THE WASHINGTON STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

A high-quality education system that prepares all students for college, career, and life.

Title:	Skyview High School
As Related To:	☐ Goal One: Develop and support policies to close the achievement and opportunity gaps. ☐ Goal Two: Develop comprehensive accountability, recognition, and supports for students, schools, and districts. ☒ Goal Three: Ensure that every student has the opportunity to meet career and college ready standards. ☒ Goal Four: Provide effective oversight of the K-12 system. ☐ Other
Relevant To Board Roles:	☐ Policy Leadership ☒ System Oversight ☐ Advocacy ☐ Communication ☐ Convening and Facilitating
Policy Considerations / Key Questions:	Educators from Skyview High School will present on the efforts school staff made to ensure that students participated in the 2015 HS Smarter Balanced Assessment. The presentation will address the following key questions. 1. What behaviors did Skyview High School staff engage in to bring about the higher than predicted participation rates on the 2015 Smarter Balanced Assessment (SBA)? 2. What were the HS SBA experiences like for the students and staff of Skyview High School?
Possible Board Action:	☒ Review ☐ Approve ☐ Adopt ☐ Other
Materials Included in Packet:	☒ Memo ☐ Graphs / Graphics ☐ Third-Party Materials ☒ PowerPoint
Synopsis:	**Although not meeting the 95 percent participation rate benchmark**, many high schools saw participation rates that were higher than expected or predicted. Using a statistical analysis methodology that controlled for school enrollment and school-level poverty, Skyview High School had very good participation rates on the 2015 HS Smarter Balanced assessment.

SKYVIEW HIGH SCHOOL

Summary

For a variety of reasons discussed at the State Board of Education (SBE) September meeting, the 11th grade participation rate on the HS Smarter Balanced assessment was low across the state and very low at many schools. Only seven comprehensive high schools in the state met the 95 percent participation rate needed to meet federal accountability requirements. Although not meeting the 95 percent participation rate benchmark, many high schools saw participation rates that were higher than expected or predicted. Using a statistical analysis methodology that controlled for school enrollment and school-level poverty, Skyview High School had very good participation rates on the 2015 HS Smarter Balanced assessment.

Skyview High School is a relatively large comprehensive high school in the northwestern part of Vancouver, Washington. The Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) reported the following information for Skyview High for the 2014-15 school year on the Washington Report Card (Table 1). The class of 2014 On-Time graduation rate for Skyview High School was 90.2 percent, which is 13 percentage points higher than the state rate of 77.2 percent.

Table 1: Shows the school demographics for the 2014-15 school year.

	Skyview High School*	Washington
American Indian/Alaskan Native	0.4%	1.5%
Asian	5.2%	7.2%
Black/African American	2.7%	4.5%
Hispanic/Latino	11.4%	21.7%
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1.0%	1.0%
White	73.3%	57.0%
Two or More	6.0%	7.1%
Bilingual	2.3%	10.4%
Low Income	26.6%	45.0%
Special Education	9.5%	13.4%

*Note: the May 2015 student count at Skyview High School was 1977 students.

In the latest Achievement Index version (winter 2015), Skyview High School is identified as a Very Good school with a Composite Index rating of 7.39. Skyview is a consistently high performer on proficiency measures and the graduation measure, but is a weaker performer on the growth measures. Skyview High School earned the 2013 Washington Achievement Award (WAA) for High Progress but no awards for the 2014 WAAs.

Methodology

Multiple regression analysis is used to estimate the relationship between three or more variables. The technique computes a Multiple R; that is, a correlation coefficient for three or more variables. Multiple regression estimates how the dependent variable (Test Participation rate) changes when either of the independent variables (Enrollment 2014 and Percent of Students at a School Who Qualify for FRL) change. In multiple regression, a predicted value and a residual value are computed for every school in the analysis. These values can be used to determine whether a school performed better or worse on a measure that would be predicted after controlling for other factors.

A multivariate (multiple) regression using school enrollment and the percentage of assessed students who qualified for the Free and Reduced Price Lunch (FRL) Program to predict school-level participation rates for the 2015 HS Smarter Balanced assessment was conducted. The statistics describing the results of the analysis form Appendix A.

