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Executive Summary

The state assessment program experienced numerous changes during the 2010–11 school year and will have similar changes, plus new enhancements, occurring during 2011–12. This summary will provide a brief review of the 2011 changes and results, designs for the 2012 test administration, and an introduction to other program initiatives, including the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC). More details are found in the main body of the report. This report was written to meet the legislative reporting requirements in RCW 28A.300.041(8), RCW 28A.655.066, and 2ESHB 1087 Section 513(4).

2010–11 New Assessments and Technical Study Results

The Washington Comprehensive Assessment Program experienced two significant adjustments in 2011. The first adjustment was the initial administration of end-of-course (EOC) exams in the content area of high school mathematics, specifically the courses of Algebra 1, Integrated Math 1, Geometry, and Integrated Math 2. The second was the initial administration of science assessments in Grades 5 and 8 aligned to the newly adopted learning standards. Other recent changes to the assessment program, shorter tests and increased use of online assessments, were continued. Testing time for three of the four content areas, reading, math, and science, have been reduced by at least a third since 2008. Online testing has been successfully initiated though participation rates fell short of our goals. Feedback from the field is simply that there are an insufficient number of computers in the schools to administer the assessments online for all grades and subject areas.

The technical studies conducted in 2010–11, described later in this report, demonstrated the fidelity of the program to its long standing levels of validity and reliability, and were retained through diligent compliance to procedures and high caliber judgment and evaluation of numerous national professionals from the field of test measurement.

The comparability of online and paper-pencil testing has been examined for the last two administrations (2010 and 2011) and the two testing modes are highly comparable. Item and test statistics demonstrated that performance is similar enough on each type of test to allow the use of one raw score-to-scale score table per grade level and content test. In other words, the online tests function the same way as the paper-pencil tests that are being replaced.

2011–12 Enhancements to the Summative Tests

Test administration for the 2011–12 school year will be similar to 2010–11 with three enhancements to support the goals of the state. One enhancement will be the expansion of online testing to include Grade 3 in reading and math, with increases in participation in Grades 4 through 8 in reading, mathematics, and science. The second enhancement is the introduction of EOC testing in high school biology, aligned to the biology-related science standards adopted in 2009. The third enhancement is implementation of a revised Washington Alternate Assessment System Portfolio, our assessment for students with significant cognitive challenges. Each of these is described in more detail in this report.
Other 2011–12 Program Initiatives

Other efforts within the assessment program planned for 2011–12 include:

- **Collection of Evidence (COE) for mathematics and biology**
  With the increased math EOC exam requirements for graduation for the classes of 2013 and beyond and the biology EOC exam, for students in the classes of 2015 and beyond, it is necessary to offer the various Certificate of Academic Achievement (CAA) options beginning in 2013. Tasks are now being developed for the math and biology Collections of Evidence.

- **Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS)**
  After selecting a kindergarten assessment from among those piloted in 2010–11, nearly 500 teachers in 165 schools are voluntarily implementing the WaKIDS this year, assessing approximately 11,000 students. Next year, 2012–13, WaKIDS will be required in all state-funded full-day kindergarten classrooms.

- **New Assessment of English Language Proficiency**
  Commencing in the 2011–12 school year, Washington has adopted the LAS Links™ product offered by CTB/McGraw-Hill as its new Washington English language proficiency assessment (WELPA). Selection of the new test instrument revolved around two elements key to the present environment of reduced resources—cost and lessening the testing burden on districts and schools.

- **SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)**
  Washington continues as a member-state of SBAC in the role of governing state and lead state/fiscal agent. The current make-up of the consortium is twenty-eight state members total. As a pre-requisite for continued participation in SBAC, Washington formally adopted the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in July 2011.

  The SMARTER Balanced program is established as a four-year project designed to develop assessment instruments that align with the CCSS in English language arts and mathematics. The CCSS, released in June 2010, are designed to measure whether students exiting high school are ready for college or career. It is the aim of SBAC to develop assessment instruments that support student learning with summative, interim, and formative measures.

  Major work accomplishments as of this report include finalizing the content specifications in both English language arts and mathematics that will shape the subsequent item and test development efforts supporting pilot and field testing in years 2013 and 2014, and finalizing the system architecture that will act as the road map for designing the computer adaptive testing (CAT) platform for the summative and interim assessment instruments.
SBAC also has a focus for the next year on the tasks below:

- Writing assessment items.
- Working with state membership to tryout various items with students to determine functionality.
- Devising a vision of program sustainability for member states beyond the grant period.
- Unveiling a compilation of communication and classroom tools that will assist stakeholders with understanding the assessment system being developed by SBAC.
- Aiding teachers with the transition to the CCSS.
- Collaborating with higher education in synchronizing the phases of exiting high school.
- Beginning work in credit-bearing college coursework.

**Instructionally Relevant Formative Assessments**

In 2009–10, the following formative assessment efforts were initiated:

- **Web-Based Instructionally Supportive Student Assessment Systems**: Project to identify an interactive tool that districts can use to support teachers in the classroom assessing students’ knowledge, skills, and progress toward achievement of learning standards.

