


ASSESSMENT SYSTEM AND ASSESSMENT REQUIREMENTS



OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF
EDUCATION
— CHAMPION EXCELLENCE —



JOY HOFMEISTER

STATE SUPERINTENDENT *of* PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT *of* EDUCATION

MEMORANDUM

TO: Oklahoma State Board of Education
FROM: Superintendent Joy Hofmeister
DATE: December 15, 2016
SUBJECT: Recommendations pursuant to HB 3218 (Laws 2016)

HB 3218 amends, in part, 70 O.S. §1210.508 and specifically states that by December 31, 2016 the State Board of Education shall adopt a statewide system of student assessments in compliance with the Every Student Succeeds Act ("ESSA"). See HB 3218, §4, page 10. Further, HB 3218 provides, in part as follows:

The State Board of Education in consultation with the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development shall study and develop assessment requirements which upon final approval shall be implemented in conjunction with the statewide system of student assessments adopted pursuant to Section 1210.508 of Title 70 of the Oklahoma Statutes.

Additionally, "[b]y January 1, 2017, the Board shall adopt the assessment requirements as studied and developed," to include:

1. Establishment of a multimeasures approach to high school graduation;
2. A determination of the performance level on the assessments at which students will be provided remediation or intervention and the type of remediation or intervention to be provided;
3. Establishment of a means for ensuring student accountability on the assessments;
4. Ways to make the school testing program more efficient and effective while still achieving the objective of having assessments designed to indicate whether students have attained an understanding of Oklahoma subject matter standards; and,
5. Establishment of a multimeasures approach to accountability, as required in 70 O.S. §1210.545 and in accordance with ESSA.¹ *Id.*, at pp. 19-20.

The word "shall" is ordinarily construed as mandatory, and not permissive. See *Opsrey LLC v. Kelly-Moore Paint Co.*, 1999 OK 50, 984 P.2d 194. As such, according to the express language of HB 3218 and its multiple uses of the term "shall," the Board must take action to adopt a statewide system of student assessments and assessment requirements by December 31, 2016.

The enclosed report, inclusive of the recommendations for the statewide system of student assessments and assessment requirements studied and developed pursuant to HB 3218 is enclosed and recommended for approval.

Attached Documentation:

- Assessment Report
- Accountability Report
- Graduation Requirements Report
- Remediation and Intervention Report
- HB 3218

JH/bc

¹ 70 O.S. §1210.545 requires the State Board of Education to prepare annual reports of the results of the Oklahoma School Testing Program which describe student achievement in the state and each school site, and identify school sites as having letter grades, ranging from A-F. See 70 O.S. §1210.545.

ASSESSMENT REPORT

Prepared By:
Juan D'Brot, Ph.D.
Erika Hall, Ph.D.

With Contributions From:
Scott Marion, Ph.D.
Joseph Martineau, Ph.D.

Contents

Executive Summary	iii
Purpose of This Report	iii
House Bill 3218.....	iii
Collecting Feedback from Regional Engage Oklahoma Meetings and the Oklahoma Task Force	iv
Key Summative Assessment Recommendations	iv
Recommendations for Assessments in Grades 3-8	v
Recommendations for Assessments in High School	vi
Key Considerations for Summative Assessment Recommendations	vii
Conclusion.....	viii
Limitations of This Report.....	x
Introduction	1
Purpose of This Report	1
House Bill 3218.....	1
Convening the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force	2
Feedback from Regional Meetings and the Oklahoma Task Force	2
Considerations for Developing an Assessment System	3
Types of Assessments and Appropriate Uses	4
The Role and Timing of Assessments in Relation to Standards and Instruction.....	8
The Assessment Development Process	8
OSDE Recommendations for Oklahoma’s Assessments.....	9
Assessment Goals Based on Desired Characteristics and Uses	10
OSDE Recommendations: Addressing Intended Goals.....	11
Recommendations for 3-8 Statewide Assessments	11
Recommendations for Assessments in High School.....	14
Key Areas of Importance to Consider	19
Conclusion.....	19
References	22
Appendix A: Task Force Representation.....	24
Appendix B: Detail on Issues in Sub-Score Reporting	28

Executive Summary

The Oklahoma Legislature directed the State Board of Education (OSBE) to evaluate Oklahoma's current state assessment system and make recommendations for its future. As a result, the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) held regional meetings across the state and convened the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force to deliberate over many technical, policy, and practical issues associated with implementing an improved assessment system. The 95 Task Force members met four times between August 4 and October 18, 2016. This report presents the results of those deliberations in the form of recommendations from the OSDE to the Oklahoma State Board of Education (OSBE).

Purpose of This Report

This report addresses the requirements stated in House Bill 3218, provides an overview of key assessment concepts, describes the role of the Task Force, and presents the recommendations made by the OSDE. Additionally, this report provides considerations relevant to the recommendations made by the OSDE, which are presented in the full body of the report.

House Bill 3218

In June 2016, Oklahoma Governor Mary Fallin signed House Bill 3218 (HB 3218), which relates to the adoption of a statewide system of student assessments. HB 3218 required the OSBE to study and develop assessment recommendations for the statewide assessment system. The House Bill specifically tasks the OSBE, in consultation with representatives from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education, and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development, to study and develop assessment requirements. Additionally, HB 3218 requires the State Board to address accountability requirements under ESSA, which will be presented in a separate report for accountability. This report focuses specifically on the assessment requirements of HB 3218, which include the degree to which the Oklahoma assessment:

- Aligns to the Oklahoma Academic Standards (OAS);
- Provides a measure of comparability among other states;
- Yields both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores;
- Has a track record of statistical reliability and accuracy; and
- Provides a measure of future academic performance for assessments administered in high school.

Collecting Feedback from Regional Engage Oklahoma Meetings and the Oklahoma Task Force

Prior to convening Oklahoma's Assessment and Accountability Task Force, the OSDE held regional meetings in Broken Arrow, Sallisaw, Durant, Edmond, Woodward, and Lawton. These meetings yielded responses on various questions addressing the desired purposes and types of assessments. This regional feedback was incorporated in the discussions with the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force. The Task Force included 95 members who represented districts across the state, educators, parents, business and community leaders, tribal leaders, and lawmakers. Additionally, members from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education, and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development were also represented on the Task Force. For a complete list of Task Force members, please refer to Appendix A of this report.

On four occasions, the members of the Task Force met with experts in assessment and accountability to consider each of the study requirements and provide feedback to improve the state's assessment and accountability systems. Two of those experts also served as the primary facilitators of the Task Force: Juan D'Brot, Ph.D., from the National Center for the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA) and Marianne Perie, Ph.D., from the University of Kansas' Achievement and Assessment Institute. These meetings occurred on August 4 and 5, September 19, and October 18, 2016. At each meeting, the Task Force discussed the elements of HB 3218, research and best practices in assessment and accountability development, and feedback addressing the requirements of HB 3218. This feedback was subsequently incorporated into OSDE's recommendations to the OSBE.

Key Summative Assessment Recommendations

Oklahoma's Assessment and Accountability Task Force and the OSDE recognized that assessment design is a case of optimization under constraints¹. In other words, there may be many desirable purposes, uses, and goals for assessment, but they may be in conflict. Any given assessment can serve only a limited number of purposes well. Finally, assessments always have some type of restrictions (e.g., legislative requirements, time, and cost) that must be weighed in finalizing recommendations. Therefore, a critical early activity of the Task Force was to identify and prioritize desired characteristics and intended uses for a new Oklahoma statewide summative assessment for OSDE to consider.

Upon consolidating the uses and characteristics, the facilitators returned to the Task Force with draft goals for the assessment system. The Task Force provided revisions and input to these goals. Facilitators then presented the final goals to the Task Force. Once goals were defined, the

¹ See Braun (in press).

desired uses and characteristics were clarified within the context of the Task Force’s goals. The members of the Task Force agreed to the following goals for OSDE to consider for Oklahoma’s assessment system:

1. Provide instructionally useful information to teachers and students with appropriate detail (i.e., differing grain sizes for different stakeholder groups) and timely reporting;
2. Provide clear and accurate information to parents and students regarding achievement and progress toward college- and career-readiness (CCR) using an assessment that is meaningful to students;
3. Provide meaningful information to support evaluation and enhancement of curriculum and programs; and
4. Provide information to appropriately support federal and state accountability decisions.

Following discussion of the Oklahoma assessment system’s goals, the Task Force worked with the facilitators to articulate feedback for the grade 3-8 and high school statewide summative assessments. This feedback was subsequently incorporated into the OSDE’s recommendations to the State Board. These recommendations are separated into those for grades 3-8 and those for high school.