Results

In combination, large comprehensive high schools with a relatively low percentage of students qualifying for FRL (like Skyview High School) would be predicted to have very low participation rates on the HS Smarter Balanced assessment in 2015 (Table 2). The computed residual for Skyview High School was approximately 50 percentage points, which means that the actual performance of Skyview High School (86 percent participation) was approximately 50 percentage points higher than the predicted participation rate of 37 percent. After controlling for school factors, the performance of Skyview High School on this measure was very good. **However, remember that Skyview High School did not meet the 95 percent participation threshold required under state and federal accountability.**

Table 2: Shows the comprehensive high schools where the actual participation rate on the HS Smarter Balanced assessment exceeded the predicted participation rate by the greatest amount.

District	School	Enroll	FRL %	ELA Part.	Math Part.	Average Part.[1]	Predicted Rate[2]	Residual[3]
VANCOUVER SD	SKYVIEW HS	2003	29	86	86	86	37	50
MEAD SD	MEAD SENIOR HS	1573	23	91	89	90	41	49
BETHEL SD	KAPOWSIN HS	1811	36	90	85	87	40	47
LAKE STEVENS SD	LAKE STEVENS SHS	1779	23	74	91	82	38	44
YAKIMA SD	EISENHOWER HS	1987	70	95	94	94	51	43
OAK HARBOR SD	OAK HARBOR HS	1540	35	90	85	88	46	42
CHENEY SD	CHENEY HS	1169	41	95	95	95	54	41
YELM SD	YELM HS	1260	40	95	92	93	54	40
BETHEL SD	BETHEL HS	1578	47	92	88	90	51	39
ARLINGTON SD	ARLINGTON HS	1621	26	84	79	82	43	39
BETHEL SD	SPANAWAY LAKE HS	1710	51	89	85	87	50	37
STEILACOOM HIST. SD	STEILACOOM HS	875	18	89	91	90	53	37
ORTING SD	ORTING HS	740	33	95	94	95	58	37
PUYALLUP SD	EMERALD RIDGE HS	1528	23	77	80	79	42	36
PASCO SD	CHIAWANA HS	2335	69	75	90	82	46	36

[1]Note: the average participation rates shown here are all higher than the median value of 63.7 percent for the comprehensive high schools in the state. The Average Participation rate shown here is the simple average of the ELA and math participation rates from the 2015 Smarter Balanced assessment.
[2]Note: the predicted rates show here is the school participation rate on the HS Smarter Balanced Assessment predicted by the multiple regression model described at the end of this memo.
[3]Note: the residual value is a measure of the actual participation rate (Average Part.) minus the predicted rate. A Positive residual value means that the school's actual performance was higher than predicted.

Staff from Skyview High School will discuss the efforts made by school personnel to ensure that students participated in the HS Smarter Balanced administration. The presentation will include a description of the communication plan, the testing plan, and the make-up examination activities.

Action

There is no Board action on this topic.

Appendix A

Summary of the Statistical Analyses

Dependent (DV) and Independent Variables (IV)

- DV = Percent of students who participated in the 2015 SBAC assessments
- IV = School enrollment in 2014
- IV = Percent of assessed students in 2014 who were FRL

A multiple regression was conducted to determine the best linear combination of variables (Enrollment 2014 and Percent Assessed Students Who Qualify for FRL 2014) for predicting high school Test Participation 2015. The means, standard deviations, and inter-correlations can be found in Table 1. This combination of variables significantly predicted test participation rates, $F(2,246) = 49.29$, $p < 0.001$, with both variables significantly contributing to the prediction. The adjusted R^2 value was 0.280. This indicates that 28.0 percent of the variance in test participation rate was explained by the model.

Table 1: Means, Standard Deviations, and Inter-correlations for Testing Participation rates and Predictor Variables (N = 248)

	M	*SD*	Enrollment 2014	Percent Assessed Students Who Qualify for FRL 2014
Test Participation 2015	58.1	28.12	-0.466*	0.403*
Predictor Variable				
Enrollment 2014	1092.8	581.02		-0.333*
Percent Assessed Students Who Qualify for FRL - 2014	45.0	21.58		

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.005 level (2-tailed).

