



REPORT TO THE LEGISLATURE

Washington Comprehensive Assessment Program

December 2015

Authorizing legislation:

- RCW 28A.300.041(8)
(<http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=28A.300.041>)
- RCW 28A.655.066
(<http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=28A.655.066>)

Robin G. Munson, Ph.D.
**Assistant Superintendent of Assessment
and Student Information**

Prepared by:

- **Robin G. Munson, Ph.D.**, Assistant Superintendent, Assessment and Student Information | robin.munson@k12.wa.us | 360-725-6336
- **Linda Drake**, Research Director, State Board of Education
linda.drake@k12.wa.us | 360-725-6028

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	3
2014–15 Implementation of New Assessments in English Language Arts and Math	5
2014–15 Continuation of Science Assessments in Grades 5, 8, and High School	10
Overview of Assessment Results	11
2014–15 Implementation of New Exit Exams.....	13
2014–15 Implementation of New Alternate Assessments.....	16
Other Assessment Program Initiatives	17
Cost Analysis	19
State Board of Education’s Activities and Role in the Washington Comprehensive Assessment Program	21
Appendix A: Student Time Involved in State Summative Testing	26

List of Tables

Table 1: Online Testing Participation.....	6
Table 2: Status on Legislative Recommendations to Redesign State Testing	8
Table 3: Achievement Results for 2015 ELA, Math, and Science	11
Table 4: 2015 Achievement Results for States That Used Smarter Balanced Assessments	12
Table 5: Achievement Results for 2015 EOC Year 1 Math, Year 2 Math, and Biology.....	13
Table 6: Achievement Results for 2015 ELA Smarter Balanced Exit Exam, Grade 10.....	14
Table 7: Certificate of Academic Achievement Options Accessed in 2013–14.....	14
Table 8: How Students in the Class of 2015 Fulfilled Assessment Graduation Requirements	15
Table 9: Achievement Results for 2015 WA-AIM	16
Table 10: WaKIDS Participation	17
Table 11: 2014–15 WaKIDS Results	18
Table 12: 2014–15 and 2015–16 Assessment Contract Costs.....	19
Table 13: SBE’s Work on Assessments During 2015.....	23

Executive Summary

The state assessment program changed significantly during the 2014–15 school year, as the state transitioned to new Smarter Balanced tests in English language arts (ELA) and math. This report summarizes the changes and results, and provides an update on other program initiatives.

The Washington Comprehensive Assessment Program (WCAP) test administration for the 2014–15 school year introduced the Smarter Balanced Assessments in ELA and math, and continued the Measurements of Student Progress (MSP) in science for grades 5 and 8, and the Biology End-of-Course exam in high school.

The initial results for the Smarter Balanced assessments will serve as a new baseline of school, district, and state achievement. Washington’s state learning standards are now more rigorous, and OSPI’s expectations for lower proficiency in this initial year were well communicated. While proficiency rates were significantly lower than on previous tests, as expected, performance exceeded the state’s expectations (which were based on consortium-wide field test results from 2014). In fact, of the 12 states that have reported Smarter Balanced results, Washington had the highest proficiency rate in math in grades 3, 4, 5, 6, and 8.

Washington also administered, for the first time, its alternate assessment, Washington Access to Instruction and Measurement (WA-AIM), in spring 2015. The WA-AIM is the state’s alternate assessment using alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS), designed specifically for students with significant cognitive challenges. WA-AIM was developed because of the state’s transition to college- and career-ready learning standards, and the need for an assessment with alignment and correspondence to the state’s general learning standards.

The intent of the WA-AIM is to address a greater breadth of content standards than the former Washington Alternate Assessment System (WAAS)-Portfolio. WA-AIM, which is a performance task-based assessment, will focus teachers on instructing and measuring student performance on skills aligned to the “essential elements” developed as part of the Dynamic Learning Maps project, thus linking our current methods for documenting achievement toward college- and career-ready standards by students who are significantly cognitively challenged.

Other efforts within the assessment program include:

- **Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS):** WaKIDS is required in all state-funded, full-day kindergarten classrooms. It assesses incoming kindergartners’ developing social-emotional, physical, cognitive, language, literacy, and math skills. Approximately 2,900 teachers from 261 districts have recently completed their fall assessment of 58,500 kindergartners. This represents about 74 percent of all kindergartners, mostly in state-funded, full-day kindergarten, and the rest in kindergartens who volunteered to administer the assessment. Fall 2015 data will be available in January 2016. The fall 2014 WaKIDS results show students are entering kindergarten most prepared in the areas of literacy and physical

development, and least prepared in the areas of language development and math (with math significantly lower than any of the other areas).

- Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment (WELPA) and English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) Consortium:** 2014–15 marked the final year of Washington schools administering the WELPA, using LAS Links™ (a product offered by CTB/McGraw-Hill). For the past two years, Washington has been part of a 10-state consortium developing a new English language proficiency assessment (ELPA 21) for initial administration during the 2015–16 school year.

ELPA21 is funded by the U.S. Department of Education, and is charged with development of new English language proficiency assessments aligned to a common set of English language proficiency (ELP) standards that hold correspondences to the Common Core State Standards. Washington adopted these common ELP standards in December 2013.

For 2014–15, Washington experienced a combination of assessment instrument transitions or service provider changes which resulted in close-out payments to old vendors and start-up payments to new vendors across the same fiscal period.

Actual costs for the assessment program for 2014–15 were lower than projected. Costs for the 2015–16 administration year are expected to be lower still, even with an increase to the English language proficiency assessment, as the agency eliminates the close-out payments to previous contracts and addresses legislative changes to the assessment graduation requirements (deferral of science for two student cohorts).

Annual Cost of Assessments

Test	Cost
State tests used for accountability (general and alternate)	\$21 million to \$22 million
Alternatives for graduation requirements if students don't meet standard on state tests	\$11 million
WaKIDS	More than \$600,000 as full-day K expands
ELPA21	\$2.5 million

2014–15 Implementation of New Assessments in English Language Arts and Math

Due to the change in state standards in English language arts and mathematics, the state transitioned to new assessments, aligned to those standards, in 2014–15. Both the general assessments (MSP, HSPE, and EOCs) and the alternate assessment (Portfolio) were replaced in 2014–15. The replacement tests and results are described below.

Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium

Washington implemented the new assessment system developed by the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. The Common Core State Standards, released in June 2010, are designed to ensure students exiting high school are ready for college or career. The consortium developed assessment instruments that support student learning with summative and interim measures, and formative practices and instructional resources. The Smarter Balanced Assessment system is comprised of the Digital Library, which is a repository of resources to help teachers improve classroom-based assessment practices; interim assessments that provide classroom teachers the opportunity to periodically assess students' knowledge and skills that are being taught as part of the state's new learning standards and that will be measured on the final component of Smarter Balanced; and the summative tests that measure college and career readiness at the 11th grade and, in other grades, whether students are on track to be college and career ready.