- **Formative Assessment Training**: Professional development for agency and Educational Service District staff on formative assessment as a framework for improved instruction and increased learning.

- **Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Development (WaKIDS)**: Project to identify a quality methodology to determine readiness of students in kindergarten.

- **Evaluating the Validity of English Language Proficiency Assessments (EVEA)**: Research project coordinated with four other states to develop protocols to evaluate the validity in English language proficiency assessments.

Unfortunately, due to budget cuts in this area, the position guiding this work had to be eliminated for 2010–11, and there are no resources to continue the first two activities. WaKIDS funding continued and that assessment is underway.

**Cost Analysis**

All contracts supporting the assessment program, with the exception of the Collection of Evidence contract and the newly executed English language proficiency assessment contract, have been negotiated to both extend the period through the current biennium and to control costs by executing the renewal clauses with pre-set inflationary rates. The actual length of the extension is through contract year 2014, allowing for alignment with the projected transition to the SBAC system, scheduled to come online in spring 2015.
Possible cost reductions for the assessment program are listed below. Except for increasing online participation, the reductions would significantly reduce the high quality, comprehensive assessment program Washington now has. Both technical and political considerations would need to be examined before implementing any of these reductions.

Possible cost reductions (amounts are effective with the 2012–13 school year and running through the end of the existing contracts) include:

- Significantly increase online participation in Grades 3–8 = $140K per 10 percent additional participation across all grades and content areas until reaching 100 percent
- Eliminate graduation requirements and corresponding options:
  - Eliminate Year 2 math as a graduation requirement = $3.2M
  - Eliminate reading, writing, both math EOCs and science EOC as graduation requirements = $10M
- Eliminate writing in Grade 4 and 7 = $1.8M
- Eliminate writing in HS = $1.8M
- Eliminate hand scoring by only using multiple choice items = $15.3M
- Eliminate WaKIDS = $1.5M
2010–11 New Assessments and Technical Study Results

Though many of the characteristics associated with the state’s summative assessments in 2010–11 were similar to the 2010 administration year, two significant adjustments were unveiled in 2011. The first adjustment is the initial administration of EOC exams in the content area of high school mathematics, specifically the courses of Algebra 1, Integrated Math 1, Geometry, and Integrated Math 2. The second is the initial administration of science assessments in Grades 5 and 8, aligned to the newly adopted learning standards.

The 2010–11 school year was the second year of using the Measurements of Student Progress (MSP) for Grades 3 through 8 in reading, writing, mathematics, and science, and the High School Proficiency Exam (HSPE) for high school reading, writing, and science. The HSPE for mathematics was replaced this year with the first EOC exams for Year 1 Math (Algebra 1 or Integrated Math 1) and for Year 2 Math (Geometry or Integrated Math 2).

The 2011 tests continued to be substantially reduced in size (i.e., fewer items) and type of items (no four-point items), as compared to 2009 and earlier tests to be in concert with legislative guidance provided in ESSB 5414 from the 2009 legislative session. The shorter tests continued the reduction in testing time associated with the annual test administration. Testing time for three of the four content areas, reading, math, and science, have been reduced by at least a third since 2008.

Online Testing

Online testing was expanded in spring of 2011 with the addition of Grade 4 reading and math and Grades 5 and 8 in science. Schools participate in online testing on a voluntary basis. The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) established a transition plan for full online testing within a three-year time frame. The first year, 2009–10, focused on Grades 6 through 8 reading and mathematics, and the goal of 25 percent student participation was achieved. The transition plan called for 80 percent participation in these same grades for 2011 and a similar first year participation rate of 25 percent for Grades 4 and 5 in 2011. Participation fell short of these goals, see Table 1 for 2010–11 actual participation. Feedback from the field is simply that there are an insufficient number of computers in the schools to administer the assessments online for all grades and subject areas. The actual and revised projected participation in online testing is shown in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade levels</th>
<th>Grades 6–8</th>
<th>Grades 4–5</th>
<th>Grade 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009–10 actual</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Only Paper-Pencil</td>
<td>Only Paper-Pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–11 actual</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>Only Paper-Pencil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–12 projected</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012–13 projected</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013–14 projected</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014–15 projected</td>
<td>95% SBAC</td>
<td>95% SBAC</td>
<td>95% SBAC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over the two years of online testing, there have been only isolated instances of technical difficulties, and no major flaws were identified. Feedback from most in the field, including survey responses from students, indicates the overall experience was positive. Though schools have not embraced online testing as quickly as planned, based on field response and the context of other states that experienced widespread administration problems with their online programs, OSPI deems these initial years of online testing a success.

To ensure consistent performance interpretation between students who accessed the online test and those who tested via the traditional paper-pencil mode, equating between both test modes was performed and reported.

