup>	269	43.95	312	51.15	275	44.64	245	44.14
2	46	7.52	23	3.77	50	8.12	20	3.60
3	0	0	3	0.49	1	0.16	2	0.36
4	9	1.47	3	0.49	5	0.81	6	1.08
5	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.18
6	13	2.12	11	1.80	18	2.92	14	2.52
7	5	0.82	1	0.16	1	0.16	5	0.90
8	31	5.07	34	5.57	49	7.95	46	8.29
9	2	0.33	6	0.98	1	0.16	5	0.90
10	24	3.92	22	3.61	31	5.03	28	5.05
11	6	0.98	9	1.48	11	1.79	7	1.26
12	71	11.60	100	16.39	73	11.85	88	15.86
13	1	0.16	0	0	0	0	0	0
14	16	2.61	10	1.64	26	4.22	5	0.90
15	2	0.33	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	8	1.31	4	0.66	5	0.81	3	0.54
17	0	0	0	0	1	0.16	1	0.18
18	14	2.29	6	0.98	6	0.97	7	1.26
19	0	0	5	0.82	4	0.65	1	0.18
20	17	2.78	15	2.46	22	3.57	20	3.60
21	2	0.33	1	0.16	3	0.49	0	0
22	13	2.12	8	1.31	7	1.14	9	1.62
23	4	0.65	3	0.49	0	0	2	0.36
24	59	9.64	34	5.57	27	4.38	40	7.21

<sup>11</sup> Final total score of 0 only includes portfolios that showed insufficient evidence of proficiency. Portfolios not aligned with GLE or refused were reported accordingly without providing final scores.



Table 8.3 2008 WAAS- Portfolio Total Score Distributions (Continued)

Score	Reading		Writing		Math		Science	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Grade 11</b>								
0 <sup>12</sup>	74	47.74	94	52.51	73	48.34	NA <sup>13</sup>	NA
2	8	5.16	6	3.35	11	7.28	NA	NA
4	1	0.65	1	0.56	4	2.65	NA	NA
5	1	0.65	0	0	0	0	NA	NA
6	4	2.58	3	1.68	0	0	NA	NA
7	0	0	1	0.56	2	1.32	NA	NA
8	13	8.39	14	7.82	14	9.27	NA	NA
9	0	0	0	0	1	0.66	NA	NA
10	9	5.81	3	1.68	2	1.32	NA	NA
11	2	1.29	2	1.12	2	1.32	NA	NA
12	22	14.19	35	19.55	19	12.58	NA	NA
13	0	0	0	0	1	0.66	NA	NA
14	6	3.87	3	1.68	3	1.99	NA	NA
16	4	2.58	2	1.12	5	3.31	NA	NA
18	1	0.65	3	1.68	1	0.66	NA	NA
20	1	0.65	4	2.23	4	2.65	NA	NA
21	1	0.65	0	0	1	0.66	NA	NA
22	3	1.94	1	0.56	0	0	NA	NA
23	0	0	1	0.56	1	0.66	NA	NA
24	5	3.23	6	3.35	7	4.64	NA	NA

<sup>12</sup> Final total score of 0 only includes portfolios that showed insufficient evidence of proficiency. Portfolios not aligned with GLE or refused were reported accordingly without providing final scores.

<sup>13</sup> Not Applicable.

Table 8.3 2008 WAAS- Portfolio Total Score Distributions (Continued)

Score	Reading		Writing		Math		Science	
	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent	Count	Percent
<b>Grade 12</b>								
0 <sup>14</sup>	46	38.66	50	29.76	56	50.91	NA <sup>15</sup>	NA
2	4	3.36	5	2.98	3	2.73	NA	NA
4	2	1.68	1	0.60	0	0	NA	NA
6	1	0.84	9	5.36	8	7.27	NA	NA
7	0	0	2	1.19	0	0	NA	NA
8	2	1.68	8	4.76	6	5.45	NA	NA
9	0	0	3	1.79	1	0.91	NA	NA
10	8	6.72	6	3.57	1	0.91	NA	NA
11	1	0.84	4	2.38	1	0.91	NA	NA
12	15	12.61	36	21.43	19	17.27	NA	NA
13	0	0	1	0.60	0	0	NA	NA
14	1	0.84	2	1.19	3	2.73	NA	NA
16	3	2.52	0	0	1	0.91	NA	NA
17	0	0	0	0	2	1.82	NA	NA
18	4	3.36	4	2.38	0	0	NA	NA
19	2	1.68	2	1.19	0	0	NA	NA
20	1	0.84	6	3.57	1	0.91	NA	NA
22	6	5.04	8	4.76	3	2.73	NA	NA
23	1	0.84	0	0	1	0.91	NA	NA
24	22	18.49	21	12.50	4	3.64	NA	NA

<sup>14</sup> Final total score of 0 only includes portfolios that showed insufficient evidence of proficiency. Portfolios not aligned with GLE or refused were reported accordingly without providing final scores.