Washington continues as a “member state” of the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium. As the grant that funded the four-year project designed to develop the assessment system ended December 31, 2014, the consortium became a member-states led organization based at the University of California, Los Angeles. OSPI signed a memorandum of understanding that we will continue as a member state with access to all three components of the Smarter Balanced assessment system.

Digital Library

The Digital Library, now available to all educators in the K–12 system, is an online collection of resources aligned to the Common Core that supports K–12 teachers' use of the formative assessment process. The Digital Library has assessment literacy modules, exemplar instructional modules, and education resources submitted and vetted by teachers. Teachers can rate materials and share their expertise with educators across the country. OSPI is collaborating with the Washington Student Achievement Councils (WSAC) to also grant Digital Library access to higher education faculty in teacher preparation programs.

Interim Assessments

Smarter Balanced interim assessments are also available to all school districts in Washington for optional administration in grades 3–8 and high school. At the high school level, the assessments are consistent with the high school summative design and may be administered in grades 9, 10, 11, and/or 12. The interim assessments are designed to allow schools to check in on student progress and provide information to inform instruction. There are two types of interim assessments allowing flexible administration options: Interim Comprehensive Assessments use the same design as the summative assessments,

assess the same range of standards, and provide scores on the same scale; Interim Assessment Blocks focus on smaller sets of related standards and provide more detailed information for instructional purposes.

Summative Assessments

Summative assessments in ELA and math were administered in grades 3–8 and 11 toward the end of the school year. Students complete a computer adaptive test and performance task in each subject area. Students received composite scores for each subject area and the following claim-level scores: in ELA—reading, writing, listening, and research; in Math—concepts and procedures, problem solving and modeling/data analysis, and communicating reasoning.

Due to Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 5946 (ESSB 5946), passed in 2013, which requires the principal and teacher to meet with the parents of any child who scores “below basic” on the 3rd-grade ELA test prior to the end of school, the assessment window for 3rd-grade ELA testing was shortened and scheduled early in the spring (late March to mid-April).

Operational Update

Smarter Balanced tests are designed to be administered online; a key feature of the assessment is that they are computer adaptive, meaning they adjust the difficulty of the items presented to the student’s demonstrated knowledge and skill. Paper/pencil testing was available for districts that chose to not administer the online tests, but districts had to pay \$6 per test for each student tested on paper for grades 3–8 and 11.

Table 1: Online Testing Participation, by Grade

School Year	Grade 3	Grades 4–5	Grades 6–8	Grade 11
2009–10	Paper/Pencil	Paper/Pencil	~25%	Paper/Pencil
2010–11	Paper/Pencil	~20%	~40%	Paper/Pencil
2011–12	~15%	~30%	~50%	Paper/Pencil
2012–13	~24%	~42%	~55%	Paper/Pencil
2013–14	~59%	~62%	~67%	Paper/Pencil
2014–15	~97%	~97%	~98%	~97%

Feedback on Smarter Balanced Tests

OSPI conducted customer satisfaction surveys for teachers, administrators, and students after the Smarter Balanced test administration. More than 2,100 responses were received for the Educator Survey. Feedback included positive opinions about technology, score reporting, and the interim assessments. Technology generally worked well; certainly there were isolated issues, but in general the new test engine was far better than in previous years. Teachers were excited about students’ scores being available in the online reporting system instead of having to wait for hard copy reports at the end of the summer. And teachers who accessed the optional Smarter Balanced interim assessments and Digital Library resources last spring gave favorable reviews.

Negative feedback from teachers and administrators mostly focused on inadequate technology in schools, resulting in it taking many days to have everyone tested. The length of the tests was also a common concern, now that writing is assessed at each grade. In

addition, the adjustment to the administration window for 3rd-grade ELA testing, to comply with [RCW 28A.655.230](#), was a concern for teachers and principals who feel 3rd graders had to be assessed too early in the school year to sufficiently capture students' growth in 3rd grade. The law was changed in 2015 by ESSB 5803 Sec 1 (2), which requires a meeting between the parent and teacher prior to the return of the results. This will allow schools to schedule their 3rd-grade assessments later in the year if desired.

Testing coordinators had additional concerns about the first year's administration of the Smarter Balanced assessments. Because of delays from the Smarter Balanced consortium and Washington's assessment vendor (AIR), administration materials were delivered to schools way too late. Furthermore, it took an inordinate amount of time for district assessment coordinators and test administrators (teachers) to become familiar with the new procedures, instructions, online applications, etc. and the AIR help desk that was established to assist with the administration was slow to respond and often unhelpful or inaccurate.

Finally, one of the biggest concerns with this first operational year of Smarter Balanced was that scores for individual students took much longer to appear in the online reporting system than promised. Instead of the expected three-week turnaround for students' scores, some results took up to 10 weeks to appear in the online reporting system. The state's new operational assessment vendor expected to be able to return score reports to schools three weeks after students tested, but there were substantial delays for many scores this first year. Unforeseen scoring and reporting difficulties resulted in scores appearing in the Online Reporting System that teachers and administrators access anywhere between four and twelve weeks. OSPI has assurances from the vendor that these delays were due to it being the initial year of implementation and will not occur in 2016. Teachers and administrators should have access to their Smarter Balanced scores within 3–4 weeks after a student tests.

There were more than 3,000 responses to the survey from students in grades 3–5.

- More than 62% of students said they would choose online testing over a paper booklet next year.
- Students reported liking the online tools and the ability to keyboard/type their responses.
- Feedback was primarily positive.

There were more than 2,500 responses from students in grades 6–high school.

- Almost 55% of respondents preferred online to paper/pencil.
- In general, the online tools were the most favorite feature of taking the test online.
- Many comments were not repeatable or are inappropriate for distribution.

Testing Times

Both the feedback described above and a press release from President Obama raise the question of the amount of instructional time that is lost because of state mandated testing. The President suggested that states should not exceed 2 percent of students' instructional time in state-mandated summative testing. See Appendix A for an analysis of the student time Washington's state-mandated assessments take on average (about 1% per grade).

Status on Legislative Recommendations

[RCW 28A.300.041](#) required a redesign of the state’s assessment system. The table below summarizes the state’s status with respect to each feature requested.