To ensure consistent performance interpretation between students who accessed the online test and those who tested via the traditional paper-pencil mode, equating between both tests modes was conducted using the early return paper-pencil sample and the early return online sample. The Washington National Technical Advisory Committee reviewed the results prior to releasing the final scoring tables. A testing mode comparability study was also carried out to further explore whether testing mode effects exist using matched paper-pencil and online samples.

The matched sampling ensured that similar groups of students were compared for each content test and grade level. The matching criteria used in selecting the paper-pencil and online examinee samples were student’s previous grade scale score on the same subject, gender, ethnicity, geographical region, and the testing mode in which the student took the previous grade test. For science, a combined reading and math scale score for the previous grade was used for matching.

The comparability of online and paper-pencil testing has been examined for the last two administrations (2010 and 2011), and the two testing modes are highly comparable. Item and test statistics demonstrated that performance is similar enough on each type of test to allow the use of one raw score-to-scale score table per grade-level and content test. In other words, the online tests function the same way as the paper-pencil tests that are being replaced.

Based on the equating analyses and comparability study, it was determined that across the grades and content areas, the two testing modes consistently had the following characteristics:

- Consistent item difficulty and discrimination properties were observed between the two testing modes.
- Yielded raw-to-scale score tables that were essentially consistent with differences of only one raw score point at 1 out of 15 cut points for reading, 5 out of 15 for mathematics, and no differences for science\(^1\).
- Tests delivered in both testing modes were equally reliable for classifying students into appropriate performance levels consistently.

While the two modes of the test are comparable, individual students may find taking the test online less familiar, therefore may perform less well than they might have on a paper-pencil test.

\(^1\) The differences in the raw score cut points across the two modes are similar to the differences in the raw score cut points observed during the operational year-to-year equating analyses.
A challenge facing OSPI is convincing schools to move forward with testing online even though a small percentage of their students may actually find the online test more challenging due to the new format. When statewide testing began with the Washington Assessment of Student Learning (WASL), extended response (open ended) questions were unfamiliar to most students, and several years of experience with this new item type were required before most students were sufficiently comfortable. One difference between the extended response transition and the transition to online testing is that schools were mandated to use the extended response questions. By contrast, schools currently have the choice to transition to online testing or continue to test in paper-pencil mode. Given the significant advantages to online testing, in terms of printing, distribution, storage and security of paper-based materials, OSPI is continuing to encourage districts to move as many schools and students online as district and school technology capacity will allow. Increased participation in online testing will not only improve the scoring efficiency of the current Washington Comprehensive Assessment Program (WCAP) assessments, but will also help in preparing for the foreseeable transition to the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) assessments of the Common Core State Standards.

The following table presents the percent of students meeting standard on each of the tests that did not have to have new standards set this year. Results for the new tests (math EOC exams and Grades 5 and 8 science) are presented later in the report.

### Achievement Results for 2011

Table 2: Grades 3–8 Reading, Writing, and Math; HSPE Reading, Writing, and Science

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Not Meeting Standard</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Meeting Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>26.7%</td>
<td>67.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>32.3%</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>21.2%</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>56.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>22.1%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Not Meeting Standard</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Meeting Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Continued on next page.)
Table 2: Grades 3–8 Reading, Writing, and Math; HSPE Reading, Writing, and Science (cont.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics (cont.)</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Not Meeting Standard</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Meeting Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>38.7%</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>61.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>32.1%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>57.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Not Meeting Standard</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Meeting Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>43.1%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Not Meeting Standard</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Meeting Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

New Standards Assessed

Science, Grades 5 and 8, and Math End-of-Course Exams

The biggest change in the assessments in 2010–11 was the first administration of the math end-of-course (EOC) exams. In addition, new content standards, adopted for math in 2008 and science in 2009, were assessed for the first time in 2011. The science standards were assessed in Grades 5 and 8. The new math content standards for Algebra 1/Integrated Math 1 (referred to as Year 1 Math) and Geometry /Integrated Math 2 (referred to as Year 2 Math) were assessed using the new EOC exams.

Students enrolled in Year 1 Math or Year 2 Math courses were given the corresponding exam, regardless of grade level. In addition, students who are in the class of 2013 or beyond, likely in 10th grade in 2010–11, and had already completed their Year 1 and/or Year 2 Math course were able to take a “makeup” EOC exam even though they were not currently in the tested class. Finally, because 10th grade is the grade level in which all students must be assessed in math for federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) purposes, all 10th graders were expected to be tested on an EOC exam even if they were not taking one of the corresponding classes.

The communications and operational challenges of implementing the new EOC exams were not trivial. Issues included:
• How to design EOC exams for the related subjects (e.g., Algebra 1 and Integrated Math 1) when the content standards are not the same and/or are taught in different years in each course;
• How to identify students who needed to be tested;
• How to schedule testing in various periods of the day rather than the traditional arena-style administration;
• How to test students who were not enrolled in an EOC class but needed to take an EOC exam (i.e., students who had already completed math and 10th graders);
• How to calculate Adequate Yearly Progress for the math content area given the change from one comprehensive test to two end-of-course exams; and
• Whether or not the Legislature would change the graduation requirement for math, which would impact how many tests students needed to take.