<sup>15</sup> Not Applicable.

Table 8.4 Mean Total Score Summary for All Grades and Contents

Group	Count	Mean Total Score Reading	Mean Total Score Writing	Mean Total Score Math	Mean Total Score Science
<b>Grade 3</b>					
All	809	6.91	NA <sup>16</sup>	7.69	NA
Male	538	6.89	NA	7.51	NA
Female	271	6.95	NA	8.06	NA
Native American	31	4.93	NA	7.37	NA
Asian	43	7.24	NA	7.90	NA
African American	69	6.50	NA	7.76	NA
Hispanic	142	6.89	NA	7.21	NA
White	499	7.15	NA	7.79	NA
<b>Grade 4</b>					
All	790	5.84	4.89	7.01	NA
Male	531	5.85	4.77	6.98	NA
Female	259	5.83	5.15	7.09	NA
Native American	33	6.28	3.72	7.33	NA
Asian	45	5.42	4.60	8.28	NA
African American	73	4.26	5.06	6.94	NA
Hispanic	107	5.48	4.81	6.76	NA
White	508	6.18	5.05	6.93	NA
<b>Grade 5</b>					
All	709	4.99	NA	5.65	4.48
Male	461	4.99	NA	5.49	4.51
Female	248	4.98	NA	5.94	4.42
Native American	34	5.45	NA	6.12	4.21
Asian	56	4.66	NA	5.44	4.57
African American	53	4.73	NA	5.87	4.08
Hispanic	119	4.47	NA	6.17	4.46
White	424	5.27	NA	5.57	4.56

Statistics of certain subgroups not reported due to their size (less than 20 in total).

<sup>16</sup> Not Applicable.

Table 8.4 Mean Total Score Summary for All Grades and Contents (Continued)

Group	Count	Mean Total Score Reading	Mean Total Score Writing	Mean Total Score Math	Mean Total Score Science
<b>Grade 6</b>					
All	721	2.99	NA <sup>17</sup>	3.53	NA
Male	463	3.11	NA	3.62	NA
Female	258	2.78	NA	3.38	NA
Native American	27	1.79	NA	3.42	NA
Asian	48	2.76	NA	3.43	NA
African American	53	2.56	NA	2.84	NA
Hispanic	113	2.77	NA	3.35	NA
White	463	3.22	NA	3.66	NA
<b>Grade 7</b>					
All	659	4.64	3.85	4.67	NA
Male	428	4.62	3.70	4.47	NA
Female	231	4.68	4.13	5.02	NA
Native American	28	4.37	3.67	5.96	NA
Asian	51	5.17	3.77	4.55	NA
African American	52	4.94	3.83	4.75	NA
Hispanic	84	4.10	4.00	3.79	NA
White	430	4.73	3.91	4.76	NA
<b>Grade 8</b>					
All	706	3.28	NA	2.78	3.78
Male	445	3.20	NA	2.65	3.65
Female	261	3.42	NA	3.01	4.01
Native American	22	3.73	NA	4.55	3.55
Asian	53	2.50	NA	2.16	3.88
African American	47	1.60	NA	2.52	2.54
Hispanic	95	2.25	NA	1.29	3.23
White	466	3.67	NA	3.06	4.06

Statistics of certain subgroups not reported due to their size (less than 20 in total).

<sup>17</sup> Not Applicable.

Table 8.4 Mean Total Score Summary for All Grades and Contents (Continued)

Group	Count	Mean Total Score Reading	Mean Total Score Writing	Mean Total Score Math	Mean Total Score Science
<b>Grade 10</b>					
All	647	7.33	6.19	6.32	7.03
Male	387	6.93	6.10	6.51	6.84
Female	260	7.94	6.32	6.05	7.35
Native American	26	7.21	5.50	7.04	3.89
Asian	45	5.17	4.69	5.56	6.32
African American	50	6.31	6.76	4.35	7.47
Hispanic	73	7.18	7.15	8.29	5.71
White	442	7.74	6.19	6.30	7.34
<b>Grade 11</b>					
All	228	5.95	5.71	5.88	NA <sup>18</sup>
Male	147	5.79	5.20	5.57	NA
Female	81	6.20	6.63	6.41	NA
Native American	2	4.00	0.00	8.00	NA
African American	2	6.00	0.00	16.00	NA
Hispanic	6	7.33	2.40	0.00	NA
White	19	5.85	4.63	2.00	NA
<b>Grade 12</b>					
All	227	9.98	9.93	5.77	NA
Male	138	9.65	9.39	6.51	NA
Female	89	10.46	10.68	4.65	NA

Statistics of certain subgroups not reported due to their size (less than 20 in total).