Table 2: Status on Redesign to State Testing

<p>(1) The Legislature finds that a statewide student assessment system should improve and inform classroom instruction, support accountability, and provide useful information to all levels of the educational system, including students, parents, teachers, schools, school districts, and the state. The Legislature intends to redesign the current statewide system, in accordance with the recommendations of the Washington assessment of student learning legislative work group, to:</p>	<p>How the Washington Comprehensive Assessment Program (WCAP) addresses each feature:</p>
<p>(a) Include multiple assessment formats, including both formative and summative, as necessary to provide information to help improve instruction and inform accountability;</p>	<p>Smarter Balanced is comprised of a balanced system of formative, interim, and summative assessments.</p>
<p>(b) Enable collection of data that allows both statewide and nationwide comparisons of student learning and achievement; and</p>	<p>Washington is one of 17 states that administered Smarter Balanced assessments, allowing direct comparisons within our state and across other Smarter Balanced states.</p>
<p>(c) Be balanced so that the information used to make significant decisions that affect school accountability or student educational progress includes many data points and does not rely on solely the results of a single assessment.</p>	<p>Washington’s federal and state accountability system incorporates proficiency on state tests, student growth percentiles, attendance (grades 3–8) and graduation rates (high school), and dual credit course participation.</p>
<p>(2) The Legislature further finds that one component of the assessment system should be instructionally supportive formative assessments. The key design elements or characteristics of an instructionally supportive assessment must:</p>	<p>Smarter Balanced offers educators full access to the Digital Library, a collection resources focused on formative assessment processes, as well as optional interim assessments.</p>
<p>(a) Be aligned to state standards in areas that are being assessed;</p>	<p>The interim assessments and formative assessment processes are fully aligned to current state standards.</p>
<p>(b) Measure student growth and competency at multiple points throughout the year in a manner that allows instructors to monitor student progress and have the necessary trend data with which to improve instruction;</p>	<p>The optional interim assessments may be administered as often as teachers choose but are fixed forms so repeated administrations will not necessarily demonstrate true growth. The formative assessment processes emphasized throughout the Digital Library will fulfill this criteria.</p>
<p>(c) Provide rapid feedback;</p>	<p>Formative assessment practices, by definition, provide immediate feedback to teachers and students. Interim assessment results are available immediately after the teacher hand scores a small number of items.</p>

(Table continued on next page)

(d) Link student growth with instructional elements in order to gauge the effectiveness of educators and curricula;	The Smarter Balanced consortium is still working on identifying the direct connections between particular performance patterns and resources in the Digital Library.
(e) Provide tests that are appropriate to the skill level of the student;	Smarter Balanced tests are computer adaptive, meaning they adjust the difficulty of the item the student sees based on the student's performance on previous items.
(f) Support instruction for students of all abilities, including highly capable students and students with learning disabilities;	Smarter Balanced tests are computer adaptive, meaning they adjust the difficulty of the item the student sees based on the student's performance on previous items. Furthermore, teachers may administer interim assessments from higher or lower grades to support instruction of students performing outside their grade level.
(g) Be culturally, linguistically, and cognitively relevant, appropriate, and understandable to each student taking the assessment;	Smarter Balanced item development includes a bias and sensitivity review by members of a wide variety of groups.
(h) Inform parents and draw parents into greater participation of the student's study plan;	Smarter Balanced score reports are designed to inform parents about their child's progress toward college and career readiness. Parents have offered positive feedback about the new reports.
(i) Provide a way to analyze the assessment results relative to characteristics of the student such as, but not limited to, English language learners, gender, ethnicity, poverty, age, and disabilities;	All assessment results are disaggregated by racial groups and program participation including free/reduced meals, ELL, special education, and foster care.
(j) Strive to be computer-based and adaptive; and	Smarter Balanced tests are computer adaptive, meaning they adjust the difficulty of the item the student sees based on the student's performance on previous items.
(k) Engage students in their learning.	A key part of Digital Library's focus on formative assessment processes in the engagement of students in their learning and in providing feedback to teachers about their learning.
(3) The Legislature further finds that a second component of the assessment system should be a state-administered summative achievement assessment that can be used as a check on the educational system in order to guide state expectations for the instruction of children and satisfy legislative demands for accountability. The key design elements or characteristics of the state administered achievement assessment must:	Smarter Balanced summative assessments, administered in grades 3–8 and 11 in ELA and math, fulfill these purposes.
(a) Be aligned to state standards in areas that are being assessed;	Smarter Balanced summative assessments are fully aligned to the state learning standards in ELA and math.
(b) Maintain and increase academic rigor;	The state learning standards assessed by Smarter Balanced assessments are more rigorous than previous state learning standards.
(c) Measure student learning growth over years; and	OSPI calculates student g (Table continued on next page) 4–8 in ELA and math.

(d) Strengthen curriculum.	Smarter Balanced score reports provide both a comprehensive score for the content area and “claim” sub-scores to help inform curricular decisions.
(4) The Legislature further finds that a third component of the assessment system should include classroom-based assessments, which may be formative, summative, or both. Depending on their use, classroom-based assessments should have the same design elements and characteristics described in this section for formative and summative assessments.	Smarter Balanced offers optional interim assessments for both ELA and math. The Comprehensive Interim Assessments (CIA) mirrors the summative assessment in depth and breadth, covering all learning standards at the particular grade level. Shorter Interim Assessment Blocks (IAB) target fewer learning standards and therefore require less time.
(5) The Legislature further finds that to sustain a strong and viable assessment system, pre-service and ongoing training should be provided for teachers and administrators on the effective use of different types of assessments.	OSPI has partnered with the Association of Educational Service Districts to develop assessment literacy training that can be used to boost teachers’ knowledge of good assessment practices in general and best practices around the utilization of a comprehensive assessment system. Those training modules will be ready for implementation in spring 2016.
(6) The Legislature further finds that as the statewide data system is developed, data should be collected for all state-required statewide assessments to be used for accountability and to monitor overall student achievement.	OSPI is able to use CEDARS data collection to administer the testing program and report state assessment results.
(7) The superintendent of public instruction, in consultation with the state board of education, shall begin design and development of an overall assessment system that meets the principles and characteristics described in this section. In designing formative and summative assessments, the superintendent shall solicit bids for the use of computerized adaptive testing methodologies.	The Washington Comprehensive Assessment System is described in this report.
(8) Beginning December 1, 2009, and annually thereafter, the superintendent and state board shall jointly report to the Legislature regarding the assessment system, including a cost analysis of any changes and costs to expand availability and use of instructionally supportive formative assessments.	This report fulfills this requirement.

2014–15 Continuation of Science Assessments in Grades 5, 8, and High School

Science testing remained constant in 2014–15 while assessments aligned with the new Next Generation Science Standards are being developed. The Measurements of Student Progress was again administered in grades 5 and 8, and the Biology End-of-Course exam was given in high school, per state and federal requirements. The results of each are presented in the next section.