OSPI and district staff tackled each challenge with a focus on support for students, families, teachers, administrators, and even reporters (describing the new system was tricky).

The adoption of new content standards for science in 2009 and high school mathematics in 2008 required testing on the new standards in 2011. These changes, in addition to the conversion from one comprehensive math test to two EOC exams required OSPI to conduct several studies:

• Alignment to standards
• Equating online to paper-pencil (science only)
• Standard setting to derive new cut scores at the conclusion of the 2011 test administration cycle

Alignment to Standards
Per guidance from the U.S. Department of Education peer review process, OSPI employed the services of Alpine Testing Solutions to facilitate the alignment studies comparing the 2011 Grades 5 and 8 science assessments and math EOC exams to the existing state content standards. The adoption of new content standards and tests necessitated an initial independent alignment study of these assessments. The primary task of the educators and content specialists, who were selected to participate due to having experience at these grade levels and content areas, was the application of professional judgment to evaluate how well each assessment item under the new test designs aligned with the state content standards in terms of content and cognitive complexity. The alignment study process required two steps:

1. Panelists initially made judgments on the cognitive complexity of each content standard for Grades 5 and 8 science or performance expectation (PE) for math. Judgments were made independently and then the group discussed each of the content standards or PEs to achieve group consensus. Panels were encouraged to discuss items where there was not consensus, but were also reminded that consensus did not require unanimous agreement among all members. Conclusions regarding alignment were based on this model of consensus decisions.
2. Panelists then focused on the items within the assessments. Panelists rated the cognitive complexity of the item using the same framework applied to the content standards or PE; then identified the content standards/PEs, if any, to which the item aligned in terms of content. They were asked to evaluate the fit of the items within the content standard using the following scale:

- **Complete fit:** The main content required to answer the item correctly is contained in the content standard/PE. If the student answers the item correctly, this is one relevant piece of information about the student’s level of achievement of the content stated in the standard.
- **Partial fit:** A significant portion of the content required to answer the item correctly is embodied in the content standard/PE. But there is additional, significant understanding required that is represented by some other content standard/PE. If the student answers the item correctly, it is because the student has some other significant knowledge that is not part of this content standard.
- **Slight fit:** There is some relationship between the item content and the content of the content standard/PE, but much more is needed to answer the item correctly. Perhaps only one of several pieces of content required to answer the item correctly is stated in the content standard/PE. Alignment would probably be more complete with some other standards/PEs, or it might take several standards/PEs to cover the content of the item sufficiently. If an item has a slight fit with one content standard/PE, it may have a slight fit with another as well.
- **No fit:** The item does not fit any content standard/PE.

**Equating**

To ensure consistent performance interpretation between students who accessed the online test for Grades 5 and 8 science and those who tested via the traditional paper-pencil mode, equating between both tests modes was conducted using the early return paper-pencil sample and the early return online sample.

**Standard Setting**

As in previous standard setting efforts, OSPI adopted the modified bookmark method, including the addition of a contrasting group study conducted prior to the standard setting meeting, and presented as guidance for panelists during standard setting. The modified bookmark method included a presentation of the items from the grade or course-level test, arranged from easiest to hardest based on the item difficulty (p-value). In successive rounds of review, the standard setting panelists deliberated student performance expectations, proposed preliminary cut-scores, and reviewed rationales in context with added evidence/information all designed to solidify the thinking of the group around a final set of cut-score decisions. Additional evidence/information that informed each round of review was:

- Round 1 = Contrasting Group Study guidance
- Round 2 = Item difficulties (p-values)
- Round 3 = Grade-level impact (student performance) data
The Contrasting Groups Study data was collected from self-selected grade-level teachers from all across the state. They completed an online training on using the Performance Level Descriptors to evaluate student work. These teachers submitted predictions for each of their students, based on that training, prior to the administration of the test. Their predictions indicated whether the student would be “proficient or above” or “basic or below” on the test. This data was correlated to the students’ actual performance on the test and provided panelists with a range of pages in the Ordered Item Booklet (OIB) that corresponded to the raw score cut indicated by the predictions.

Once cut-scores were established for each grade or course by the standard setting panels, representatives from each grade or course-level panel were brought together as a committee to address any cross-grade or cross-course anomalies in the recommended cut-scores (e.g., proficiency at Grade 5 established at higher level of difficulty than Grade 8, proficiency for Year 1 Math established at higher level of difficulty than Year 2 Math). The efforts of the committee resulted in cut-score recommendations for Grades 5 and 8 science and for the Year 1 Math and Year 2 Math EOC exams.

All the associated efforts of the standard setting meetings resulted in the cut-scores approval by the State Board of Education on August 9, 2011.