<sup>18</sup> Not Applicable.

## **IX. PERFORMANCE ON THE WAAS-PORTFOLIO RELATIVE TO STANDARDS**

Federal legislation and regulations for ESEA and IDEA reauthorization require states to report results for all students assessed using general assessments and alternate assessments relative to the same grade level academic content and corresponding achievement standards general education or alternate academic.

Table 9.3 shows the actual percentage of students achieving various standard levels on the 2008 WAAS-Portfolio for each grade and content area. Sixth and eighth grade portfolios have the lowest rate of meeting standards. When examined by content domain, science seems to be the lowest among the four content areas. The achievement standards reported here are for the WAAS-Portfolio assessments and should not be compared to the results or standards for students participating in the WASL.

Performance distributions were also examined separately for males and females. Table 9.4 shows the percentage of students classified into each performance level for both genders across all grades. In general, the percentages of students meeting the new standard are very close for males and females.

Table 9.3 Summary of Distribution by Performance Level on 2008 WAAS-Portfolio

		Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	HS
<b>Reading</b>								
N count		786	756	677	687	628	660	886
Level 1	Not Meeting Standard	24.68%	31.35%	39.73%	61.72%	44.11%	61.21%	51.92%
Level 2		11.20%	11.77%	27.92%	20.38%	25.80%	19.09%	13.66%
Levels 1 & 2		35.88%	43.12%	67.65%	82.10%	69.91%	80.30%	65.58%
Level 3	Meeting Standard	17.05%	21.16%	8.12%	7.57%	8.60%	4.09%	19.19%
Level 4		47.07%	35.71%	24.22%	10.33%	21.50%	15.61%	15.24%
Levels 3 & 4		64.12%	56.87%	32.34%	17.90%	30.10%	19.70%	34.43%
<b>Writing</b>								
N count			745			622		957
Level 1	Not Meeting Standard		40.13%			50.48%		52.04%
Level 2		12.75%				28.46%		14.42%
Levels 1 & 2		52.88%				78.94%		66.46%
Level 3	Meeting Standard		19.33%			4.98%		22.26%
Level 4		27.79%				16.08%		11.29%
Levels 3 & 4		47.12%				21.06%		33.55%
<b>Math</b>								
N count		783	752	675	683	620	658	877
Level 1	Not Meeting Standard	16.73%	20.35%	30.67%	48.90%	38.71%	61.40%	54.50%
Level 2		10.47%	13.43%	17.19%	22.25%	15.48%	13.37%	16.99%
Levels 1 & 2		27.20%	33.78%	47.86%	71.15%	54.19%	74.77%	71.49%
Level 3	Meeting Standard	18.26%	19.28%	19.41%	14.20%	24.84%	15.50%	19.27%
Level 4		54.53%	46.94%	32.74%	14.64%	20.97%	9.73%	9.24%
Levels 3 & 4		72.79%	66.22%	52.15%	28.84%	45.81%	25.23%	28.51%
<b>Science</b>								
N count				669			645	557
Level 1	Not Meeting Standard			43.35%			50.54%	52.78%
Level 2		29.60%					28.99%	31.24%
Levels 1 & 2		72.95%					79.53%	84.02%
Level 3	Meeting Standard			9.12%			6.51%	3.05%
Level 4		17.94%					13.95%	12.93%
Levels 3 & 4		27.06%					20.46%	15.98%