Overview of 2015 Assessment Results

The following table presents the percent of students meeting standard on each of the tests for all grades used in federal accountability and Table 4 shows how Washington's proficiency rates compare with those in other Smarter Balanced states.

Table 3: Achievement Results for 2015 ELA, Math, and Science

ELA – Smarter Balanced								
Grade	No Score	Level 1	Level 2	% Not Meeting Standard	Basic (met standard)	Level 3	Level 4	% Meeting Standard
3	1.9%	22.5%	23.3%	47.8%	0.4%	23.7%	27.9%	52.1%
4	1.9%	24.6%	18.7%	45.3%	0.4%	24.2%	29.9%	54.6%
5	1.9%	21.4%	18.8%	42.3%	0.4%	32.6%	24.5%	57.6%
6	2.2%	19.1%	24.5%	45.9%	0.6%	34.2%	19.1%	54.0%
7	2.8%	19.5%	20.7%	43.0%	0.6%	36.8%	19.4%	56.9%
8	3.3%	16.5%	23.1%	43.0%	0.8%	37.0%	19.0%	56.9%
11	48.9%	12.0%	12.6%	73.6%	0.3%	16.1%	9.8%	26.3%
Math – Smarter Balanced								
Grade	No Score	Level 1	Level 2	% Not Meeting Standard	Basic (met standard)	Level 3	Level 4	% Meeting Standard
3	2.0%	19.3%	21.8%	43.2%	0.3%	31.3%	25.0%	56.7%
4	2.1%	15.6%	28.1%	45.9%	0.4%	28.6%	24.9%	54.0%
5	2.1%	23.3%	26.3%	51.8%	0.3%	20.5%	27.1%	48.1%
6	2.4%	23.7%	28.2%	54.4%	0.3%	21.9%	23.2%	45.5%
7	3.0%	22.8%	26.0%	51.9%	0.4%	23.9%	23.6%	48.0%
8	3.7%	26.4%	23.6%	53.8%	0.2%	19.8%	26.0%	46.1%
11	52.8%	21.6%	11.7%	86.2%	0.0%	8.7%	4.9%	13.7%
Science – MSP								
Grade	No Score	Level 1	Level 2	% Not Meeting Standard	Basic (met standard)	Level 3	Level 4	% Meeting Standard
5	1.7%	13.9%	20.8%	36.5%	0.6%	34.4%	28.3%	63.4%
8	2.8%	12.4%	24.0%	39.2%	0.9%	34.2%	25.5%	60.7%
Science – Biology EOC								
Grade	No Score	Level 1	Level 2	% Not Meeting Standard	Basic (met standard)	Level 3	Level 4	% Meeting Standard
10	10.0%	6.5%	19.4%	36.0%	2.1%	31.9%	29.8%	63.9%

Table 4: 2015 Achievement Results for States That Used Smarter Balanced Assessments

ELA Results <i>(highest proficiency marked in green)</i>							
State	Grade 3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8	Grade 11
California	38%	40%	44%	43%	44%	45%	56%
Connecticut	54%	55%	59%	56%	57%	54%	53%
Delaware	54%	54%	56%	49%	50%	49%	52%
Hawaii	46%	48%	54%	47%	44%	47%	53%
Idaho	48%	46%	52%	49%	51%	52%	61%
Missouri	57%	59%	59%	55%	57%	58%	NA
New Hampshire	55%	56%	63%	57%	62%	58%	60%
Oregon	47%	51%	55%	55%	57%	58%	69%
South Dakota	49%	45%	49%	45%	49%	48%	59%
Vermont	52%	51%	57%	53%	55%	54%	58%
Washington	53%	56%	59%	55%	59%	59%	52%
West Virginia	46%	45%	51%	43%	45%	43%	47%
Math Results <i>(highest proficiency marked in green)</i>							
California	40%	35%	30%	33%	34%	33%	29%
Connecticut	48%	44%	37%	37%	39%	37%	31%
Delaware	53%	47%	38%	34%	37%	35%	23%
Hawaii	50%	46%	42%	38%	38%	39%	30%
Idaho	50%	46%	38%	36%	38%	37%	30%
Missouri	52%	50%	40%	38%	35%	28%	NA
New Hampshire	53%	49%	45%	46%	51%	44%	37%
Oregon	47%	45%	42%	39%	43%	44%	31%
South Dakota	51%	46%	37%	35%	39%	39%	39%
Vermont	52%	45%	42%	37%	43%	40%	37%
Washington	58%	55%	49%	47%	50%	48%	29%
West Virginia	44%	35%	30%	26%	25%	25%	20%

2014–15 Implementation of New Exit Exams

New exit exams were administered for the first time in 2014–15, per RCW 28A.655.070.

Math

Two new math exit exams were developed: Algebra 1/Integrated Math 1 and Geometry/Integrated Math 2. Both exams were developed to assess skills covered in the state’s new math learning standards. Statewide results for each EOC are presented below in Table 5.

Table 5: Achievement Results for 2015 EOC Year 1 Math, Year 2 Math

Mathematics EOC: Algebra or Integrated 1 Exit Exam							
Grade	Level 1	Level 2	% Not Meeting Standard	Basic (met standard)	Level 3	Level 4	% Meeting Standard
7 and below	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	25.0%	75.0%	100.0%
8	9.6%	9.6%	19.1%	0.0%	10.4%	70.4%	80.9%
9	15.8%	15.8%	31.6%	0.6%	31.8%	36.0%	68.4%
10	40.0%	20.7%	60.7%	2.1%	25.0%	12.2%	39.3%
11	39.1%	23.7%	62.7%	1.0%	26.2%	10.1%	37.3%
12	44.0%	24.0%	68.0%	0.1%	23.7%	8.1%	32.0%
All Grades	24.1%	17.9%	42.0%	0.9%	29.5%	27.6%	58.0%
Mathematics EOC: Geometry or Integrated 2 Exit Exam							
Grade	Level 1	Level 2	% Not Meeting Standard	Basic (met standard)	Level 3	Level 4	% Meeting Standard
7 and below	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
8	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	11.1%	88.9%	100.0%
9	3.7%	7.9%	11.6%	0.0%	17.6%	70.8%	88.4%
10	11.4%	18.5%	29.9%	0.9%	31.6%	37.5%	70.1%
11	17.7%	26.1%	43.8%	0.7%	31.8%	23.7%	56.2%
12	21.6%	30.5%	52.1%	0.2%	29.9%	17.8%	47.9%
All Grades	12.2%	19.3%	31.5%	0.7%	29.3%	38.5%	68.5%

ELA

The high school Smarter Balanced ELA assessment, which is required of all 11th graders for accountability, was also administered to all 10th graders, per state legislative requirement, as the new exit exam to fulfill the ELA assessment graduation requirement. OSPI had been directed to develop a new comprehensive 10th-grade ELA assessment for the Classes of 2016, 2017, and 2018, using Smarter Balanced items. As we began that development we realized anything we developed would look exactly like the Smarter Balanced high school test, so we decided to simply allow 10th graders access to the high school ELA test. Ninety-seven percent of 10th graders participated in this assessment and of those, 74 percent demonstrated college and career readiness by earning a score of Level 3 or Level 4. These

students who have already demonstrated college and career readiness will not need to retake the ELA test in 11th grade. Instead, for purposes of school and district accountability, their “previously passed” score will be rolled forward so they will count as a participant and as proficient.