**Table 3: Results of the MSP Science Test in Grades 5 and 8**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Science</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Not Meeting Standard</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Meeting Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
<td>31.2%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4: Results of the HSPE – EOC Exams in Mathematics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mathematics EOC</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Below Basic</th>
<th>Basic</th>
<th>Not Meeting Standard</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Advanced</th>
<th>Meeting Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algebra</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated 1</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>32.5%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makeup Yr 1</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Yr 1</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>34.9%</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geometry</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrated 2</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>30.9%</td>
<td>35.6%</td>
<td>33.2%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Yr 2</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>18.0%</td>
<td>26.5%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>41.1%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Concordance (“Bridging”) Between HSPE and EOC

Because EOC exams are used for state and federal accountability, a bridging study was conducted to provide a translation between the 2010 and 2011 mathematics tests. Bridging studies provide one-time concordance that expresses relationship between previous and the new reporting scales. In the case of Washington’s HSPE comprehensive assessment of high school mathematics, the final concordance tables were used for Annual Yearly Progress (AYP) calculations. The bridging or linking analyses were performed following procedures similar to those used in operational equating (refer to processes in section on Equating above). The sample included in the analyses consisted of the students who were administered the paper-and-pencil version of the mathematics test.

Using the Rasch Partial Credit Model (PCM), scores on the 2011 EOC exams were placed on the reporting scale established in 2004 by fixing the item performance parameters (e.g., difficulties and step values) for each item that comprised the anchor set to the items existing bank values. The anchor sets used for linking on the EOC exams included only internal anchors.

Internal anchors reflected the overlap of the old and new standards, and included both multiple choice and short answer items. The number of internal anchors ranged from 7 to 13 for each form of the test. The table below provides the total number of operational items and the distribution of internal anchors for each EOC exam.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Total Number of Operational Items</th>
<th>Total Number of Internal Anchor Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>AA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This series of psychometric analyses were conducted to ensure reported results had connection to previous years’ information. In recapping these efforts, the fidelity of the program to its long standing levels of validity and reliability were retained through diligent compliance to procedures and high caliber judgment and evaluation of numerous national professionals from the field of test measurement.

Certificate of Academic Achievement Options

Graduation options available to students continue to include:

- Collection of Evidence: reading and writing are mature programs with mathematics and science under development to support the new EOC models
- College entrance exams: SAT, ACT, AP
- Grade Comparison: evaluating a student against cohort of similar course-taking students
In addition, students can be given a “waiver” if they have already met standard on a comparable test in another state, or under particular circumstances for students in special education (locally determined assessment or awareness waiver). Finally, there is a review panel to decide if a student’s special circumstance appeal should be granted, allowing the student to graduate without having met standard on a particular test.

Below are counts of students who accessed Certificate of Academic Achievement options in the 2010–11 school year.

**Table 6: Count of Students who Accessed Certificate of Academic Achievement Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options Accessed in 2010–11</th>
<th>Total across subjects</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collections of Evidence</td>
<td>4,574</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>3,035</td>
<td>1,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Entrance Test</td>
<td>2,672</td>
<td>784</td>
<td>1,102</td>
<td>786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Comparison</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>341</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of State Test</td>
<td>4,068</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>1,432</td>
<td>1,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Determined Assessment</td>
<td>870</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Waiver</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Circumstance Appeals</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following table shows how many 12th graders used each option for meeting the graduation requirements. The number of students who accessed the options exceeds the number of students who ultimately needed the option for graduation in cases where the student tested on the general assessment as well as used an option. If standard was met on the assessment, the student is represented in that row rather than in the row for the particular option.
Table 7: Methods of Fulfilling Assessment Graduation Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12th grade Students in the Class of 2011</th>
<th>Reading #</th>
<th>Reading %</th>
<th>Writing #</th>
<th>Writing %</th>
<th>Mathematics #</th>
<th>Mathematics %</th>
<th>Science #</th>
<th>Science %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Met Standard</td>
<td>64,731</td>
<td>94.47%</td>
<td>64,797</td>
<td>95.56%</td>
<td>42,521</td>
<td>62.05%</td>
<td>27,487</td>
<td>40.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Proficiency Exam</td>
<td>59,419</td>
<td>86.72%</td>
<td>61,074</td>
<td>89.13%</td>
<td>37,137</td>
<td>54.20%</td>
<td>27,183</td>
<td>39.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Alternative Assessments (Special Education)</td>
<td>3,049</td>
<td>4.45%</td>
<td>2,481</td>
<td>3.62%</td>
<td>3,333</td>
<td>4.86%</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>0.44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic (Level 2)</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>1,087</td>
<td>1.59%</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAS Developmentally Appropriate Exam</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>642</td>
<td>0.94%</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>3.64%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAAS Portfolio</td>
<td>522</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>518</td>
<td>0.76%</td>
<td>501</td>
<td>0.73%</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>0.35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locally Determined Assessments</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>0.15%</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>0.16%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate of Academic Achievement</td>
<td>1,403</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>0.64%</td>
<td>1,157</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection of Evidence</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>1.44%</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSAT/SAT/ACT/AP</td>
<td>409</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>0.34%</td>
<td>674</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades Comparison</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.02%</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>0.49%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Waiver</td>
<td>860</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>1.17%</td>
<td>894</td>
<td>1.30%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out-of-State Waivers</td>
<td>847</td>
<td>1.24%</td>
<td>788</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>883</td>
<td>1.29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness Level Waivers (Special Education)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special Circumstance Appeals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.01%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tested: Not Met Standard</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
<td>1,158</td>
<td>1.69%</td>
<td>23,276</td>
<td>33.97%</td>
<td>27,787</td>
<td>40.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No score</td>
<td>2,459</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td>2,567</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>2,725</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
<td>13,248</td>
<td>19.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>68,522</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>68,522</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>68,522</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>68,522</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2011–12 Enhancements to the Summative Assessment