Table 9.4 2008 WAAS-Portfolio Performance Distribution by Gender

		Grade 3		Grade 4		Grade 5		Grade 6		Grade 7		Grade 8		HS	
<b>Reading</b>		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
N count		523	263	514	242	439	238	441	246	403	225	419	241	532	244
Level 1	Not Meeting Standard	25.24	23.57	31.91	30.17	38.27	42.44	61	63.01	43.67	44.89	62.29	59.34	54.89	47.95
Level 2		11.28	11.03	10.7	14.05	30.3	23.53	19.73	21.54	27.05	23.56	18.62	19.92	13.91	13.93
Levels 1 & 2		36.52	34.6	42.61	44.22	68.57	65.97	80.73	84.55	70.72	68.45	80.91	79.26	68.8	61.88
Level 3	Meeting Standard	16.44	18.25	20.62	22.31	7.74	8.82	8.16	6.5	8.68	8.44	5.01	2.49	15.79	22.54
Level 4		47.04	47.15	36.77	33.47	23.69	25.21	11.11	8.94	20.6	23.11	14.08	18.26	15.41	15.57
Levels 3 & 4		63.48	65.4	57.39	55.78	31.43	34.03	19.27	15.44	29.28	31.55	19.09	20.75	31.2	38.11
<b>Writing</b>		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
N count				510	235					402	220			579	243
Level 1	Not Meeting Standard			41.18	37.87					53.73	44.55			53.71	54.32
Level 2				12.35	13.62					25.12	34.55			14.16	14.81
Levels 1 & 2				53.53	51.49					78.85	79.1			67.87	69.13
Level 3	Meeting Standard			20.39	17.02					4.73	5.45			21.42	21.4
Level 4				26.08	31.49					16.42	15.45			10.71	9.47
Levels 3 & 4				46.47	48.51					21.15	20.9			32.13	30.87
<b>Math</b>		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
N count		521	254	513	239	437	238	438	245	399	221	417	241	530	246
Level 1	Not Meeting Standard	18.81	12.6	21.64	17.57	32.49	27.31	48.17	50.2	39.6	37.1	62.35	59.75	53.77	54.88
Level 2		10.17	11.07	13.06	14.23	16.48	18.49	22.37	22.04	15.29	15.84	13.91	12.45	16.79	17.89
Levels 1 & 2		28.98	23.67	34.7	31.8	48.97	45.8	70.54	72.24	54.89	52.94	76.26	72.2	70.56	72.77
Level 3	Meeting Standard	18.04	18.7	17.93	22.18	19.68	18.91	13.7	15.1	26.82	21.27	15.59	15.35	19.81	18.7
Level 4		52.98	57.63	47.37	46.03	31.35	35.29	15.75	12.65	18.3	25.79	8.15	12.45	9.62	8.54
Levels 3 & 4		71.02	76.33	65.3	68.21	51.03	54.2	29.45	27.75	45.12	47.06	23.74	27.8	29.43	27.24
<b>Science</b>		M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
N count						433	236					407	238	342	214
Level 1	Not Meeting Standard					42.96	44.07					52.09	47.9	51.75	54.21
Level 2						29.33	30.08					28.5	29.83	35.09	25.23
Levels 1 & 2						72.29	74.15					80.59	77.73	86.84	79.44
Level 3	Meeting Standard					9.47	8.47					6.63	6.3	1.75	5.14
Level 4						18.24	17.37					12.78	15.97	11.4	15.42
Levels 3 & 4						27.71	25.84					19.41	22.27	13.15	20.56



*APPENDIX A. 2008 WAAS-PORTFOLIO SCORING HANDBOOK*

Washington Alternate Assessment System

**2008 WAAS-Portfolio  
Scoring Handbook**



**Dr. Terry Bergeson**  
State Superintendent  
of Public Instruction

**June  
2008**

**Part I: Alignment of Skills and Evidence**

<b>A</b>	<b>Scores</b>	4	3	2	1	IE
	<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>	Full alignment: Academic skill in content area and aligned to GLEs (YES)	Near alignment: Academic skill within content area (NO)	Little alignment: Academic skill not within content area (NO)	No alignment: Functional life skill – not academic (NO)	No skill given (NO)
<b>B</b>	<b>Evidence Aligned to Targeted Skill</b>	All evidence is aligned to the targeted skill: <b>3 pieces of evidence</b>	Most evidence is aligned to the targeted skill: <b>2 pieces of evidence</b>	Some evidence is aligned to the targeted skill: <b>1 piece of evidence</b>	Very little evidence aligned to the targeted skill	<b>No evidence</b> aligned to the targeted skill

**Part II: Performance and Generalization**

<b>C</b>	<b>Scores</b>	4	3	2	1	IE
	<b>Evidence of performance on targeted skill</b>	Evidence of performance demonstrates that student <b>exceeded</b> the goal for the targeted skill.	Evidence of performance demonstrates that student <b>met</b> the goal for the targeted skill.	Evidence of performance demonstrates that student <b>approached</b> the goal for the targeted skill.	Evidence or performance demonstrates that the student is <b>not approaching</b> the goal on the targeted skill.	<b>No evidence</b> of student's level of proficiency on the targeted skill

<b>D</b>	<b>Scores</b>	2	1	IE
	<b>Contexts</b>	Evidence that student generalizes the skill to <b>three or more contexts</b> .	Evidence that student generalizes the skill to <b>two contexts</b> .	Evidence that student demonstrates skill in only <b>one context</b> .