Recommendations for Assessments in Grades 3-8

The feedback provided by the Task Force and subsequently incorporated by the OSDE for grades 3-8 can be grouped into four categories: Content Alignment and Timing, Intended Purpose and Use, Score Interpretation, and Reporting and State Comparability. The OSDE’s recommendations are presented below.

Content Alignment and Timing

- Maintain the focus of the new assessments on the Oklahoma Academic Standards (OAS) and continue to administer them at the end of grades 3 through 8; and
- Include an adequate assessment of writing to support coverage of the Oklahoma English Language Arts (ELA) standards.

Intended Purpose and Use

- Ensure the assessment can support calculating growth for students in at least grades 4-8 and explore the potential of expanding growth to high school depending on the defensibility of the link between grade 8 and high school assessments and intended interpretations; and
- Ensure the assessment demonstrates sufficient technical quality to support the intended purposes and current uses of student accountability (e.g., promotion in grade 3 based on reading and driver’s license requirements on the grade 8 ELA assessments).

Score Interpretation

- Provide a measure of performance indicative of being on track to CCR, which can inform preparation for the Oklahoma high school assessment;
- Support criterion-referenced interpretations (i.e., performance against the OAS) and report individual claims including but not limited to scale score², Lexile³, Quantile⁴, content cluster⁵, and growth⁶ performance; and
- Provide normative information to help contextualize the performance of students statewide such as intra-state percentiles.

Reporting and State Comparability

- Support aggregate reporting on claims including but not limited to scale score, Lexile, Quantile, content cluster, and growth performance at appropriate levels of grain size (e.g., grade, subgroup, teacher, building/district administrator, state); and
- Utilize the existing National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data to establish statewide comparisons at grades 4 and 8. NAEP data should also be used during standard-setting⁷ activities to ensure the CCR cut score is set using national and other state data.

Recommendations for Assessments in High School

The feedback provided by the Task Force and subsequently incorporated by the OSDE can be grouped into four categories: Content Alignment and Timing, Intended Purpose and Use, Score Interpretation, and Reporting and State Comparability. The OSDE's recommendations are presented below.

Content Alignment and Timing

- Use a commercial off-the-shelf college-readiness assessment (e.g., SAT, ACT) in lieu of state-developed high school assessments in grades 9 or 10; and
- Consider how assessments measuring college readiness can still adequately address assessment peer review requirements, including but not limited to alignment.

² A scale score (or scaled scores) is a raw score that has been transformed through a customized set of mathematical procedures (i.e., scaling and equating) to account for differences in difficulty across multiple forms and to enable the score to represent the same level of difficulty from one year to the next.

³A score developed by MetaMetrics that represents either the difficulty of a text or a student's reading ability level

⁴A score developed by MetaMetrics that represents a forecast of or a measure of a student's ability to successfully work with certain math skills and concepts

⁵A content cluster may be a group of items that measures a similar concept in a content area on a given test.

⁶ Growth can be conceptualized as the academic performance of the same student over two or more points in time. This is different from improvement, which is change in performance over time as groups of students matriculate or when comparing the same collection of students across time (e.g., Grade 3 students in 2016 and Grade 3 students in 2015).

⁷ The process through which subject matter experts set performance standards, or cut scores, on an assessment or series of assessments.

Intended Purpose and Use

- Ensure the assessment demonstrates sufficient technical quality to support the need for multiple and differing uses of assessment results;
- Explore the possibility of linking college-readiness scores to information of value to students and educators (e.g., readiness for postsecondary, prediction of STEM readiness, remediation risk);
- Maintain a focus on rigorous expectations of college and career-readiness that are not lessened by tying assessments to graduation requirements or course grades; and
- Ensure that all students in the state of Oklahoma can be provided with a reliable, valid, and fair score, regardless of accommodations provided or the amount of time needed for a student to take the test. Ensure that scores reflecting college readiness can be provided universally to the accepting institution or employer of each student.

Score Interpretation

- Support criterion-referenced interpretations (i.e., performance against the OAS) and report individual claims appropriate for high school students;
- Provide evidence to support claims of CCR. These claims should be (1) supported using theoretically related data in standard-setting activities (e.g., measures of college readiness and other nationally available data) and (2) validated empirically using available postsecondary data linking to performance on the college-readiness assessment; and
- Provide normative information to help contextualize the performance of students statewide such as intra-state percentiles.

Reporting and State Comparability

- Support aggregate reporting on claims at appropriate levels of grain size for high school assessments (e.g., grade, subgroup, teacher, building/district administrator, state); and
- Support the ability to provide norm-referenced information based on other states that may be administering the same college-ready assessments, as long as unreasonable administration constraints do not inhibit those comparisons.

Key Considerations for Summative Assessment Recommendations

While the Task Force addressed a targeted set of issues stemming from HB 3218, the facilitators were intentional in informing Task Force members of three key areas that must be considered in large-scale assessment development and/or selection:

1. **Technical quality**, which serves to ensure the assessment is reliable, valid for its intended use, and fair for all students;
2. **Peer Review**, which serves as a means to present evidence of technical quality; and
3. **Accountability**, which forces the issue of intended purpose and use.

In the time allotted, the Task Force was not able to consider all of the constraints and requirements necessary to fully expand upon their feedback to the OSDE. The facilitators worked to inform the Task Force that the desired purposes and uses reflected in their feedback would be optimized to the greatest extent possible in light of technical- and policy-based constraints⁸. As historically demonstrated, we can expect that the OSDE will continue to prioritize fairness, equity, reliability, and validity as the agency moves forward in maximizing the efficiency of Oklahoma’s assessment system. A more detailed explanation of the context and considerations for adopting OSDE’s recommendations is provided in the full report below.

Conclusion

The conversations that occurred among Task Force members, assessment and accountability experts, and the OSDE resulted in a cohesive set of goals for an aligned comprehensive assessment system which includes state and locally selected assessments designed to meet a variety of purposes and uses. These goals are listed on page 9 of this report. The feedback provided by the Task Force and the recommendations presented by the OSDE, however, are focused only on Oklahoma’s statewide summative assessments.

While the OSDE’s recommendations can be grouped into the four categories of (1) Content Alignment and Timing, (2) Intended Purpose and Use, (3) Score Interpretation, and (4) Reporting and State Comparability, it is important to understand how these recommendations address the overarching requirements outlined in HB 3218.

Alignment to the OAS. Summative assessments used for accountability are required to undergo peer review to ensure the assessments are reliable, fair, and valid for their intended uses. One such use is to measure student progress against Oklahoma’s college- and career-ready standards. The Task Force and department believe it is of vital importance that students have the opportunity to demonstrate their mastery of the state’s standards. However, there is also a perceived need to increase the relevance of assessments, especially in high school. The Task Force and OSDE believe a state-developed set of assessments for grades 3-8 and a college-readiness assessment in high school would best support teaching and learning efforts in the state.

Comparability with other states. Throughout feedback sessions, Task Force meetings, and OSDE deliberations, the ability to compare Oklahoma performance with that of other states was considered a valuable feature of the assessment system. However, there are tensions among administration constraints, test design requirements, and the strength of the comparisons that may make direct comparisons difficult. Currently, Oklahoma can make comparisons using statewide aggregated data (e.g., NAEP scores in grades 4 and 8, college-

⁸ See Braun (in press).

readiness scores in grade 11), but is unable to support comparisons at each grade. Task Force feedback and OSDE recommendations suggest leveraging available national comparison data beyond its current use and incorporating it into assessment standard-setting activities. This will allow the OSDE and its stakeholders to determine CCR cut scores on the assessment that reflect nationally competitive expectations.

Norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores. Based on Task Force feedback, the OSDE confirmed that reported information supporting criterion-referenced interpretations (e.g., scale score, Lexile, Quantile, content cluster, and growth performance) are valuable and should continue to be provided in meaningful and accessible ways. Additional feedback and OSDE's recommendations note that norm-referenced interpretations would enhance the value of statewide summative assessment results by contextualizing student learning and performance. By working with a prospective vendor, the OSDE should be able to supplement the information provided to stakeholders with meaningful normative data based on the performance of other Oklahoma students.

Statistical reliability and accuracy. The technical quality of an assessment is an absolute requirement for tests intended to communicate student grade-level mastery and for use in accountability. The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing⁹ present critical issues that test developers and test administrators must consider during assessment design, development, and administration. While custom state-developed assessments require field testing and operational administration to accumulate evidence of statistical reliability and accuracy, the quality of the processes used to develop those assessments can be easily demonstrated by prospective vendors and the state. In contrast, off-the-shelf assessments should already have evidence of this, and the state can generalize their technical quality if the assessment is given under the conditions defined for the assessment. Thus, the technical quality of an assessment is a key factor in ensuring assessment results are reliable, valid, and fair.