For graduation purposes the State Board of Education established a lower cut score to ease the impact of the more rigorous learning standards on the first few cohorts of students who must meet standard to graduate (see State Board’s section later in this report). Table 6, below shows the results of 10th graders on the Smarter Balanced high school ELA test.

Table 6: Achievement Results for 2015 ELA Smarter Balanced Exit Exam, Grade 10

Grade	No Score	Did Not Meet Exit Exam Standard	Met Special Ed Exit Exam Standard	Met Exit Exam but not CCR Standard	Met CCR Standard
10	11%	15.9%	0.6%	7.7%	64.8%

2014–15 Implementation of Exit Exam Alternatives

Most of the state’s exit exam alternatives in 2014–15 were similar to 2013–14. Graduation options available to students continue to include:

- **Collection of Evidence:** reading and writing are mature programs; mathematics COEs started in 2013 and biology in 2014
- **College entrance exams:** SAT, ACT, AP, IB
- **Grade Comparison:** evaluating a student against cohort of similar course-taking students who met standard on the assessment

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.

Table 7 shows the counts of students who accessed Certificate of Academic Achievement options in the 2014–15 school year.

Table 7: Certificate of Academic Achievement Options Accessed in 2014–15

Options Accessed in 2014–15	# of Students				
	Using Option	Math	Reading	Writing	Science
Collections of Evidence	13,183	4,991	2,166	1,451	4,575
College Entrance Test	4732	1287	1306	725	1414
Grade Comparison	114	16	18	16	64
Out-of-State Test	5586	1604	1549	1387	1046
Locally Determined Assessment	2228	761	330	612	525
Awareness Waiver	42	14	14	14	-
Special Circumstance Appeals	78*	24	12	14	42

* Total number of students applying for Special Circumstances Appeals does not match numbers across content areas due to the fact that students can apply for multiple content areas in one application.

Table 8 shows how many 12th graders used each option for meeting their assessment 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 general assessment, the student is represented in that row rather than in the row for the particular option.

Table 8: How Students in the Class of 2015 Fulfilled Assessment Graduation Requirements

Class of 2015 in Grade 12	ELA		Mathematics	
	#	%	#	%
Total Met Standard	69,920	91.3%	6,9480	90.8%
Via HS Proficiency Exam/End-of-Course	65,550	85.6%	60,596	79.2%
Via Washington Alternative Assessments (Special Education)	2,821	3.7%	5,023	6.6%
HSPE/EOC-Basic	1,335	1.7%	1,451	1.9%
WAAS Developmentally Appropriate Proficiency Exam	746	1.0%	2,394	3.12
WAAS Portfolio	615	.8%	619	.8%
Locally Determined Assessments	120	.2%	558	.7%
Collection of Evidence - Basic	1	0%	1	0%
Smarter Balanced - Basic	4	0%		
Via Certificate of Academic Achievement Options	629	.8%	3,002	3.9%
Collection of Evidence	215	.3%	2,218	2.9%
PSAT/SAT/ACT/AP	408	.5%	771	1%
Grades Comparison	6	0%	13	0%
Via Special Waiver	920	1.2%	859	1.1%
Out-of-State Waivers	905	1.2%	841	1.1%
Awareness Level Waivers (Special Education)	10	0%	10	0%
Special Circumstance Appeals	5	0%	8	0%
Tested: Not Met Standard	3,564	4.7%	4,211	5.5%
No score	3,070	4%	2,863	3.7%
TOTAL	76,554	100%	76,554	100%

2014–15 Implementation of New Alternate Assessment

Washington administered, for the first time, its alternate assessment, Washington Access to Instruction and Measurement (WA-AIM) in spring 2015. The WA-AIM is the state’s alternate assessment using alternate achievement standards (AA-AAS), designed for students with significant cognitive challenges. WA-AIM came about with the state’s transition to college-and-career ready learning standards, and the need to develop an assessment with alignment and correspondence to the state’s general learning standards.

The intent of the new assessment is to address a greater breadth of content standards than the former WAAS-Portfolio. WA-AIM, which is performance task–based, will focus teachers on instructing and measuring student performance on skills aligned to the “essential elements” developed as part of the Dynamic Learning Maps project, thus linking our current methods for documenting achievement toward college- and career-ready standards by students who are significantly cognitively challenged.

For the 2014–15 school year, WA-AIM was administered to students in grades 3–8 and 11 for English language arts (ELA) and math, and grades 5 and 8 in science; high school science was not administered because students had already been assessed the previous year in science (the minimum required of the state’s high school accountability requirements). Achievement levels (cut scores) were established during summer 2015 for ELA, math, and the associated science grade levels; high school science will be administered in spring 2016, with achievement levels established in late spring to align with reporting of results for the other content areas.

Table 9: Achievement Results for 2015 WA-AIM

ELA – WA-AIM								
Grade	No Score	Level 1	Level 2	% Not Meeting Standard	Basic (met standard)	Level 3	Level 4	% Meeting Standard
3	3.2%	13.5%	36.4%	53.2%	NA	27.3%	19.4%	46.7%
4	3.7%	9.5%	45.9%	59.2%	NA	31.7%	9.0%	40.7%
5	2.9%	8.1%	47.7%	58.8%	NA	32.9%	8.1%	41.1%
6	3.7%	22.8%	41.6%	68.3%	NA	26.3%	5.3%	31.6%
7	4.2%	19.6%	50.6%	74.5%	NA	22.8%	2.6%	25.4%
8	2.5%	27.8%	38.4%	68.8%	NA	24.2%	6.8%	31.1%
11	5.9%	34.4%	45.4%	85.7%	NA	12.7%	1.4%	14.2%
Math – WA-AIM								
Grade	No Score	Level 1	Level 2	% Not Meeting Standard	Basic (met standard)	Level 3	Level 4	% Meeting Standard
3	2.9%	10.5%	41.7%	55.2%	NA	25.3%	19.4%	44.7%
4	3.1%	6.9%	40.0%	50.1%	NA	30.5%	19.3%	49.8%
5	3.2%	6.7%	40.0%	50.0%	NA	31.8%	18.1%	50.0%
6	3.2%	16.7%	41.0%	61.0%	NA	22.5%	16.3%	38.9%
7	4.6%	27.9%	36.3%	68.9%	NA	24.4%	6.6%	31.0%
8	2.0%	30.0%	41.9%	74.1%	NA	22.1%	3.7%	25.8%
11	3.0%	30.8%	38.7%	72.5%	NA	19.0%	8.3%	27.4%

Other Assessment Program Initiatives

Other efforts within the assessment program include:

- Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS)
- Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment (WELPA)

Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS)

OSPI has continued implementation of the Washington Kindergarten Inventory of Developing Skills (WaKIDS), a kindergarten transition process that includes measurement of the skills, knowledge, and characteristics of incoming kindergartners.