<b>Attempted Codes</b> (for each content area)	<b>IE Codes</b> (for content area performance and context scores)
PP = previously passed	IE-A = fewer than required number of pieces of evidence for the skill
CR = not assessed in the content area	IE-B = missing captions/labels
TL = too late to be scored	IE-C = missing measureable criterion for skill
RF = refused	IE-D = missing names and dates on data sheet or evidence
IC = incomplete	IE-E = information on data sheet does not match evidence
T = Tested	IE-F = data collected outside of the data collection window
NNEP = New Non English Proficient	

## **WAAS-PORTFOLIO-Portfolio**

The WAAS-Portfolio is a collection of student work based on individual targeted skills aligned to the GLE extensions.

### **WAAS-Portfolio Documentation**

Each of the Content Entries will document the following:

Part A: Skill Aligned To GLE

Targeted skill aligned to the GLE extension.

Part B: Evidence Aligned To Targeted Skill

Number of pieces of student work evidence aligned to the targeted skill.

Part C: Skill Score

The level to which the student met the stated criterion/goal in the targeted skill.

Part D: Contexts

Generalization and application of the skill in varied contexts and activities.

### **Content areas assessed in the WAAS-Portfolio**

3rd Grade: Reading, Math

4th Grade: Reading, Math, Writing

5th Grade: Reading, Math, Science

6th Grade: Reading, Math

7th Grade: Reading, Math, Writing

8th Grade: Reading, Math, Science

10th Grade: Reading, Math, Writing, Science

11th & 12th Grades: Reading, Math, Writing

### **Skills or Targeted Skills in the WAAS-Portfolio**

Skill or Targeted Skill is what the individual student should know and be able to do written in observable, measurable terms; these skills are specific to individual students but should closely reflect the GLE Extension.

#### EXAMPLES OF TARGETED SKILLS IN THE WAAS-PORTFOLIO

##### **In Reading:**

Grade Level Expectation (GLE) 1.3.2:

Understand and apply content/academic vocabulary critical to the meaning of text.

Grade Level Expectation Extension:

Student will use grade level text-based details to:

5-6d) Identify the meaning of words.

Example of a Targeted Skill:

Samuel will use grade level, text-based details to identify the meaning of words with 60% accuracy

**In Writing:**Grade Level Expectation (GLE) 3.1.1:

Analyze ideas, selects a narrow topic, and elaborates using specific details and/or examples

Grade Level Expectation Extension:

When writing an expository essay, the student will:

HS b) Choose a topic and choose details from research

Example of a Targeted Skill:

When writing an expository essay, Annie will choose a topic and details from research in 2 out of 3 sentences.

**In Mathematics:**Grade Level Expectation (GLE) 1.2.1:

Understand how the attributes of length, perimeter, time, money, value, weight/mass, capacity, and temperature are used to describe objects or events (3rd). Understand the concept of area (4th).

Grade Level Expectation Extension:

Student will:

3a) Determine the perimeter of geometric figures.

Example of a Targeted Skill:

Libby will determine the perimeter of geometric figures with 75% accuracy.

**In Science:**Grade Level Expectation (GLE) 2.1.2:

Understand how to plan and conduct simple investigations following all the safety rules.

Grade Level Expectation Extension:

Following safety guidelines a student will plan and conduct a controlled scientific investigation to find an answer.

5. I) order the steps of the investigative process using pictures.

Example of a Targeted Skill:

While planning a scientific experiment, Ivan will order pictures to show the investigative process with 80% accuracy.

**General Components for each WAAS-Portfolio**

Each portfolio should contain:

- Student Demographic Sheet
- Table of Contents

### **Components for each entry in the WAAS-Portfolio**

- Entry Cover Sheet documents the following for each targeted skill:
  - GLE
  - GLE Extension
  - Targeted Skill with goal/criterion
- Data Sheet for each targeted skill
- Supporting evidence sheets for each targeted skill
- Student work evidence for each targeted skill

### **Evidence: Terminology and Clarifications**

Evidence: Data sheet and student work or captioned photo showing the student performing the skill.

- Evidence must represent instructional activities occurring during the collection period of August 2007 to March 31, 2008.
- Behind each entry cover sheet, the student includes the data sheet that summarizes the evidence that documents his/her performance on and generalization of the targeted skill.
- Each entry consists of at least 3 pieces of student work evidence.
- Each piece of evidence must include the student's name/date and should be graded/scored.

### **General Scoring Review of a Portfolio**

Prior to scoring the portfolio:

- Compare the scoring supplemental sheet to the evidence to ensure accuracy of information:
  - Student name on the evidence matches the supplemental sheet.
  - Grade level on evidence matches the supplemental sheet.
  - The barcodes on the binder, supplemental sheet and monitor all match.