Future academic performance for assessments administered in high school. As noted earlier in the report, there is a clear value in high school assessment results being able to predict future academic performance. Based on OSDE's recommendation of using a college-readiness assessment in high school, the state and its prospective vendor should be able to determine the probability of success in early post-secondary academics based on high school assessments. However, the state and its prospective vendor should amass additional Oklahoma-specific evidence that strengthens the claims of likely postsecondary success. This can be supported both through standard-setting activities and empirical analyses that examine high school performance based on postsecondary success.

⁹ AERA, APA, & NCME. (2014). Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, DC: AERA.

The recommendations made to the OSDE in the previous section offer relatively fine-grain suggestions that can be interpreted through the lens of the HB 3218 requirements. These recommendations also reflect the Task Force’s awareness of the three areas of technical quality, peer review requirements, and accountability uses, which were addressed throughout deliberations. Through regional meetings and in-depth conversations with the Task Force, the OSDE was able to critically examine the feedback provided and present recommendations to support a strong statewide summative assessment that examines the requirements of HB 3218 and seeks to maximize the efficiency of the Oklahoma assessment system in support of preparing students for college and careers.

Limitations of This Report

The OSDE and Task Force acknowledged that there are many other assessments that comprise the Oklahoma assessment system, including the Alternate Assessment on Alternate Achievement Standards (AA-AAS), the English Language Learner Proficiency Assessment (ELPA), and the many assessments that make up the career and technical assessments. However, the Task Force did not address these assessments in this report for two main reasons. First, the focus placed on the Task Force was to address the requirements of HB 3218 specific to the state summative assessment. While the goals defined by the Task Force go beyond the scope of the House Bill, they are important in framing OSDE’s recommendations specific to the statewide summative assessment. Second, the time frame for making these recommendations and issuing this report was compressed. The OSDE devoted considerable effort in a short amount of time to arrive at these recommendations through regional feedback meetings and by convening the Task Force within the specified deadline. Therefore, it may be prudent for the OSDE to examine more specific aspects of this report with small advisory groups that include representation from the original Task Force.

Introduction

The Oklahoma Legislature directed the State Board of Education (OSBE) to evaluate Oklahoma's current state assessment system and make recommendations for its future. As a result, the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) held regional meetings across the state and convened the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force to deliberate over many technical, policy, and practical issues associated with implementing an improved assessment system. This report presents the results of those deliberations in the form of OSDE's recommendations to the State Board.

Purpose of This Report

As part of the response to House Bill 3218, the OSBE was tasked with studying a variety of requirements for Oklahoma's assessment and accountability system. This report addresses the requirements stated in House Bill 3218, provides an overview of key assessment concepts, describes the role of the Task Force, and presents the recommendations made by the OSDE. Additionally, this report provides considerations relevant to the recommendations made by the OSDE.

House Bill 3218

In May 2016, the Oklahoma Legislature approved House Bill 3218 (HB 3218), which relates to the adoption of a statewide system of student assessments. HB 3218 required the OSBE to study and develop assessment recommendations for the statewide assessment system.

The House Bill specifically tasks the OSBE, in consultation with representatives from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education, and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development, to study assessment requirements and develop assessment recommendations. Additionally, HB 3218 requires the State Board to address accountability requirements under ESSA, which is presented in a separate report for accountability. The House Bill study notes the following requirements should be examined by the State Board for both assessment and accountability:

- A multi-measures approach to high school graduation;
- A determination of the performance level on the assessments at which students will be provided remediation or intervention and the type of remediation or intervention to be provided;
- A means for ensuring student accountability on the assessments, which may include calculating assessment scores in the final or grade-point average of a student; and
- Ways to make the school testing program more efficient.

The House Bill also specifies additional requirements for assessment that the Board should examine as part of the study. These include an assessment that:

- Aligns to the Oklahoma Academic Standards (OAS);
- Provides a measure of comparability among other states;
- Yields both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores;
- Has a track record of statistical reliability and accuracy; and
- Provides a measure of future academic performance for assessments administered in high school.

Convening the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force

In response to the HB 3218 requirements, the OSDE convened an Assessment and Accountability Task Force that included representatives from those noted on page 20 of the House Bill: students, parents, educators, organizations representing students with disabilities and English learners, higher education, career technology education, experts in assessment and accountability, community-based organizations, tribal representatives, and business and community leaders. For a complete list of Task Force members, please refer to Appendix A of this report.

The role of the Task Force was to deliberate over the assessment and accountability topics required in the House Bill and provide feedback that the OSDE would incorporate into their recommendations to the State Board. The Task Force was comprised 95 members who met with experts in assessment and accountability to consider each of the study requirements and make recommendations to improve the state's assessment and accountability systems. Two of those experts also served as the primary facilitators of the Task Force: Juan D'Brot, Ph.D., from the National Center on the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA) and Marianne Perie, Ph.D., from the University of Kansas' Achievement and Assessment Institute.

The Task Force met four times to discuss best practices in assessment and accountability and to provide feedback informing OSDE's recommendations to the State Board. These meetings occurred on August 4, August 5, September 19, and October 18, 2016. Throughout these meetings, the Task Force discussed HB 3218, the role of the Task Force, research and best practices in assessment and accountability development, and feedback addressing the requirements of HB 3218. This feedback was subsequently incorporated into OSDE's recommendations to the OSBE.

Feedback from Regional Meetings and the Oklahoma Task Force

Prior to convening Oklahoma's Assessment and Accountability Task Force, the OSDE held regional meetings in Broken Arrow, Sallisaw, Durant, Edmond, Woodward, and Lawton. These meetings yielded responses on various questions addressing the desired purposes and types of

assessments. This regional feedback was incorporated into the discussions with the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force. Additional information on House Bill 3218 can be found on OSDE's website: <http://sde.ok.gov/sde/hb3218>.

The Task Force includes 95 members who represent districts across the state, educators, parents, and lawmakers (for a complete list of Task Force members, please refer to Appendix A of this report) and met four times to address the assessment. The August meeting served primarily as an introduction to the requirements of the House Bill and to the issues associated with assessment and accountability design. Task Force members were also introduced to the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), a bipartisan measure that reauthorized the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* (ESSA), and ESSA's requirements for statewide educational systems. The August meeting also served as a foundational meeting that allowed the Task Force members to identify the primary goals of the assessment system. The September meeting served as an opportunity to clarify the goals of the Task Force and provide specific feedback that directly addressed the House Bill requirements. The October meeting was used to finalize the feedback from the Task Force and discuss next steps for the OSDE to develop recommendations for the OSBE.

Throughout the four meetings, Task Force members engaged in discussion that addressed the varied uses, interpretations, and values associated with the state's assessment system. These discussions were used to establish and refine the Task Force's feedback, which were subsequently incorporated into the OSDE's recommendations. The final recommendations are presented in the section titled "OSDE Recommendations for Oklahoma's Assessment Recommendations," which can be found in the full report.

Considerations for Developing an Assessment System

Before presenting OSDE's recommendations in response to House Bill 3218, we must first provide some critical definitions and necessary context.

We begin by defining two broad categories of assessment use: (1) *high-stakes accountability* uses and (2) *lower-stakes instructional uses*. Stakes (or consequences) may be high for students, teachers or administrators, or schools and districts. For students, test scores may be used for making high-stakes decisions regarding grades, grade promotion, graduation, college admission, and scholarships. For educators, student test scores may formally or informally factor into periodic personnel evaluations. In addition, students, teachers, and administrators are affected by high-stakes uses of test scores in school and district accountability: Identification as a school or district in need of intervention often leads to required interventions intended to correct poor outcomes.

Lower-stakes instructional uses of test scores for teachers and administrators include informing moment-to-moment instruction; self-evaluation of teaching strategies and instructional effectiveness; and evaluating the success of a curriculum, program, or intervention.

As described above, within the *high stakes accountability* and *lower stakes formative* categories there are many different uses of assessment results; however, for many uses, the distinction between categories is blurred. For example, many of the appropriate uses of assessment introduced below may fall into both broad categories. We present a further distinction of assessments based on the appropriate use of those assessments below. These distinctions include formative, summative, and interim assessments.

Types of Assessments and Appropriate Uses

While there are several possible categorizations of assessment by type, we focus on the distinction among *summative*, *interim*, and *formative* assessment¹⁰ because of the direct relevance to the Task Force’s work. The facilitators provided a similar overview to the Task Force members to focus feedback on the statewide summative assessment. We define and outline the appropriate uses of the three types of assessment below.

Formative Assessment

Formative assessment, when well implemented, could also be called formative instruction. The purpose of formative assessment is to evaluate student understanding against key learning targets, provide targeted feedback to students, and adjust instruction on a moment-to-moment basis.