WaKIDS is a kindergarten transition process intended to:

1. Welcome families into the Washington K–12 system as partners in their child’s education.
2. 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, mathematical, and physical development.
3. Align practices of early learning professionals and kindergarten teachers to support smooth transitions for children.
4. Offer a statewide snapshot of where children in Washington are in their development at the start of kindergarten, to help inform state-level decisions about policy and investments.

Second Substitute Senate Bill 5427, passed during the 2011 legislative session, initiated the move toward statewide WaKIDS implementation. The Legislature mandated that WaKIDS be implemented in state-funded, full-day kindergarten beginning in 2012–13. Prior to 2012–13, participation was voluntary (RCW 28A.655.080). Table 10 shows the evolution of WaKIDS implementation.

Table 10: WaKIDS Participation

	2011–12	2012–13	2013–14	2014–15	2015–16
Full-Day K funding	21%	22%	44%	44%	72%
WaKIDS Districts	65	105	187	193	261*
WaKIDS Schools	156	309	506	623	847*
WaKIDS Teachers	452	1,150	1,800	2,110	2,900*
WaKIDS Kindergartners	6,661	21,812	38,443	43,298	58,500*
Total Kindergartners in State	78,096	80,679	81,530	80,714	79,401
% of all Kindergartners in WaKIDS	8.5%	27%	47%	52%*	74%*

** Data collection for 2015–16 was recently completed but, until the data are verified, the numbers are approximations only.*

In addition to students in schools with state-funded, full-day kindergarten, approximately two percent of the students assessed in 2015–16 were in the 60 schools that volunteered to participate.

State, federal, and private funding sources are supporting WaKIDS in 2015–16. While the state is the primary source of support, carryover funds from the Department of Early Learning’s Race to the Top grant, private funding secured by Thrive Washington, and carryover funding from the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation are helping to support advanced WaKIDS training, early learning collaboration activities, and inter-rater reliability certifications not funded by the state.

Table 11 shows that overall percentages of students demonstrating characteristics of entering kindergartners varied by area assessed in 2014–15.

Table 11: 2014–15 WaKIDS Results (From highest to lowest)

Area of Development and Learning	Percent Demonstrating Characteristics of Entering Kindergartners
Literacy	79.1%
Physical Development	78.0%
Social-Emotional Development	74.3%
Cognitive Development	74.1%
Language Development	70.3%
Math	52.9%

Math (counting, quantifying, and understanding shapes) continues to be the least strong area for entering kindergartners. Additional results for WaKIDS are available on the OSPI Report Card at

<http://reportcard.ospi.k12.wa.us/WaKidsDetailPage.aspx?domain=WaKIDS&year=2014-15&groupLevel=District&schoolId=1&reportLevel=State&waslCategory=1&yrs=2014-15&chartType=1>.

The fall 2015 WaKIDS data will be available on the state report card in January 2016.

Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment

2014–15 marked the final year of Washington schools administering the LAS Links™ (a product offered by CTB/McGraw-Hill) as its Washington English Language Proficiency Assessment (WELPA). Over the course of the previous two years, Washington has been part of a ten-state consortium developing a new English language proficiency assessment (ELPA) for use that will see its initial administration during the 2015–16 school year.

The multi-state consortium, English Language Proficiency Assessment for the 21st Century (ELPA21) is funded by the U.S. Department of Education, and is charged with development of new English language proficiency assessments aligned to a common set of English language proficiency (ELP) standards that hold correspondences to the Common Core State Standards. Washington adopted these common ELP standards in December 2013.

Washington is part of the governance board that guides ELPA21’s assessment development activities, and has recruited several state teachers to participate in the consortium work, including the ELPA21 field test administered in spring 2015.

Cost Analysis

For 2014–15 Washington experienced a combination of assessment instrument transitions or service provider changes which resulted in close-out payments to old vendors and start-up payments to new vendors across the same fiscal period. (The assessment contracts have completed this turn-over process with new service providers and/or new scopes of work serving the 2015–16 administration year.)

In the course of the administration year, the actual costs for 2014–15 were lower than projected; costs for the 2015–16 administration year are expected to be lower still, even with an increase to the English language proficiency assessment, as the agency eliminates the close-out payments to previous contracts and addresses legislative changes to the assessment graduation requirements (deferral of science for two student cohorts). Annual costs for accountability testing (general and alternate assessment) are between \$21 million and \$22 million; costs for alternative to fulfill assessment graduation purposes cost approximately \$11 million annually (+/- \$500K). Other assessment costs include the kindergarten assessment, (projected to be in excess of \$600K as the full-day kindergarten expands in the state), and the English language proficiency assessment, which is expected to rise about 50 percent (to \$2.5M) with its transition to the ELPA21 instrument.

Table 12 shows the assessment contract costs for 2014–15 (estimated and actuals) and projections for 2015–16. Contract budgets are not necessarily built test-by-test, so current year entries are estimates based on contract budgets attributable to each known assessment activity.