***Note:** For any mismatched information or a refusal, see your table leader.*

### **Initial Scoring Steps:**

Fill out information on monitors:

- Scorer ID

Fill out information on scorer worksheets:

- Scorer ID
- Student Name
- SSID Number

## Part A: Skill Aligned To GLE Needs

Scores	4	3	2	1	IE
<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>	Academic skill within content area and on-grade level	Academic skill within content area and off-grade level	Academic skill not within content area	Functional life skill – not academic	No skill given

Part A of the rubric checks the extent to which the chosen targeted skill is aligned to the assigned GLE Extension.

Minor mistakes in copying the exact wording of the GLEs or GLE extensions will not be penalized, but the Targeted Skill must be aligned to the extension specified in the OSPI GLEs.

- Example: All reading GLEs state “*student will use, grade-level text based details to...*” When copying for the targeted skill, this phrase is often omitted. It will be acceptable in scoring part A, but in scoring part B, we must see “grade-level text based details” in the evidence.

### Part A: GLE Alignment Terminology

Academic: Academic content areas (e.g. reading, writing, math, science)

Functional life skill: Activities of daily living (e.g., dressing, grooming, eating, mobility, social/behavioral, etc.)

Functional Skill Examples:

- Daily living skills (e.g., brushing teeth, washing, proper eating habits)
- Using a schedule
- Using a transportation system
- Identifying body parts
- Toileting skills
- Behavior in social situations

On-grade level: Grade level in which the student is enrolled.

Off-grade level: Grade level other than that in which the student is enrolled.

GLE (Grade Level Expectation): What all students should know and be able to do by grade level.

GLE extensions: A resource that allows students with significant cognitive disabilities access to the GLEs. The extensions are aligned (or linked) to the grade level standards and have been reduced in complexity.

### Part A: Scoring Clarifications for Skill Aligned to GLE

- If Targeted Skill is aligned to the GLE extension and the GLE extension is from the student’s assigned grade level, Skill Alignment receives a score of 4.
- If the Targeted Skill does not align to the assigned GLE extension, but is
  - an academic skill within the content area, Part A scores a 3.
  - an academic skill not within the content area, Part A scores a 2.

- If the Targeted Skill does not align to the assigned GLE Extension, but is
  - a functional skill, alignment scores a 1.
- If no GLE extension or Targeted Skill is present, alignment scores an IE.
- If both targeted skills are from the same GLE (even though different extensions are used), the second skill scores an N2 for all parts.
- If there is only one targeted skill, the second skill scores an N2 for all parts.
- All targeted skills that receive a 4, 3, 2 or 1 for Part A will be scored for Part B.
- If the targeted skill receives an IE for Part A, it will be scored NA for Parts B, C and D.

## Part B: Evidence Aligned to Targeted Skills

Scores	4	3	2	1	IE
<b>Evidence Aligned to Targeted Skill</b>	All evidence is aligned to the targeted skill: <b>3 pieces of evidence</b>	Most evidence is aligned to the targeted skill: <b>2 pieces of evidence</b>	Some evidence is aligned to the targeted skill: <b>1 piece of evidence</b>	Very little evidence aligned to the targeted skill	<b>No</b> evidence aligned to the targeted skill

Part B measures the extent to which the evidence presented in an entry reflects the behavior and content of the targeted skill listed on the entry cover sheet.

### Part B: Evidence Aligned to Targeted Skills Terminology

- Aligned: Evidence of student performance reflects the concepts, skills, language and intent of the targeted skill and GLE extension
- Primary evidence: student work, pictures of student completing work with detailed captions.
- Secondary evidence: data sheet, captions, anecdotal records

### Part B: Scoring Clarifications for Evidence Alignment

- Always refer to the entry cover sheet for the targeted skill and criterion.
- Review the evidence to verify that the student’s performance is based on work that is representative of the targeted skill.
- To score a 4, all three pieces of evidence within the entry must align to the targeted skill.
- To score a 3, most or two pieces of evidence must align to the targeted skill.
- To score a 2, some or one piece of evidence must align to the targeted skill.
- To score Insufficient Evidence (IE), no evidence aligns to the targeted skill. (data sheet + no evidence, or no data sheet, no evidence)
- Evidence must be graded/scored before it can be used to show alignment to the targeted skill.
- If any piece of evidence is not age appropriate (i.e. indicates something that younger students would be using, doing, reading, etc.), it cannot be used in scoring.
  - If not certain about making the decision about age appropriate material, see your table leader.

- Student work evidence must have the student’s name and the date before it can be used in scoring.
- Student work evidence trumps all other evidence (data, teacher explanations, etc.).
- Photographs must show a clear link to information contained in the targeted skill and the caption.
  - Is the student in the picture? If not, the photograph cannot be used.
  - Is the work related to the targeted skill in the picture? If not, photograph cannot be used.
  - Does the work displayed look like what is described in the targeted skill and the caption?