In 2006, the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) and experts on formative assessment developed a widely cited definition (Wiley, 2008):

Formative assessment is a process used by teachers and students during instruction that provides feedback to adjust ongoing teaching and learning to improve students’ achievements of intended instructional outcomes (p. 3).

The core of the formative assessment process is that it takes place during instruction (i.e., “in the moment”) and under full control of the teacher to support student learning. Further, unless formative assessment leads to feedback to individual students to improve learning, it is not formative! This is done through diagnosing on a very frequent basis where students are in their progress toward learning goals, where gaps in knowledge and skill exist, and how to help students close those gaps. Instruction is not paused when teachers engage in formative assessment. In fact, instruction should be inseparable from formative assessment processes.

¹⁰In defining formative, interim, and summative assessment, this section borrows from three sources (Perie, Marion, & Gong, 2009; Michigan Department of Education, 2013; Wiley, 2008).

Formative assessment is not a product, but an instruction-embedded process tailored to monitoring the learning of and providing frequent targeted feedback¹¹ to individual students. Effective formative assessment occurs frequently, covering small units of instruction (such as part of a class period). If tasks are presented, they may be targeted to individual students or groups. There is a strong view among some scholars that because formative assessment is tailored to a classroom and to individual students, results cannot (and should not) be meaningfully aggregated or compared.

Data gathered through formative assessment have essentially no use for evaluation or accountability purposes such as student grades, educator accountability, school/district accountability, or even public reporting that could allow for inappropriate comparisons. There are at least four reasons for this:

1. If carried out appropriately, the data gathered from one unit, teacher, moment, or student will not be comparable to the next;
2. Students will be unlikely to participate as fully, openly, and honestly in the process if they know they are being evaluated by their teachers or peers on the basis of their responses;
3. For the same reasons, educators will be unlikely to participate as fully, openly, and honestly in the process; and
4. The nature of the formative assessment process is likely to shift (i.e., be corrupted) in such a way that it can no longer optimally inform instruction.

Summative Assessment

Summative assessments are generally infrequent (e.g., administered only once to any given student) and cover major components of instruction such as units, semesters, courses, credits, or grade levels. They are typically given at the end of a defined period to evaluate students' performance against a set of learning targets for the instructional period. The prototypical assessment conjured by the term "summative assessments" is given in a standardized manner statewide (but can also be given nationally or districtwide) and is typically used for accountability or to otherwise inform policy. Such summative assessments are typically the least flexible of the various assessment types. Summative assessments may also be used for "testing out" of a course, diploma endorsement, graduation, high school equivalency, and college entrance. Appropriate uses of standardized summative assessments may include school and district accountability, curriculum/program evaluation, monitoring educational trends, and informing policymakers and other stakeholders. Depending on their alignment to classroom instruction and the timing of the administration and results, summative assessments may also be appropriate for grading (e.g., end-of-course exams).

¹¹See Sadler (1989).

Less standardized summative assessments are also found in the majority of middle and high school classrooms. Such assessments are typically completed near the end of a semester, credit, course, or grade level. Common examples are broad exams or projects intended to give a summary of student achievement of marking period objectives, and they frequently figure heavily in student grading. These assessments are often labeled “mid-terms,” “final projects,” “final papers,” or “final exams” in middle and high school grades. Elementary school classrooms have similar types of summative assessments, but they tend not to be referenced using a consistent label. Classroom summative assessments may be created by individual teachers or by staff from one or more schools or districts working together.

Summative assessments tend to require a pause in instruction for test administration. They may be controlled by a single teacher (for assessments unique to the classroom), groups of teachers working together, a school (e.g., for all sections of a given course or credit), a district (to standardize across schools), a group of districts working together, a state, a group of states, or a test vendor. The level at which test results are comparable depends on who controls the assessment. Depending on the conditions of assessments, results may be comparable within and across classrooms, schools, districts, or even states.

Assuming they are well designed, appropriate uses of such summative assessments include:

- Student grading in the specific courses for which they were developed;
- Evaluating and adjusting curriculum, programming, and instruction the next time the large unit of instruction is taught;
- Serving as a post-test measure of student learning; and
- As indicators for educational accountability.

Interim Assessment

Many periodic standardized assessment products currently in use that are marketed as “formative,” “benchmark,” “diagnostic,” and/or “predictive” actually belong in the interim assessment category. They are neither formative (e.g., they do not facilitate moment-to-moment targeted analysis of and feedback designed to student learning) nor summative (they do not provide a broad summary of course- or grade-level achievement tied to specific learning objectives).

Many interim assessments are commercial products and rely on fairly standardized administration procedures that provide information relative to a specific set of learning targets – although generally not tied to specific state content standards – and are designed to inform decisions at the classroom, school, and/or district level. Although infrequent, interim assessments may be controlled at the classroom level to provide information for the teacher,

but unlike formative assessment, the results of interim assessments can be meaningfully aggregated and reported at a broader level.

However, the adoption and timing of such interim assessments are likely to be controlled by the school district. The content and format of interim assessments are also very likely to be controlled by the test developer. Therefore, these assessments are considerably less instructionally relevant than formative assessment in that decisions at the classroom level tend to be *ex post facto* regarding post-unit remediation needs and adjustment of instruction the next time the unit is taught.

Common assessments developed by a school or district for the purpose of measuring student achievement multiple times throughout a year may be considered interim assessments. These may include common mid-term exams and other periodic assessments such as quarterly assessments. Many educators refer to “common formative assessments,” but these tend to function more like interim assessments. This is not a negative connotation because there is tremendous transformative power in having educators collaboratively examine student work.

Standardized interim assessments may be appropriate for a variety of uses, including predicting a student’s likelihood of success on a large-scale summative assessment, evaluating a particular educational program or pedagogy, identifying potential gaps in a student’s learning after a limited period of instruction has been completed, or measuring student learning over time.

There are three other types of interim assessments currently in use beyond the “backward looking” interim assessments described above. All are “forward-looking.” One useful but less widely used type is a pre-test given before a unit of instruction to gain information about what students already know in order to adjust plans for instruction before beginning the unit (teachers may do these pre-instruction checks on a more frequent, formative basis). Such forward-looking assessments may be composed of prerequisite content or the same content as the end-of-unit assessment.

A second type of forward-looking assessment is a placement exam used to personalize course-taking according to existing knowledge and skills. Finally, a third type of forward-looking assessment is intended to predict how a student will do on a summative assessment before completing the full unit of instruction. The usefulness of this last type of interim assessment is debatable in that it is unlikely to provide much instructionally relevant information and there is often other information available to determine who is likely to need help succeeding on the end-of-year summative assessment.

The Role and Timing of Assessments in Relation to Standards and Instruction

Throughout conversations with the Assessment and Accountability Task Force, the facilitators defined and described the assessment types and uses presented here to ensure members had a shared understanding of assessment. To address the specific requirements of HB 3218, the Task Force only focused on the role and uses of *summative* assessments – specifically, the state summative assessment for accountability. To further explore the role of state summative assessments, the Task Force spent time discussing the role and timing of these assessments in the educational system.

Given the backwards-looking nature of the information gleaned from statewide summative assessments and their potential uses (e.g., evaluate achievement, monitor progress over time, support accountability), it is important to understand how these assessments follow standards and instruction. However, after-the-fact assessment results can be used to inform adjustments to curriculum that may lead to revisions in instruction. That is, once standards are developed and adopted, curriculum aligned to those standards is implemented, which helps inform teachers' instruction to those standards.

The statewide summative assessment must also be aligned to those standards to inform educators whether students are making progress against grade-level expectations. Depending on the results of the assessments, educators then determine whether any adjustments to curriculum or instruction are necessary to support student learning. However, the assessment is dependent on the state standards, and great efforts are taken to determine the facets of the standards that are most appropriate to assess. This process is described in more detail in the next section.

The Assessment Development Process

As described to the Task Force, the assessment development process must begin with a clarification of the uses and purposes of the assessment. In the case of Oklahoma's state summative assessment, the assessments must provide evidence of student proficiency of grade-level standards, inform progress toward college- and career-readiness (CCR), and support student and school accountability. A detailed description of the major goals established in light of the Task Force's suggested uses is provided in the OSDE Recommendations section of this report.

In order to appropriately frame the OSDE's recommendations, it is important to consider the general steps that are necessary to develop an assessment. Those steps include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following¹² – depending on the uses of the assessment:

¹² Adapted from DRC|CTB (2016).