Test administration for 2011–12 will be similar to 2010–11 with three enhancements to support the goals of the state. One enhancement will be the expansion of online testing to include Grade 3 in reading and math, with increases in participation in Grades 4 through 8 in reading, mathematics, and science. The second enhancement is the introduction of EOC testing in high school biology, aligned to the biology-related science standards adopted in 2009. The third enhancement is implementation of a revised Washington Alternate Assessment System Portfolio, Washington’s assessment for students with significant cognitive challenges.

Expansion of Online Testing

Statewide test administrations will witness further transitioning to online testing in 2012. In 2011, 40 percent of students tested online in Grades 6 through 8 reading and mathematics, 20 percent in Grades 4 and 5 reading and mathematics, and 30 percent in Grades 5 and 8 science. Participation in 2012 is being encouraged to reach 60 percent amongst these same grade and content areas from 2011. The state is expanding available online tests in 2012 to include Grade 3 reading and math with an expected participation of 25 percent. The state’s planned migration to online testing will be more cost effective than paper-pencil testing, and will position Washington for a positive transition to the new common assessments being developed by SBAC.

OSPI initially estimated all testing to be administered online by 2012 but upon further consideration of questions involving validity specific to the writing assessment construct, fairness, linked to graduation requirements for high school testing, including EOC testing, and
district infrastructure and available technology, the agency has re-evaluated its transition plan. The revised plan currently excludes the transition of all writing, high school reading, and EOC exams. For all other grades and content areas, it is projected that participation will reach close to 100 percent by 2013–14. This coincides with the projected administration timeframe for the new common assessments in 2014–15 which are expected to be delivered online.

End-of-Course Biology

In spring 2009, the state adopted revised learning standards for science in Grades K–12. Associated with any change to learning standards is the necessity to develop items and tests that align to new learning targets. Since the adoption of the revised learning standards, OSPI has been working through the processes related to item and test development with 2012 being the first administration linked to the new standards for high school. For assessment purposes, the biology EOC exam will be used to assess high school-level science. Students will be tested according to the course sequence available in their respective districts with some students testing in 9th grade and others in 10th grade. All students will be required to take the biology EOC exam by the end of 10th grade.

The design of the EOC exam provides for a test of 40 items used for reporting student performance. Table 4 provides a detailed look at item types with item counts projected for a typical test booklet.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 8: Biology End-of-Course Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alignment to Content Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testing Time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Test Window</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test Item Count/Types and Test Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The EOC exam is designed for classroom administration, though districts are being provided the flexibility to administer the assessment as best meets the needs of the students, teachers and administration. For test security purposes, there are administration protocols that will require consideration, particularly managing item exposure prior to testing. OSPI will work with districts in determining the best means to meet the needs of all involved.

Under current legislation, students enrolled in classes coded specifically as biology will be required to be assessed using the EOC exam. All students in 10th grade, whether enrolled in biology or not, will be required to test to fulfill NCLB requirements, unless they have previously passed the biology EOC exam in an earlier grade (not possible in this first year of the biology EOC exam).

The cut scores for performance levels on the tests will be established in August 2012 by the State Board of Education. As established with testing in 2010, the biology EOC exam has fewer test items than in earlier years of the program. There are no four-point items on the biology EOC exam but new completion items will appear in the 2012 exam.

**Alternate Assessment (WAAS-Portfolio)**

Washington’s alternate assessment based on alternate achievement standards is the assessment available to students with significant cognitive challenges. This assessment, called the Washington Alternate Assessment System-Portfolio (WAAS-Portfolio), was modified to address concerns raised by teachers, parents and the Legislature. Concerns focused on three areas and the revisions have targeted each of these as described below:

1. Lack of connection to the student’s educational program
2. Too many administrative rules
3. Little support for teachers on how to compile WAAS-Portfolio

**Expanded extensions**

To better connect the assessment to students’ Individual Education Plans (IEPs), extensions of the content standards that are assessed have been expanded. The new extensions go “deeper”, meaning there are now more pre-requisite academic skills so the Portfolio measurement is more relevant to students IEPs and their ongoing classroom instruction. Training materials have been revised to assist teachers in targeting relevant skills in the assessment.