Table 12: 2014–15 and 2015–16 Assessment Contract Costs

	2014–15 (estimated)	2014–15 (actual)	2015–16 (projected)	Notes
Accountability Assessments (General)				
ELA and Math Smarter Balanced Grades 3–8 and 11	\$18,349,645	\$16,756,322	\$16,643,806	
Science MSP (G5 & 8); Biology EOC	\$2,718,622	\$2,718,622	\$2,743,669	
Next Generation Science Standards Test Development	\$789,000	\$20,000	\$945,700	Bulk of 2014–15 development deferred to work w/ other states on assessment frameworks
Accountability Assessment (Alternate)				
WA-AIM	\$1,643,198	\$1,643,198	\$1,806,829	
Total Cost	\$23,500,465	\$21,138,142	\$22,140,004	

(Table continued on next page)

Graduation Alternatives				
ELA 10th Grade and Off-Grade Level ELA and Math Smarter Balanced	\$2,482,234	\$1,301,505	\$1,431,248	
Reading & Writing HSPE Retakes	\$825,000	\$1,410,133	\$825,000	
Math EOCs	\$7,293,384	\$3,642,996	\$3,141,934	
Collection of Evidence (COE)	\$5,607,235	\$5,197,160	\$5,434,000	
Total Cost	\$16,212,853	\$11,551,794	\$10,832,182	
Other Assessments				
Kindergarten Inventory (WaKIDS)	\$576,516	\$462,637	\$607,079	Teaching Strategies Contract
English Language Proficiency				
WELPA	\$1,523,438	\$1,672,503	\$150,000	2015–16 costs are for placement screeners for ELPA21 transition
ELPA21	-	-	\$2,327,000	
Total Cost	\$2,099,954	\$2,135,140	\$3,084,079	
Other Contract Costs				
HSPE (Reading & Writing), EOC Math, Science MSP & EOC, and DAPE	\$6,673,226	\$8,799,281	-	2014–15 costs were carryover from ending contracts
Total Cost	\$6,673,226	\$8,799,281		
GRAND TOTAL (State Contracts)				
	\$48,486,498	\$43,624,357	\$36,056,265	

State Board of Education’s Activities and Role in the Washington Comprehensive Assessment Program

Overview

This section of the report summarizes the activities of the State Board of Education (SBE) concerning the state assessment system in 2015 and anticipated actions of the Board in 2016.

Statute assigns both broad responsibilities and specific duties to the SBE in the state assessment system. As an example of broad responsibilities, the SBE provides consultation to the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) in the development and maintenance of the assessment system. Specific duties of the SBE include setting the scores needed to show proficiency on state assessments and approved alternative assessments. Legislation passed in 2013 (EHB 1450) and codified in RCW 28A.305.130 directed the SBE by the end of the 2014–15 school year to set the minimum graduation scores on the high school Smarter Balanced exams and on the math end-of-course (EOC) exit exams to be used during the transition to the new assessments. The Board fulfilled this directive in August 2015.

A focus of the Board in 2015 has been the exploration of possible additional alternatives for high school students to demonstrate meeting standard and earning a Certificate of Academic Achievement (CAA). The Board continues to affirm exams required for high school graduation, combined with alternatives that provide students multiple pathways to demonstrate meeting standard, as part of a meaningful high school diploma.

Activities of the Board in 2015

The SBE was very engaged in work on the state assessment system in 2015. Assessments were a topic at every meeting of the Board during the year (summarized in Table 13). The Board fulfilled its responsibility to set graduation and achievement level standards on new state assessments, as well as explored the policy implications of the new assessments. Highlights of board actions include:

1. Approval of graduation scores on new high school assessments, based on an “equal impact” approach.
2. Hearing from educators and students, as well as from members of the public, on the implementation, experience of, and opinions about the new assessments and the state’s assessment system.
3. An in-depth review and discussion of the high school assessment system, including options for alternative to state assessment, as part of the development of the SBE’s legislative priorities for 2016.

Approval of graduation scores on new high school assessments

In the January 2015 SBE’s Position Statement on Assessment (a link to the statement is in Table 13), the board articulated an “equal impact” approach to setting the score for high school graduation on the new high school assessments. This approach would set the scores for high school graduation on the new exams so that the impact was approximately the same as under the previous assessments. Based on this guidance, OSPI developed a

methodology that was approved by the Board in March 2015. OSPI applied this methodology to results from spring 2015 state testing to determine recommended cut scores.

Setting a score for graduation on the Smarter Balanced assessment was complicated by low assessment participation rates by 11th graders. The graduation score for English language arts was set based on results of 10th graders. The score for math was set by translating the English language arts score to the math scale. The resulting graduation scores for the Smarter Balanced assessments are in the mid-Level 2 range, below the career- and college-ready threshold score set by the Smarter Balanced consortium.

These two cut scores, the graduation score and the career- and college-ready score, align with the intent of Legislature, as specified in EHB 1450, that there be two student performance standards “one for the purposes of high school graduation that will be established by the state board of education and one that is intended to demonstrate a student's career and college readiness” (Sec. 1). EHB 1450 further states that “The scores established by the state board of education for the purposes of earning a certificate of academic achievement and graduation from high school may be different from the scores used for the purpose of determining a student's career and college readiness.” (Sec. 7.) A two cut score approach accordingly follows the intent, established in rule (WAC 180-17-100) that:

The state's graduation requirements should ultimately be aligned to the performance levels associated with career and college readiness. During implementation of these standards, the board recognizes the necessity of a minimum proficiency standard for graduation that reflects a standard approaching full mastery, as both students and educators adapt to the increased rigor of common core and the underlying standard of career and college readiness for all students.

Hearing from educators, students, and members of the public on assessments

Board meetings provided a public venue for both educators and members of the public to share information and ideas on the assessment system. In addition to the opportunity for public comment provided at each board meeting that many members of the public used to share opinions on the assessment system, the Board heard from several panels on the implementation of the new assessments and the experience of educators and students (see Table 13). A record of public comments received and the discussion and presentations by panels are documented in the meeting minutes. Links to audio and video (if available) of board meetings are also posted on the meeting materials website (<http://www.sbe.wa.gov/materials.php#.V1976DbTlD8>).

In addition to board meetings, the SBE held public forums associated with each regular board meeting, where board members met and conversed with members of the public at each board meeting location. The assessment system was a concern of many of the members of the public who visited with board members at the public forums in 2015.

Review, discussion and development of the Board's priorities for assessments and alternatives

The assessment system was a foremost area of concern for board members as well of the public. Much of the November 2015 board meeting was dedicated to discussion of the

assessment system. Materials prepared for the November meeting addressed key topics identified by board discussion (see links in Table 13). Topics included:

1. Exit exams for graduation
2. Graduation score on exit exams
3. Alternatives to meeting the graduation score on exit exams
4. Grade of administration of exit exams
5. Science assessments
6. Phase-out of the former system of assessments

As a result of extensive board member discussion on these topics, the Board approved legislative priorities that included two concerning assessments:

- End the Biology End-of-Course exam as a graduation requirement and adopt a comprehensive science assessment.
Legislative Action: The Board urges the Legislature not just to suspend but to end the Biology End-of-Course exam as a high school graduation requirement, effective with the class of 2018. A comprehensive science assessment aligned with Next Generation Science Standards should be administered according to the schedule for the assessment developed by the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction.
- Expand alternatives to assessments for high school graduation.
Legislative Action: The Board urges the Legislature to expand and fund alternatives for students who do not pass the high school Smarter Balanced tests required for graduation, beginning with the Class of 2019, to include successful completion of transition courses and dual credit courses.