1. Develop assessment specifications based upon: the state’s academic standards, detailed specifications about the learning objectives that support the standards, and the rules dictating requirements for test content, format, and accessibility for all students;
2. Develop and review assessment materials, which include item development guides, scoring rubrics, graphic design requirements, a verification of content and standard alignment, and score report requirements;
3. Conduct pilot tests, usability studies (to ensure ease of use by students and educators), tryout studies (to confirm consistent and accurate scoring if relevant), and bias and sensitivity reviews (to ensure content is validly and fairly represented for all students);
4. Conduct field tests to determine how well items are performing, that items effectively represent the content being assessed, and that items can be accessed fairly and appropriately by all students;
5. Produce final assessment materials, which include final test versions, reports for educators and students, and supporting information/data that helps contextualize test results to those consuming reports from the test such as administrative manuals and interpretative guides;
6. Administer, score, and report student performance using the final version of the tests; and
7. Engage in ongoing evaluation of the assessment system to ensure the assessment is meeting the goals of the system and to determine if any refinements or revisions to improve its quality and effectiveness are needed.

While these can be considered a general set of steps for assessment development, there may be additional or fewer steps depending on the intended uses of the assessment results. Although this report focuses only on Oklahoma’s summative assessment, there are additional components of an assessment system that may provide a more comprehensive view of student performance and school quality (e.g., locally selected assessments, assessments common across districts, or classroom- developed assessments and formative practices). Those additional components may include all, a subset, or additional steps than those listed here.

OSDE Recommendations for Oklahoma’s Assessment

Oklahoma’s Assessment and Accountability Task Force and the OSDE recognized that assessment design is a case of optimization under constraints¹³. In other words, there may be many desirable purposes, uses, and goals for assessment, but some of them may be in conflict. Any given assessment can serve only a limited number of purposes well. Finally, assessments always have some type of restrictions (e.g., legislative requirements, time, and cost) that must be weighed in determining assessment design and specifications. Therefore, a critical early

¹³ See Braun (in press).

activity of the Task Force was to identify and prioritize desired characteristics and intended uses for a new Oklahoma statewide summative assessment for OSDE to consider.

It is important to note that the Task Force recognized that Oklahoma's assessment system should have a wider set of goals, but the feedback in response to HB 3218 should be focused around the statewide summative assessment. The following section describes the process through which the Task Force established goals and provided feedback to the OSDE. This feedback was incorporated into OSDE's recommendations to the State Board, which is included later in this section.

Assessment Goals Based on Desired Characteristics and Uses

Task Force members initially were asked to ignore constraints and identify their highest-priority purposes for assessment and their desired uses and characteristics of assessment results. Task Force members, working in small groups, identified their highest-priority uses and shared their thoughts with other smaller groups. After the first meeting, the proposed uses and characteristics were consolidated and returned to the Task Force as a set of draft goals for the assessment system. The Task Force provided revisions and feedback to these goals. Facilitators then presented the final goals to the Task Force for confirmation. Once goals were defined, the desired uses and characteristics were articulated within the context of the Task Force's feedback to the required study points of the House Bill. The members of the Task Force agreed to the following goals for OSDE to consider for Oklahoma's assessment system:

1. Provide instructionally useful information to teachers and students with appropriate detail (i.e., differing grain sizes for different stakeholder groups) and timely reporting;
2. Provide clear and accurate information to parents and students regarding achievement and progress toward CCR using an assessment that is meaningful to students;
3. Provide meaningful information to support evaluation and enhancement of curriculum and programs; and
4. Provide information to appropriately support federal and state accountability decisions.

An important outcome of this process is that no single type of assessment (formative, interim, or summative) can accommodate all of the uses and characteristics represented in the Task Force's goals. In fact, to accomplish the full set of desired uses and characteristics, a system of assessments would be required that spans across assessment types (formative, interim, and summative) and levels (classroom, district, and state). This can be accomplished by combining state and local assessments to create a coherent system and eliminating unnecessary assessment. Furthermore, this is in addition to the more process-oriented formative assessment practices that are synonymous with instruction. However, those needs exceed the scope of examination required as part of the response to HB 3218. The OSDE should continue

to work with the State Board and those representatives on the Task Force to address the needs stated by the Task Force that are beyond the scope of the statewide summative assessment.

OSDE Recommendations: Addressing Intended Goals

In developing recommendations for a new state summative assessment, the OSDE considered the Task Force’s deliberation of issues presented in HB 3218. As a reminder, the areas to be studied specific to the statewide assessment included:

- Ensuring alignment to the OAS;
- Providing a measure of comparability among other states;
- Demonstrating a track record of statistical reliability and accuracy;
- Yielding both norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores; and
- Providing a measure of future academic performance for assessments administered in high school.

To address these areas, Task Force members were asked to respond to specific questions that focused on each of the above-stated points, any relevant development or administration constraints that may need to be considered, and the intended and unintended consequences that might be associated with the assessment’s uses.

Task Force members, working in small groups, reflected upon each of the major areas presented in the House Bill and shared their thoughts with other smaller groups. Facilitators compiled and consolidated input into feedback distinguished by grades 3-8 and high school assessments. Upon consolidating feedback, the facilitators returned to the Task Force with draft feedback statements for 3-8 and high school assessments, and the Task Force provided revisions and edits to these feedback statements. Facilitators then presented the final feedback statements to the Task Force for confirmation. This feedback was then reviewed by the OSDE and incorporated into recommendations for the State Board.

What follows is a brief description of the recommendations grouped by category. The recommendations are separated into recommendations for grades 3-8 assessments and recommendations for high school assessments.

Recommendations for 3-8 Statewide Assessments

The feedback provided by the Task Force and subsequently incorporated by the OSDE for grades 3-8 can be grouped into four categories: Content Alignment and Timing, Intended Purpose and Use, Score Interpretation, and Reporting and State Comparability. Following each set of recommendations, a brief discussion on the context of and considerations for adopting these recommendations is provided.

Content Alignment and Timing

The following recommendations are presented for Content Alignment and Timing:

- Maintain the focus of the new assessments on the Oklahoma State Standards and continue to administer them at the end of grades 3 through 8; and
- Include an adequate assessment of writing to support coverage of the Oklahoma English Language Arts (ELA) standards.

The Task Force members made it apparent that the assessments in grades 3-8 should maximize the amount of instruction available to students by administering the assessments at the end of each grade. Additionally, the Task Force recognized that the Oklahoma ELA standards included expectations of writing for students and that the assessment should reflect those standards. The OSDE should explore ways in which they can continue to support educators and administrators in ensuring the assessment is administered in the most efficient manner to support learning opportunities for students.

Intended Purpose and Use

The following recommendations are presented for Intended Purpose and Use:

- Ensure the assessment can support calculating growth for students in at least grades 4-8 and explore the potential of expanding growth to high school depending on the defensibility of the link between grade 8 and high school assessments and intended interpretations; and
- Ensure the assessment demonstrates sufficient technical quality to support the intended purposes and current uses of student accountability (e.g., promotion in grade 3 based on reading and driver's license requirements on the grade 8 ELA assessments).

The Task Force recognized the need for the assessment to communicate progress toward CCR but noted that students may differ in their degree of progress toward CCR. As a result, the Task Force believed that it is important for the assessment to support the calculation of growth across years and potentially growth to standard (i.e., the required growth to reach or maintain grade-level expectations). While this is something that the OSDE is already considering, the Department should explore the multiple options available in calculating growth that may or may not require the use of vertical scales to inform educators of student progress over time.

Additionally, Task Force members were aware of the potentially conflicting intended purposes and uses of the assessment at grades 3 and 8. That is, using a single assessment as both a signal for CCR and as a signal for minimum competency can lead to mixed messages. While the OSDE currently uses a subscore specific to grade 3 for reading (i.e., Reading Sufficiency Act Status), it will be important to examine how the assessments are used in policy to identify potential systematic problems. The OSDE should continue exploring how policy decisions can help

mitigate any unintended consequences associated with using assessments signaling CCR for student accountability.

Score Interpretation

The following recommendations are presented for Score Interpretation:

- Provide a measure of performance indicative of being on track to CCR, which can inform preparation for the Oklahoma high school assessment;
- Support criterion-referenced interpretations (i.e., performance against the OAS) and report individual claims including but not limited to scale score, Lexile, Quantile, content cluster, and growth performance; and
- Support normative information to help contextualize performance of students statewide using something such as intra-state percentiles.

The Task Force deliberated for some time regarding how scores should be interpreted. The two key areas of discussion included interpretations in support of progress toward CCR and interpretations to help contextualize performance. With regard to CCR interpretations, clearly articulating how students perform against the state standards was critical. Furthermore, because the OAS are reflective of students being college and career ready upon graduation from high school, the grade-level interpretations should reflect whether students are on track for CCR (assuming the cut score for grades 3-8 is informed using data that reflects CCR-like expectations). However, sufficient information should be reported at the individual level to help students and educators understand progress against the state standards. This contextualization should extend to providing within-state normative information that may include percentiles of performance, like-student performance, or like-school performance data. The OSDE should explore the types of within-state normative information their prospective vendors could provide to the public through reporting.