**Reduced administrative requirements**

Procedural changes were also made to the WAAS-Portfolio process to lessen the administrative burden of the assessment. Every administrative requirement was reconsidered and if it was not critical to the reliability and validity of the assessment it was revised. The entire assessment process now focuses more on documentation of student growth and less on procedural compliance.

**Added resources and collaboration**

Resources for teachers and special education administrators have been expanded to include sample data collection sheets, a step by step guide to compiling a portfolio, teacher and
administrator training PowerPoints and a list serve community for asking questions and posting examples. In collaboration with OSPI, training for teachers was facilitated by the Washington Education Association, who paired four special education staff development experts with four current teachers of students with significant cognitive challenges. These four pairs of trainers offered training in 14 locations throughout the state. Over 550 teachers participated in these trainings, reaching the capacity of the facilities.

Alignment with future work
Washington is participating in the Dynamic Learning Maps (DLM) consortium (University of Kansas). The DLM project is similar to the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium described below in that it addresses the need for an assessment of the common core curriculum standards but for students with significant cognitive challenges. The DLM assessment will target performance tasks, based on learning progressions (maps), and will be online for the vast majority of students (i.e., targeting 85 percent participation online). Piloting of DLM tasks will begin in 2013–14, with full implementation planned for 2014–15. Additional information about the DLM project can be found at http://dynamiclearningmaps.org/.

Other 2011–12 Program Initiatives
Other efforts within the assessment program include:

- Collection of Evidence (COE) for mathematics and biology
- Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS)
- New Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment (WELPA)
- SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC)

Collection of Evidence for Mathematics and Biology

Collection of Evidence is an alternative option for earning a Certificate of Academic Achievement (CAA). To develop a COE, students compile a set of classroom work samples developed under a teacher’s supervision. Each student collection is scored by a panel of educators selected and trained by OSPI. Collections must demonstrate a student has the skills that are tested on the HSPE or EOC exam. Career and Technical Education (CTE) students may use work samples from their CTE classes to build their collections as well as work samples they complete in other classes. Tasks that can be used to develop these work samples are available from OSPI on the COE website (http://www.coe.k12.wa.us/Page/1).

The cut scores set to pass the reading and writing COEs are comparable in rigor to the HSPE. The mathematics COEs are aligned with the skills and content of the Year 1Math and Year 2 Math EOC exams. Standards for the math COEs will be set in March 2013. Students successfully completing a COE, in lieu of passing an HSPE or EOC exam, may earn a CAA.

Two significant changes to the COE guidelines have gone into effect as of the 2011–12 school year, due to 2ESHB 1087 and corresponding budget reductions. Previously, a student was eligible to submit a collection following one unsuccessful attempt of the HSPE. Students are now
required to attempt a test two times before accessing this option. The second change is a limit on the number of COE submissions allowed. In addition, students are now allowed only one submission per content area.

For the math COEs, the first opportunity to submit a collection will occur in February 2013 for the graduating class of 2013. In order to be eligible to submit a math COE, students must have taken and not passed two mathematics EOC exams. Development work for the math COE requirements, policies, procedures, and designated skills for testing and task development is ongoing and includes math educators from around the state.

A COE for biology is in the early stages of development. The anticipated date of availability of tasks to guide the development of work samples for a biology COE is 2012–13.

**Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS)**

In 2010–11, OSPI collaborated with the Department of Early Learning and Thrive by Five to initiate efforts associated with development of the WaKIDS program, a measure of incoming kindergarten student readiness for the learning environment of regular schooling.

WaKIDS is a kindergarten process intended to:

- Welcome families into the Washington K–12 system as partners in their child’s education.
- Give kindergarten teachers information about the development of children in their classroom to help them teach every child. The assessment provides information about each child’s social/emotional, cognitive, language/literacy and physical development.
- Align practices of early learning professionals and kindergarten teachers to support smoother transitions for children.
- Offer a statewide snapshot of where children in Washington are in their development at the start of kindergarten, which will help inform state-level decisions about policy and investments.

WaKIDS was successfully piloted during the 2010–11 school year. Nearly 3,000 children from more than 120 classrooms around the state participated in a voluntary pilot program.

Senate Bill 5427, passed during the 2011 Legislative Session, moves toward statewide WaKIDS implementation:

- WaKIDS is optional for state-funded full-day kindergarten classrooms in school year 2011–12. Participation includes:
  - 68 school districts
  - 165 schools
  - 479 teachers
  - 11,000 kindergarteners
WaKIDS will be mandatory for state-funded full-day kindergarten classrooms beginning in school year 2012–13.
Other schools are and will be able to choose to participate.

WaKIDS is paid for with state, federal, and private funding. The Department of Early Learning (DEL) and OSPI work together to oversee WaKIDS. Private partners include Thrive by Five Washington and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. In addition, the University of Washington provides evaluation guidance and technical expertise.

**Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment**

Washington concluded use of its previous English language proficiency assessment (WLPT-II) with the 2011 administration. Commencing in the 2011–12 school year, Washington has adopted the LAS Links™ product offered by CTB/McGraw-Hill as its new Washington English language proficiency assessment (WELPA). Selection of the new test instrument revolved around two elements key to the present environment of reduced resources—cost and lessening the testing burden on districts and schools.

Associated with supports to the state’s English language learner (ELL) population, Washington continues to engage with various projects ranging from identifying ELLs who also have learning disabilities requiring special education services to development of next generation English language proficiency assessments. Efforts in these projects require limited engagement by OSPI staff, but we are responding to requests for data and are providing input/feedback to shape policy interpretations and establish bases for student performance results.

**SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium**

Washington continues as a member-state of the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) in the role of a governing state and as the lead state/fiscal agent. Current make-up of the consortium is twenty-eight state members total, with twenty-one in the role of a governing state and the remaining seven as advisory states. As a pre-requisite for continued participation in SBAC, Superintendent Dorn formally adopted the Common Core State Standards in July 2011.

The SBAC program is established as a four-year project designed to develop assessment instruments that align with the Common Core State Standards in English language arts and mathematics. The Common Core State Standards, released in June 2010, are designed to measure whether students exiting high school are ready for college or career. It is the aim of SBAC to develop assessment instruments that support student learning with summative, interim, and formative measures.

Major work accomplishments as of this report include finalizing the content specifications in both English language arts and mathematics that will shape the subsequent item and test development efforts supporting pilot and field testing in years 2013 and 2014, and finalizing the system architecture that will act as the road map for designing the computer adaptive testing (CAT) platform for the summative and interim assessment instruments. Procurements are underway for developing an IT capacity tool allowing member states to determine readiness for
the transition to the new computer testing system, devising the specifications and training materials that will support item writing for the four distinct item types (multiple choice, constructed response, technology enhanced, and performance task), determining accessibility and accommodation guidelines and policies to support a multi-state environment, mapping out the validation approaches and studies that will establish the credibility of the assessments, and devising plans/processes to simulate CAT implementation.

SBAC also has a focus for the next year on the tasks below:

- Writing assessment items.
- Working with state membership to tryout various items with students to determine functionality.
- Devising a vision of program sustainability for member states beyond the grant period.
- Unveiling a compilation of communication and classroom tools that will assist stakeholders with understanding the assessment system being developed by SBAC.
- Aiding teachers with the transition to the CCSS.
- Collaborating with higher education in synchronizing the phases of exiting high school.
- Beginning work in credit-bearing college coursework.

SBAC has established regular meetings with its governance bodies (Executive Committee, governing/advisory states), advisory board (Technical Advisory Committee), and state chiefs, and continues to establish other communications channels to keep a broader stakeholder audience engaged with the project status and achievements.

Instructionally Supportive Formative Assessments

In 2009–10, the following formative assessment efforts were initiated:

1. **Web-Based Instructionally Supportive Student Assessment Systems:** Project to identify an interactive tool that districts can use to support teachers in the classroom assessing students’ knowledge, skills, and progress toward achievement of learning standards.

2. **Formative Assessment Training:** Professional development for agency and Educational Service District staff on formative assessment as a framework for improved instruction and increased learning.

3. **Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS):** Project to identify a quality methodology to determine readiness of students in kindergarten.

4. **Evaluating the Validity of English Language Proficiency Assessments (EVEA):** Research project coordinated with four other states to develop protocols to evaluate the validity in English language proficiency assessments.
Unfortunately, due to budget cuts in this area, the position guiding this work had to be eliminated for 2010–11, and there are no resources to continue the first two activities. WaKIDS funding continued and that assessment is underway.

Cost Analysis

**Current Contract Costs**

An element of this annual report is to provide cost analyses of program changes. Per budget directives from the Office of Financial Management, all contracts supporting the assessment program, with the exception of the Collection of Evidence contract and the newly executed English language proficiency assessment contract, have been negotiated to both extend the period through the current biennium and control costs by executing the renewal clauses with preset inflationary rates. The actual length of the extensions are through contract year 2014, allowing for alignment with the projected transition to the SMARTER Balanced system, scheduled to come online in spring 2015.

**Possible Cost Reductions**

Possible cost reductions to the assessment program are presented below. Except for increasing online participation, the reductions would significantly reduce the high quality, comprehensive assessment program Washington now has. Both technical and political considerations would need to be examined before implementing any of these reductions.

Possible cost reductions (amounts are effective with the 2012–13 school year and running through the end of the existing contracts) include:

- Significantly increase online participation in Grades 3–8 = $140K per 10 percent additional participation across all grades and content areas until reaching 100 percent.
- Eliminate Graduation Requirements:
  - Eliminate Year 2 Math as a graduation requirement = $3.2M
  - Eliminate reading, writing, both math EOCs and Science EOC as graduation requirements = $10M
- Eliminate writing in Grades 4 and 7 = $1.8M
- Eliminate writing in HS = $1.8M
- Eliminate hand scoring by only using multiple choice items = $15.3M
- Eliminate WaKIDS = $1.5M