Acceptable example:

The caption states that the student is using flashcards to identify the meanings of words and the photograph shows the student and shows flashcards with words on them.

Unacceptable example:

The caption states that the student is using flashcards to identify the meanings of words and the photograph shows the student and shows flashcards but what is on the flashcards cannot be identified.

- If there are more than 3 pieces of evidence, use only the first 3 for scoring.
- In Science or Math, if a GLE extension has components that are connected by “and,” the evidence can address any component of the targeted skill.
- In Reading or Writing, if a GLE extension has components that are connected by “and,” the evidence must address all components of the targeted skill.
- In scoring alignment, always verify that what is written on the entry cover sheet is the same as the OSPI GLE extension.
- In all content areas, if a GLE extension has components that are connected by “or” or “and/or” evidence can show just 1 component.
- For GLE 1.5.1, grades 3-4.d: “Identify the missing elements in the beginning, middle, or end of a pattern of numbers,” either the beginning or middle or end can be chosen.

**Parts A and B: Scoring Clarifications**

- If Part A is not aligned, then Parts C and D are not aligned, regardless of the evidence and should be scored “NA”.
- If Part A scores a 3, 2, 1, IE and Part B scores a 4, 3, 2, or 1, then Parts C and D scores “NA.”
- If Part A scores a 4 and Part B scores an IE, then Parts C and D are scored “IE.”



## Part C: Evidence of Performance on Targeted Skill

Scores	4	3	2	1	IE
<b>Skill Score</b>	Evidence of performance demonstrates that student exceeded the goal for the targeted skill.	Evidence of performance demonstrates that student met the goal for the targeted skill.	Evidence of performance demonstrates that student approached the goal for the targeted skill.	Evidence or performance demonstrates that the student is not approaching the goal on the targeted skill.	No evidence of student's level of proficiency on the targeted skill

Part C measures the student performance against the criterion set in the targeted skill.

### Part C: Evidence of Performance on Targeted Skill Terminology

- Goal: Percentage/Criterion of acceptable performance identified in the targeted skill.
- Exceeded: Percentage of acceptable performance on evidence is above the goal specified in the targeted skill.
- Met: Percentage of acceptable performance on evidence exactly matches the goal specified in the targeted skill.
- Approached/Approaching: Percentage of acceptable performance shows that the student is improving but has not met the goal identified in the targeted skill.

### Part C: Scoring Clarifications for Performance on Targeted Skill

- If the score on the evidence contradicts the score on the data sheet, use the score on the evidence in determining Part C.
- The score on the evidence does not need to be verified, with one exception:
  - If the evidence displays no student work (i.e., the answer portion of the student evidence is blank), and the score is 100%, take the portfolio to the table leader.
- If there is no observable/measurable criterion identified in the targeted skill, assume that the goal is 100%.
- If the baseline data meets or exceeds the goal, Parts C and D are scored IE.
- If there is only one aligned piece of evidence, Part C is scored a 1.
- There must be two pieces of evidence to score a 3, 2, or 1 regardless of the percentage shown.
- If there are only two usable pieces of evidence, the first usable piece is considered the baseline and if
  - The second is lower than the baseline, Part C is scored a 1.
  - The second is higher than the baseline, but does not meet or exceed the goal, Part C is scored a 2.
  - The second meets the goal, Part C is scored a 3.
- If there are only two usable pieces of evidence, the first usable piece is considered the baseline and if
  - The second exceeds the goal, Part C is scored a 3. Rationale: Skill Score of 4 cannot be earned if not all of the required evidence is usable.
- If there are 3 usable pieces of evidence and if:

- One piece is higher than the baseline and exceeds the goal, Part C scores a 4.
- One piece is higher than the baseline and meets the goal, Part C scores a 3.
- One piece is higher than the baseline, but does not meet or exceed the goal, Part C scores a 2.
- If there are 3 usable pieces of evidence and if:
  - Two pieces have the same or lower percentage as the baseline, and then Part C scores a 1.
  - The goal meets or exceeds the baseline regardless of the 2nd or 3rd piece of evidence, and then Part C scores an IE.
- If any piece of evidence scores Insufficient Evidence (IE) in Part C, then Part D must score IE.

## Part D: Contexts-the Generalization of the Skill

Scores	2	1	IE
<b>Contexts</b>	Evidence that student generalizes the skill to three or more contexts.	Evidence that student generalizes the skill to two contexts.	Evidence that student demonstrates skill in only one context.

Part D measures the extent to which the student has applied or generalized the targeted skill in varied ways.