Reporting and State Comparability

The following recommendations are presented for Reporting and State Comparability:

- Support aggregate reporting on claims including but not limited to scale score, Lexile, Quantile, content cluster, and growth performance at appropriate levels of grain size (e.g., grade, subgroup, teacher, building/district administrator, state); and
- Utilize the existing National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) data to establish statewide comparisons at grades 4 and 8. NAEP data should also be used during standard-setting¹⁴ activities to ensure the CCR cut score is set using national and other state data.

¹⁴ The process through which subject matter experts set performance standards, or cut scores, on an assessment or series of assessments.

The Task Force also wrestled with the best way to support statewide reporting and comparisons to other states. It was evident to Task Force members that the same information reported at the student level should be reported in the aggregate. Specifically, information made available to students and their guardians should be aggregated (at the school, district, and state level) and provided to educators, administrators, and the public. The OSDE should continue to explore meaningful ways to report information clearly and publically when working with their prospective vendor.

How to support state-by-state comparisons was less straightforward. Members generally agreed that there was significant value in understanding how Oklahoma students perform in comparison to students in other states. There was less agreement, however, with regard to the level of granularity necessary to support those comparisons. That is, some Task Force members believed that comparisons would be most valuable at each grade (and in some cases by student), whereas other members believed comparisons were sufficient at the state level.

Upon further examination of this issue, the facilitators noted the technical requirements necessary to make state-to-state comparisons at varying units of analysis (e.g., student, subgroup, school, grade, district, state). Once the Task Force members became aware of the additional requirements (e.g., embedded field-test items, additional testing time, cost, similar testing administration conditions, use of nationally normed tests) and the potential limitations of the interpretations based on various approaches, the perceived value of fine-grained comparisons diminished. Ultimately, Task Force members generally agreed that the *system* of assessments should support state-to-state comparisons of performance. That is, the statewide summative assessment may not serve that purpose, but other assessments in Oklahoma's assessments system (e.g., NAEP) are intended to serve this purpose.

Additionally, the information gleaned from Oklahoma's participation in NAEP can be extended to inform nationally relevant expectations of student performance on the statewide summative assessment. This can be done by leveraging existing methodologies¹⁵ using NAEP data that can be applied to Oklahoma's standard-setting activities. This process can inform standard-setting participants of how Oklahoma student performance compares to other states across the country. The OSDE should explore the inclusion of national comparison data into standard-setting activities with their prospective vendor and determine the level of rigor to which Oklahoma's CCR cut score should be aligned.

Recommendations for Assessments in High School

The feedback provided by the Task Force and subsequently incorporated by the OSDE can be grouped into four categories: Content Alignment and Timing, Intended Purpose and Use, Score

¹⁵See Jia, Phillips, Wise, Rahman, Xu, Wiley, & Diaz (2014) and Phillips (2009).

Interpretation, and Reporting and State Comparability. Following each set of recommendations, a brief discussion on the context of and considerations for adopting these recommendations is provided.

Content Alignment and Timing

The following recommendations are presented for Content Alignment and Timing:

- Use of a commercial off-the-shelf college-readiness assessment (e.g., SAT, ACT) in lieu of state-developed high school assessments in grades 9 or 10; and
- Consideration of how assessments measuring college readiness can still adequately address assessment peer review requirements, including but not limited to alignment.

Building off of the conversation in grades 3-8, the Task Force recognized the inherent value in signals of CCR. To that end, the Task Force members believed strongly that the state should consider the adoption of a commercial off-the-shelf college-readiness assessment. However, Task Force members were made aware that large-scale statewide assessments must adequately pass peer review requirements¹⁶. One of these requirements includes demonstrating that statewide assessments demonstrate sufficient alignment to the full range of the state's grade-level academic content standards¹⁷.

The statewide summative assessment has to support several purposes. For example, Oklahoma's high school assessment must be aligned to the standards that students are taught by the year students are assessed (e.g., 11th grade), should reflect evidence of student learning in the state's accountability system, and serve as a signal of CCR. While an off-the-shelf college-readiness assessment will readily provide evidence of claims of college readiness, it may be more difficult to amass evidence that the assessment sufficiently reflects the OAS to support claims of grade-level mastery and progress toward Oklahoma's conceptualization of CCR. As a result, the OSDE will need to explore the degree to which different off-the-shelf college-readiness assessments will demonstrate sufficient alignment and what, if any, augmentation may be necessary to satisfy peer review requirements. To that end, the OSDE should continue to be involved in thoughtful discussion with other states and contacts familiar with peer review requirements. This will help inform expectations of prospective vendors with regard to alignment and additional peer review requirements for college-readiness assessments.

¹⁶Peer review requirements are requirements that have been developed by the U.S. Department of Education that support ESSA's requirement that each state annually administer high-quality assessments in at least reading/language arts, mathematics, and science that meet nationally recognized professional and technical standards. Peer review involves states receiving feedback from external experts and the Department on the assessments it is using to meet ESEA requirements.

¹⁷See U.S. Department of Education (2015)

Intended Purpose and Use

The following recommendations are presented for Intended Purpose and Use:

- Ensure the assessment demonstrates sufficient technical quality to support the need for multiple and differing uses of assessment results;
- Explore the possibility of linking college-readiness scores to information of value for students and educators (e.g., readiness for postsecondary, prediction of STEM readiness, remediation risk);
- Maintain a focus on rigorous expectations of college and career readiness that are not lessened by tying assessments to graduation requirements or course grades; and
- Ensure that all students in the state of Oklahoma can be provided with a reliable, valid, and fair score, regardless of accommodations provided or the amount of time needed for a student to take the test. Ensure that scores reflecting college readiness can be provided universally to the accepting institution or employer of each student.

Like the recommendations presented in grades 3-8, Task Force members were aware of the challenges associated with using assessments for multiple purposes. Given the critical focus placed on signals of CCR for high school students, unintended consequences may be best avoided through the operationalization of the accountability system to ensure schools are recognized for progress in student learning and by not using the assessment for student accountability. Instead, the OSDE and OSBE should leverage the additional information being included in the ESSA accountability system (please see the accountability design report) that supplements high-stakes academic achievement data (i.e., chronic absenteeism and postsecondary opportunities). The OSDE should continue working to avoid potential negative unintended consequences in operationalizing Oklahoma's ESSA accountability system.

The Task Force recognized the challenges associated with stretching the assessment beyond its intended uses. Specifically, high school assessments should prioritize college- and career-ready expectations and should not be used as part of student grades or graduation requirements. Little empirical research has been conducted to determine the efficacy or impact of using high-stakes assessments in course grades, grade point averages, or graduation requirements. Descriptive examinations of how exit exams are associated with student outcomes have yielded mixed results (Amrein and Berliner, 2002; Center on Education Policy, 2003; Davenport, Davison, Kwak, et al., 2002; Warren and Edwards, 2003). This highlights the lack of clarity associated with the effects of high-stakes assessments used for student accountability.

From a policy standpoint, exit requirements based on CCR-oriented assessments and cut scores may have unintended negative consequences. For example, a state may design an assessment with a rigorous cut score where approximately 50% of students are proficient. Because many states demonstrate proficiency rate improvements of 1%-2% per year, it is unreasonable to

expect significant shifts in the overall rate of change by making the assessment a graduation requirement or a part of a student's grade. As states have explored the use of required remediation strategies or policies when high-stakes assessments are used for student accountability, resource constraints have emerged. If coupled with graduation requirements based on proficiency, the potential number of non-graduates can become difficult to manage publically, politically, and practically. This leads to an inherent tension in using a CCR assessment for two distinctly different purposes (i.e., signals of CCR and course/graduation requirements) that may damage the credibility of the assessment and the system in which it is used (D'Brot, 2016). Thus, the OSDE and OSBE should work with the Legislature to establish overt language or policy that requires students to take high-stakes assessments but should avoid making the assessment score part of a student's final grade, grade-point average, or graduation requirement.

Another potentially negative unintended consequence that the Task Force discussed was associated with college-readiness scores and information of value. A primary reason why so many Task Force members were interested in the use of an off-the-shelf college-readiness assessment was the immediate value it added to students by providing a score that would be recognized by postsecondary institutions as an indicator of readiness. However, Task Force members were aware of the current challenges associated with providing an institution-recognized score to those students who received accommodations or if the assessment administration conditions were markedly different from those required by an off-the-shelf provider. Thus, it is important for the OSDE to ensure that advocacy viewpoints are reflected in conversations with prospective vendors to support the provision of reliable, valid, and fair scores to all students in the state of Oklahoma.