Table 2: Simultaneous Multiple Regression Analysis Summary for School Enrollment-2014, Percent of Assessed Students who were White-2014, and Composite AI Rating Predicting Testing Participation Rates (N = 248)

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	*Std. Error*	*Beta*	t	Sig.	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	61.404	5.419		11.331	.000		
Enrollment - 2014	-.018	.003	-.373	-6.526	.000	.889	1.124
Percent Assessed Students Who Qualify for FRL - 2014	.364	.074	-.279	4.886	.000	.889	1.124

Note: R^2 =0.280; ANOVA $F(2, 246) = 48.288$, $p < 0.001$

Please contact Andrew Parr at andrew.parr@k12.wa.us if you have questions regarding this memo.

SBAC Spring 2015

How did Skyview High School get 85% participation from our Juniors?

Our Challenges

- Negative Media Coverage of the Common Core testing
- The "Opt Out" Movement
- Our juniors and their parents knew that the test was not required for graduation.

Planning

- Started in early January
  - Assessment Team
    - Assessment Administrator – Becky Phillips
    - Assessment Coordinator – Lynn Schedler
    - Other members:
      - Assessment teacher leaders: Zach Tautfest and Jeremy Tortora
      - ITS support: Bobby Fullbright
      - Classified Support: Janna Girard

Planning

- January
  - Facilities assessment
    - Open concept building
      - Computer labs all in open areas
      - Where were the quiet enclosed spaces?
    - Computer access
      - Up-to-date computers both desktop and laptop
      - Wireless access for laptops
      - Headphones

Planning

- Student needs
  - Who is eligible of accommodations?
  - What kind of accommodations?
  - Running Start students

Communications

- Parents and Students
  - Parent Newsletter
  - School website
    - FAQs
    - Calendars
    - Letter from Principal
    - Link to practice test for parents
  - Letters and emails
  - Robo calls
  - Provided info about Common Core to counter misinformation
  - Wing clerks called Running Start parents

Emphasis to Students

- Explained how test scores impact ratings with colleges
- Waiving Compass tests if scored high enough
- Down played the refusal option
  - Not "opt out" but refusal to assess
  - If wanted to refuse to assess, parent had to meet with administrator first.
  - Parents had to come into the school office in person
    - Did not allow students to pick up forms
    - Had to use district refusal forms and not the generic ones on the web
- Used interim assessments so they knew what to expect

Buy-in from Faculty

- Faculty meetings
- Transparent about scheduling so teachers could plan
- Met with impacted teachers in small groups
  - English
  - Math
  - US history
- Trained teachers in how to do performance tasks
  - Math teachers did the PT with all students
  - Assessment Coordinator and Proctors did PT with students who missed it in the classroom

Technology and Set Up

- Used our Media Center (30 desktop and 30 laptops) and our basement hallway outside of gyms (80 laptops)
- District boosted our Wi-Fi capacity in both areas
- Had two very brief Wi-Fi outages which were remedied quickly as well as one also very brief power outage
  - More stressful for the adults than the students
- Used 3 substitute teachers as our chief proctors
  - Consistency
  - Experience for troubleshooting

Scheduling

- Scheduled 2 blocks of testing per day with 2-4 teachers in each block
  - One 3 period block in the morning – 140 students
  - One 3 period block in the afternoon – 140 students
- English – scheduled total of 4 days with computers
  - ELA
    - Based on English teachers
- Math – scheduled total of 4 days with computers
  - Math
    - Based on US history classes since our math classes are mixed grade levels

Scheduling

- Able to divide groups into 2 groups – A & B
  - Depending on numbers involved 2-4 teachers in each block
- Did a separate testing session for students that needed accommodations such as small group
- Offered evening sessions for Running Start Students
  - Not successful
  - Only 2 showed up
- Missing students – used wing clerks to track them down

Extended & Make up tests

- Complied spreadsheets showing completed and incomplete tests nightly
- If open computers, tracked down students needing extra time or make up testing to fill extra spots
- Running Start students who had a class or two at SHS – tracked them down and brought them into testing rooms
- Built in make up testing days
- **Just kept hunting them down on a constant and daily basis**

Planning for this year

- Early planning
- Let teachers know dates early & remind often
- Website information
- Parents will have to come in and meet with an administrator before refusing to assess
  - However, this same group had a 98% participation last year
  - Already familiar with test
- Running Start students – notify them soon that they are also required to take the test
  - Misinformation last year among RS students