### **Part D: Contexts Terminology**

- Contexts: Student generalizes/applies the targeted skill in varied, authentic ways and activities.

### **Part D: Scoring Clarifications for Contexts**

- Student performs a skill in different contexts

#### Reading Example:

Student identifies the meanings of specific words:

Context 1: Grade level, text-based reading source

Context 2: Grade level, text-based science source

Context 3: Grade level, text-based social studies source

#### Math Example:

Student identifies or describes angles in pictures, illustrations, diagrams, and/or the environment:

Context 1: Math worksheet

Context 2: Snowflakes in an art project

Context 3: Identifying angles of bordering states in history/geography lesson

- Student performs a skill in the same content area location but uses different materials:

Reading Example:

Student describes the change in characters over time:

Context 1: 5th grade language arts class, from the novel Roll of Thunder, Hear My Cry

Context 2: 5th grade language arts class, from the novel Tuck Everlasting

Context 3: 5th grade language arts class, from the novel Bridge to Terabithia

Science Example:

In a high school health class, the student explains the interconnection among:

Context 1: The parts of the digestive system

Context 2: The parts of the circulatory system

Context 3: The parts of the skeletal system

- If the student demonstrates the skill:

In three or more contexts, Part D scores a 2.

In two contexts, Part D scores a 1.

In only one context, Part D scores an IE

**APPENDIX B. WAAS PORTFOLIO SCORING SUMMARY SHEET—2008**

<b>Dimension</b>	<b>Score</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>		
<b>Evidence Aligned To Targeted Skill</b>		
<b>Skill Score</b>		
<b>Context</b>		
<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>		
<b>Evidence Aligned To Targeted Skill</b>		
<b>Skill Score</b>		
<b>Context</b>		
<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>		
<b>Evidence Aligned To Targeted Skill</b>		
<b>Skill Score</b>		
<b>Context</b>		
<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>		
<b>Evidence Aligned To Targeted Skill</b>		
<b>Skill Score</b>		
<b>Context</b>		
<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>		
<b>Evidence Aligned To Targeted Skill</b>		
<b>Skill Score</b>		
<b>Context</b>		
<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>		
<b>Evidence Aligned To Targeted Skill</b>		
<b>Skill Score</b>		
<b>Context</b>		
<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>		
<b>Evidence Aligned To Targeted Skill</b>		
<b>Skill Score</b>		

<b>Context</b>		
<b>Skill Aligned to GLE</b>		
<b>Evidence Aligned To Targeted Skill</b>		
<b>Skill Score</b>		
<b>Context</b>		

## ***APPENDIX C. WAAS PORTFOLIO ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARD DESCRIPTIONS***

The academic achievement standards for students with significant disabilities who are participating in the Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS) portfolio are significantly different from the standards for students who participate in the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL). The 2008 WAAS portfolio is based on the Grade Level Expectations (GLE) Extensions, which allow the student to participate and progress in the general curriculum. Because the WAAS portfolio is based on the student's Individualized Education Program (IEP) goals in relation to the GLE Extensions, the specific assessment targets selected for the student may be the same for many content areas but may be different for any other student. Additionally, these students have educational goals that may remain the same throughout their educational careers. Therefore, the following academic achievement standard descriptors apply for all grades and content areas.

<p><b>Level 4:</b> <b>Exceeds Standard</b></p>	<p>Evidence in the portfolio shows that the student is meeting or exceeding her/his goals for both academic skills. The evidence also shows that the student applies the academic skills in three or more contexts; therefore, achievement shown in the portfolio is a reliable (dependable) demonstration of the skills linked to the targeted GLEs.</p>
<p><b>Level 3:</b> <b>Meets Standard</b></p>	<p>Evidence in the portfolio shows that the student meets or exceeds her/his goal for one academic skill and approaches her/his goal for the second academic skill. The evidence also shows that the student applies both academic skills in two or more contexts; therefore, achievement shown in the portfolio is a mostly reliable demonstration of the skills linked to the targeted GLEs.</p>
<p><b>Level 2:</b> <b>Approaches Standard</b></p>	<p>Evidence in the portfolio shows that the student is approaching her/his goals for both academic skills. The evidence also shows that the student applies the academic skills in only one or two contexts; therefore, achievement shown in the portfolio is only somewhat reliable as a demonstration of the skills linked to the targeted GLEs.</p>
<p><b>Level 3:</b> <b>Well Below Standard</b></p>	<p>Evidence in the portfolio suggests that the student is nowhere near meeting her/his goals for the academic skills. The evidence shows that the student applies each academic skill in only one context; therefore, any achievement shown in the portfolio is not a reliable demonstration of the skills linked to the targeted GLEs.</p>