Table 13: SBE’s Work on Assessments During 2015

(All board meeting materials are posted on the SBE website at <http://www.sbe.wa.gov/zarchivebm2015.php#.VI4xcDbTID8>)

Meeting	Activity	Links
January 7–8	The board approved the use of Smarter Balanced Consortium achievement level threshold scores for use in Washington. The Board also approved an approach to setting the minimum graduation score in the Board’s Position Statement on Assessments.	January 2015 SBE Memo Assessment Requirements for High School Graduation: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/Jan/03%20Assessment%20Requirements.pdf January 2015 OSPI Video on the Smarter Balanced Achievement Level Threshold Scores: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=q2IKdoEXuM&feature=youtu.be January 2015 SBE Position Statement on Assessments: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/Jan/ExhibitA_PositionStatementonAssessments.pdf
March 11–12	Based on the Board’s position statement, OSPI presented and the Board approved an approach to setting the minimum graduation	Graduation Threshold Score Recommendation: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/Mar/ExhibitF_GraduationThresholdScore.pdf

(Table continued on next page)

	score. The Board discussed possible assessment alternatives for graduation.	OSPI video on Setting the Minimum Scores for Graduation on the New Exit Exams: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GQszZ05keLA&feature=youtu.be SBE Memo Exploration of Assessment Alternatives for Graduation: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/Mar/03AssessmentAlternatives.pdf
May 13–14	The Board approved a process for setting the WA-AIM achievement level score.	OSPI Video on WA-AIM Standard Setting: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-5u4o0Rg2AU WA-AIM Process Exhibit: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/May/EXHIBIT_F_WA-AIMcut-scoreProcess.pdf
July 7–8	Panel discussion by district and OSPI representatives about the implementation of SBAC testing.	Board Memo on Review of Smarter Balanced Implementation: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/July/12SmarterBalanced.pdf
August 5	The Board approved scores for graduation on the high school Smarter Balanced math assessment, the high school Smarter Balanced English Language Arts assessments, and the new math EOCs (aligned to Common Core Standards). The Board also approved the achievement level scores and the graduation scores for WA-AIM.	Board meeting memo: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/August/01_GradScoresMemo.pdf Memo on the impact of score setting options: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/August/ScoreSettingOptionsMemo.pdf OSPI presentation on Performance Standard Setting: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/August/OSPI_FinalPresentation.pdf Board meeting highlights showing the approved scores: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/August/Highlights.pdf
September 10–11	Panel discussion by students on the student experience of the Smarter Balanced assessments. The Board discussed the results of the Smarter Balanced assessments.	Memo on Smarter Balanced assessment results: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/Sept/08SBA_Discussion.pdf
November 4–5	The Board discussed the SBE position on assessments and the role of assessment in relationship to high school graduation. In addition, the Board heard from educators about the implementation of collections of evidence, and about maximizing student participation in high school assessments.	Memo on the Role of Assessments in a Career- and College-Ready Diploma Framework: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/Nov/03_Assessments.pdf Assessment Workshop Tool created to provide information on critical questions about assessments: https://prezi.com/8las8tzffy71/assessment-system/ Memo on Collections of Evidence Data Spotlight: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/Nov/09_DataSpotlight.pdf The SBE Legislative Priorities for 2015: http://www.sbe.wa.gov/documents/BoardMeetings/2015/Nov/ExhibitLegPriorities.pdf

Activities of the Board for 2016

Anticipated activities include setting the score for high school graduation on collections of evidence, the approved alternatives for the math end-of course-exams and the high school math and English language arts Smarter Balanced assessments. In addition, scores for meeting standard on the high school WA-AIM science assessment will be set.

The SBE will support its legislative priorities by encouraging the Legislature to consider eliminating the Biology End-of-Course exam as a graduation requirement. The Board will provide consultation with OSPI on the development and implementation of new assessments aligned to the Next Generation Science Standards.

In addition, the Board will support work on the development of transition courses, and support encouraging the Legislature to identify transition courses and dual credit courses as approved alternatives for students to demonstrate meeting the assessment standard for high school graduation.

Appendix A – Student Time Involved in State Summative Testing

White House: State standardized testing should not exceed 2% of instructional time

In Washington, 1% or less of instructional time is used for state testing in any given year, and across grades K-12

	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	K-12
Instructional hours per year (state minimum)	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1000	1080	1080	1080	1080	13320
2% of instructional hours would be	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	20	21.6	21.6	21.6	21.6	266.4
Average Student Time														
Kindergarten Entry - WaKIDS (no student time)														
Reading Screening			1											1
State ELA Assessment (Smarter Balanced) actual				6	5.5	5.25	5	4.5	4.25		4.75	4.75		40
State Math Assessment (Smarter Balanced) actual				2.75	2.75	3.5	3	2.5	3			2		19.5
State Science Assessment (MSP in 5,8; Biology EOC in 10)						1.5			2		2			5.5
Math EOC (required for graduation through 2018)											2			2
Classroom based assessments (Social Studies)														9
Classroom based assessments (Health and Fitness)														9
Classroom based assessments (Arts)														9
TOTAL FOR ALL STUDENTS	0	0	0	8.75	8.25	10.25	8	7	9.25	0	8.75	6.75	0	95
	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.9%	0.8%	1.0%	0.8%	0.7%	0.9%	0.0%	0.8%	0.6%	0.0%	0.7%
Language Proficiency Test ELPA21	1.3	1.3	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.6	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	8
TOTAL FOR ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS	1.3	1.3	1.6	10.35	9.85	11.85	10	9	11.25	2	10.75	8.75	2	103
	0.1%	0.1%	0.2%	1.0%	1.0%	1.2%	1.0%	0.9%	1.1%	0.2%	1.0%	0.8%	0.2%	0.8%

Green cells required for federal accountability

Gray cells additionally required by WA Legislature

OSPI provides equal access to all programs and services without discrimination based on sex, race, creed, religion, color, national origin, age, honorably discharged veteran or military status, sexual orientation including gender expression or identity, the presence of any sensory, mental, or physical disability, or the use of a trained dog guide or service animal by a person with a disability. Questions and complaints of alleged discrimination should be directed to the Equity and Civil Rights Director at 360-725-6162 or P.O. Box 47200 Olympia, WA 98504-7200.

Download this material in PDF at <http://k12.wa.us/LegisGov/Reports.aspx>. This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Resource Center at 888-595-3276, TTY 360-664-3631. Please refer to this document number for quicker service: 15-0075.



Randy I. Dorn • State Superintendent
Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
Old Capitol Building • P.O. Box 47200
Olympia, WA 98504-7200