It is important to note that a small minority (i.e., two of the 95-member Task Force) believed it would be valuable to have a grade-level assessment aligned to the OAS rather than an off-the-shelf college-readiness assessment.

Score Interpretation

The following recommendations are presented for Score Interpretation:

- Support criterion-referenced interpretations (i.e., performance against the OAS) and report individual claims appropriate for high school students;
- Provide evidence to support claims of CCR. These claims should be (1) supported using theoretically related data in standard-setting activities (e.g., measures of college readiness and other nationally available data) and (2) validated empirically using available postsecondary data linking to performance on the college-readiness assessment; and

- Provide normative information to help contextualize the performance of students statewide such as intra-state percentiles.

Like the recommendations for grades 3-8, the Task Force discussed the most important interpretations that should be supported for the high school assessments. Given the recommendations under Intended Purpose and Use, it should come as no surprise that Task Force members prioritized claims of CCR. However, claims of student performance should also reflect progress against the state standards. Like recommendations for grades 3-8, sufficient information should be reported at the individual level to help students and educators understand progress against the state standards, which may include within-state normative information. The OSDE should explore the types of within-state normative information their prospective vendors could provide to the public through reporting.

Aligned with the previous set of recommendations for high school, the OSDE will need to work with their prospective vendor to ensure that the high school assessment can support both a CCR and standards-based claim for students. These CCR-based claims should also be further validated using empirical evidence within the state of Oklahoma and using any available national data, depending on the vendor.

Reporting and State Comparability

The following recommendations are presented for Reporting and State Comparability:

- Support aggregate reporting on claims at appropriate levels of grain size for high school assessments (e.g., grade, subgroup, teacher, building/district administrator, state); and
- Support the ability to provide norm-referenced information based on other states that may be administering the same college-ready assessments, as long as unreasonable administration constraints do not inhibit those comparisons.

The feedback provided by the Task Force for statewide reporting was similar to those for grades 3-8. That is, aggregate reporting should reflect the same types of information that are provided at the individual level, and aggregate information should be provided to educators, administrators, and the public in meaningful and easily accessible ways.

Given the Task Force's suggestion to adopt an off-the-shelf college-readiness assessment, Task Force members recommended that the OSDE work to support state-to-state comparisons. The availability of students across states potentially being administered the same items and test forms (i.e., depending on the selected vendor) allows for the possibility of direct comparisons of college readiness. However, the Task Force members recognized the potential challenges that might be associated with changes in test administration practices that may be required to support fair administration for all students in Oklahoma. In other words, national comparisons

were believed to be important, but those comparisons of CCR should not require unreasonable administration constraints. The OSDE should ensure that any prospective vendor be very clear in the kinds of comparisons that can be supported when considering Oklahoma-specific administration practices.

Key Areas of Importance to Consider

While the Task Force addressed a targeted set of issues stemming from House Bill 3218, the facilitators were intentional in informing Task Force members of three key areas of importance that must be considered in large-scale assessment development:

1. **Technical quality**, which serves to ensure the assessment is reliable, valid for its intended use, and fair for all students;
2. **Peer Review**, which serves as a means to present evidence of technical quality; and
3. **Accountability**, which forces the issue of intended purpose and use.

In the time allotted, the Task Force was not able to consider all of the constraints and requirements necessary to fully expand upon their feedback to the OSDE. The facilitators worked to inform the Task Force that the desired purposes and uses reflected in their feedback would be optimized to the greatest extent possible in light of technical- and policy-based constraints¹⁸. As historically demonstrated, we can expect that the OSDE will continue to prioritize fairness, equity, reliability, and validity as the agency moves forward in maximizing the efficiency of Oklahoma’s assessment system.

Conclusion

The conversations that occurred between Task Force members, assessment and accountability experts, and the OSDE resulted in a cohesive set of goals for an aligned comprehensive assessment system which includes state and locally selected assessments designed to meet a variety of purposes and uses. These goals are listed on page 9 of this report. The feedback provided by the Task Force and the recommendations presented by the OSDE, however, are focused only on Oklahoma’s statewide summative assessments.

While the OSDE’s recommendations can be grouped into the four categories of (1) Content Alignment and Timing, (2) Intended Purpose and Use, (3) Score Interpretation, and (4) Reporting and State Comparability, it is important to understand how these recommendations address the overarching requirements outlined in HB 3218.

Alignment to the OAS. Summative assessments used for accountability are required to undergo peer review to ensure the assessments are reliable, fair, and valid for their intended uses. One such use is to measure student progress against Oklahoma’s college- and career-ready

¹⁸ See Braun (in press).

standards. The Task Force and department believe it is of vital importance that students have the opportunity to demonstrate their mastery of the state’s standards. However, there is also a perceived need to increase the relevance of assessments, especially in high school. The Task Force and OSDE believe a state-developed set of assessments for grades 3-8 and a college-readiness assessment in high school would best support teaching and learning efforts in the state.

Comparability with other states. Throughout feedback sessions, Task Force meetings, and OSDE deliberations, the ability to compare Oklahoma performance with that of other states was considered a valuable feature of the assessment system. However, there are tensions among administration constraints, test design requirements, and the strength of the comparisons that may make direct comparisons difficult. Currently, Oklahoma can make comparisons using statewide aggregated data (e.g., NAEP scores in grades 4 and 8, college-readiness scores in grade 11) but is unable to support comparisons at each grade. Task Force feedback and OSDE recommendations suggest leveraging available national comparison data beyond its current use and incorporating it into assessment standard-setting activities. This will allow the OSDE and its stakeholders to determine CCR cut scores on the assessment that reflect nationally competitive expectations.

Norm-referenced and criterion-referenced scores. Based on Task Force feedback, the OSDE confirmed that reported information supporting criterion-referenced interpretations (e.g., scale score, Lexile, Quantile, content cluster, and growth performance) are valuable and should continue to be provided in meaningful and accessible ways. Additional feedback and OSDE’s recommendations note that norm-referenced interpretations would enhance the value of statewide summative assessment results by contextualizing student learning and performance. By working with a prospective vendor, the OSDE should be able to supplement the information provided to stakeholders with meaningful normative data based on the performance of other Oklahoma students.

Statistical reliability and accuracy. The technical quality of an assessment is an absolute requirement for tests intended to communicate student grade-level mastery and for use in accountability. The Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing¹⁹ present critical issues that test developers and test administrators must consider during assessment design, development, and administration. While custom state-developed assessments require field testing and operational administration to accumulate evidence of statistical reliability and accuracy, the quality of the processes used to develop those assessments can be easily demonstrated by prospective vendors and the state. In contrast, off-the-shelf assessments should already have evidence of this, and the state can generalize their technical quality if the

¹⁹ AERA, APA, & NCME. (2014). Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing. Washington, DC: AERA.

assessment is given under the conditions defined for the assessment. Thus, the technical quality of an assessment is a key factor in ensuring assessment results are reliable, valid, and fair.

Future academic performance for assessments administered in high school. As noted earlier in the report, there is a clear value in high school assessment results being able to predict future academic performance. Based on OSDE's recommendation of using a college-readiness assessment in high school, the state and its prospective vendor should be able to determine the probability of success in early post-secondary academics based on high school assessments. However, the state and its prospective vendor should amass additional Oklahoma-specific evidence that strengthens the claims of likely post-secondary success. This can be supported both through standard-setting activities and empirical analyses that examine high school performance based on postsecondary success.

The recommendations made to the OSDE in the previous section offer relatively fine-grain suggestions that can be interpreted through the lens of the HB 3218 requirements. These recommendations also reflect the Task Force's awareness of the three areas of technical quality, peer review requirements, and accountability uses which were addressed throughout deliberations. Through regional meetings, advisory group meetings, input in response to posted questions, and in-depth conversations with the Task Force, the OSDE was able to critically examine the feedback provided and present recommendations to support a strong statewide summative assessment that examines the requirements of HB 3218 and seeks to maximize the efficiency of the Oklahoma assessment system in support of preparing students for college and careers.

References

AERA, APA & NCME. (2014). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington, DC: AERA.

Amrein, A.L., and Berliner, D.C. (2002). An Analysis of some unintended and negative consequences of high-stakes testing. Education Policy Studies Laboratory of Arizona State University.

Braun, H. (Ed.). (in press). *Meeting the Challenges to Measurement in an Era of Accountability*. National Council on Measurement in Education. Washington, DC.

Center on Education Policy (2003). State high school exit exams put to the test. Washington, D.C.

CCSSO & ATP. (2013). *Operational Best Practices for Statewide Large-Scale Assessment Programs*. Washington, DC: Authors.

D’Brot, J. M. (2016). A system of performance standards: Policy reviews as an additional layer of validity. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National council in Education*. Washington, D.C. April, 2016.

Data Recognition Corporation | CTB (2016). Designing assessment systems: A primer on the test development process. Retrieved September 1, 2016, from <https://ctb.com/control/assetDetailsViewAction?currentPage=3&articleId=895&assetType=article&p=library>.

Davenport, E., Davison, M., Kwak, N., Irish, M. and Chan. C. (2002). Minnesota high-stakes high school graduation test and completion status for the class of 2000. Minneapolis, Minnesota. Office of Educational Accountability.

Jia, Y., Phillips, G., Wise, L.L., Rahman, T., Xu, X., Wiley, C., Diaz, T.E. (2014). *2011 NAEP-TIMSS Linking Study: Technical Report on the Linking Methodologies and Their Evaluations* (NCES 2014-461). National Center for Education Statistics, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C.

Michigan Department of Education. (2013). *Report on Options for Assessments Aligned with the Common Core State Standards*. Retrieved June 20, 2015, from http://www.michigan.gov/documents/mde/Common_Core_Assessment_Option_Report_441322_7.pdf.

Mislevy, R. J., & Riconscente, M. M. (2006). Evidence-Centered Assessment Design. In T. M. Haladyna, & S. M. Downing (Eds.), *Handbook of Test Development* (pp. 61-90). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers.

Perie, M., Marion, S., & Gong, B. (2009). Moving towards a comprehensive assessment system: A framework for considering interim assessments. *Educational Measurement: Issues and Practice*, 28 (3), 5-13.

Pellegrino, J. W., Chudowsky, N., & Glaser, R. (Eds.). (2001). *Knowing What Students Know: The Science and Design of Educational Assessment*. Washington, DC. Retrieved September 21, 2016, from http://www.nap.edu/openbook.php?record_id=10019&page=R1.

Phillips, G. W. (2009), *The Second Derivative: International Benchmarks in Mathematics for U.S. States and School Districts*. American Institutes for Research. Washington, DC.

Sadler, D. R. (1989). Formative assessment and the design of instructional systems. *Instructional Science*, 18 (2), 119-144.

Thompson, S. J., Johnstone, C. J., & Thurlow, M. L. (2002). *Universal Design Applied to Large Scale Assessments (Synthesis Report 44)*. Minneapolis, MI: University of Minnesota, National Center on Educational Outcomes. Retrieved October 5, 2016, from <http://www.cehd.umn.edu/NCEO/onlinepubs/synthesis44.html>.

U.S. Department of Education (2015). *Non-regulatory guidance for states for meeting requirements of the Elementary and Education Act of 1965, as amended*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.

Warren, J., and Edwards, M. (2005). High School Exit Examinations and High School Completion: Evidence from the Early 1990s. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 27, 43-74.

Wiley, E. C. (2008). *Formative Assessment: Examples of Practice*. Retrieved October 1, 2016, from http://ccsso.org/documents/2008/formative_assessment_examples_2008.pdf.

Appendix A: Invited Task Force Members

Name	Organization	Title
Hofmeister, Joy	State Dept. Education	State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dunlap, Katie Dr.	State Dept. Education	Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and Accountability
Tamborski, Michael Dr.	State Dept. Education	Executive Director of Accountability
Walker, Craig	State Dept. Education	Executive Director of State Assessments
Barnes, Lynn	Oklahoma City Public Schools	Sr. Executive Director of Curriculum & Federal Programs
Bax, Benjamin	American Federation of Teachers	Field Representative
Baxter, Leo J.	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Bendick, Debbie Dr.	Edmond Public Schools	Assoc. Superintendent
Best, Mary	American Federation of Teachers	President
Bishop, Katherine	Oklahoma Education Association	Vice President
Blanke, Debbie Dr.	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	Academic Affairs
Burchfield, Rocky	Fairview Public Schools	Superintendent
Burk, Jana	Tulsa Public Schools	Executive Director of Teacher/Leadership Effectiveness Initiative
Bushey, Brent	Oklahoma Public School Resource Center	Executive Director
Buswell, Robert	Office of Educational Quality and Accountability	Director of Educational Accountability
Caine, Ann	Oklahoma State School Boards Association	Director of Education Leadership
Capps, Staci	Byng Public Schools	Curriculum Director/Grant Developer
Casey, Dennis Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Charney, Rande	Research Associate	Schusterman Family Foundation
Choate, Tony	Chickasaw Nation	Media Relations
Cobb, Rick	Mid-Del Schools	Superintendent
Condit, Donnie Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Cook, H. Gary Dr.	University of Wisconsin	Associate Scientist, Expert in Assessment and Accountability, E.L.L.
Cooper, Donna	Choctaw-Nicoma Park Schools	Asst. Superintendent
D'Brot, Juan Dr.	Center for Assessment	Senior Associate, Expert in Assessment and Accountability
DeBacker, Terri Dr.	University of Oklahoma College of Education	Assoc. Dean

Name	Organization	Title
Dossett, J.J. Sen.	Oklahoma Senate	Oklahoma Senator
Dugan, Drew	Greater Oklahoma City Chamber	Vice President
Dunlop, Janet Dr.	Broken Arrow Public Schools	Assoc. Superintendent
Dunn, Kathy	Mid-Del Schools	Asst. Superintendent for Teaching and Learning
Elam, Mary Dr.	Oklahoma City Public Schools	Senior Research Associate, Planning, Research, and Evaluation Dept.
Fedore, Stephen	Tulsa Public Schools	Director of Data Quality and Data Use
Flanagan, William	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Font, Raul	Latino Community Dev. Agency	CEO/Executive Director
Ford, John Sen.	Oklahoma Senate	Oklahoma Senator
Foster, Becki	Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education	Associate State Director for Curriculum, Assessment, Digital Delivery and Federal Programs
Franks, Cathryn	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Fulton, Lisa	Ada City Schools	District Test Coordinator
Garn, Gregg A. Dr.	University of Oklahoma	Dean of Education
Grunewald, Angela	Edmond Public Schools	Executive Director of Elementary Education
Guerrero, Julian Jr.	Tribal Education Dept. National Assembly (TEDNA)	Project Director, Native Youth Community Project
Heigl, Brenda	Oklahoma Parent Teacher Association	President
Henke, Katie Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Hernandez, Kristy	Moore Public Schools	Director of Student Services
Hime, Shawn	Oklahoma State School Boards Association	Executive Director
Hooper, Tony	Lawton Public Schools	Director of Accountability and Assessment
House, Sharon	Oklahoma Parents Center, Services for Families of Children with Disabilities	Executive Director
Hutchinson, Tony	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	Strategic Planning Analysis Workforce and Economic Development
Keating, Daniel	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Lepard, Jennifer	Oklahoma State Chamber	V.P. of Government Affairs
Lester, Erin	Tulsa Public Schools	Director of Educational Indicators
Lora, Aurora	Oklahoma City Public Schools	Superintendent
Love, Courtney	Oklahoma Virtual Charter Academy	Operations Manager

Name	Organization	Title
Mack, Marcie	Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education	State Director
McDaniel, Tracy	KIPP Charter Oklahoma City	Founding School Leader & Principal
Monies, Jennifer	Oklahoma Educated Workforce Initiative	Executive Director
Mouse, Melanie Dr.	Putnam City Schools	Asst. Superintendent
Nollan, Jadine Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Ogilvie, Clark	Owasso Public Schools	Superintendent
Owens, Beecher	Mannford HS	2016 Graduate
Owens, Rick	Lawton Public Schools	Secondary Education
Owens, Ryan	CCOSA	Co-Executive Director/General Counsel; Director Legislative Services
Parks, Tammy	Howe Public Schools	PDC Coordinator
Parrish, Jim	Choctaw Nation	Executive Director of Education
Pennington, David	Ponca City Public Schools	Superintendent
Perie, Marianne Dr.	University of Kansas	Director Achievement and Assessment Institute; Expert in Assessment and Accountability
Pittman, Anatasia Sen.	Oklahoma Senate	Oklahoma Senator
Polk, Jamie	Lawton Public Schools	Asst. Superintendent
Price, Bill	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Priest, Alicia	Oklahoma Education Association	President
Reavis, Madison	Muskogee HS	2016 Graduate
Riggs, Ruthie	Edmond Public Schools	Assoc. Superintendent
Roberts, Kuma	Tulsa Regional Chamber	Education Program Manager
Roberts, Sarah	Inasmuch Foundation	Senior Program Officer
Rogers, Rep. Michael	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Roman Nose, Quinton	Tribal Education Departments National Assembly (TEDNA)	Executive Director, Board of Directors
Ross, Robert	Inasmuch Foundation & Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board of Directors, Board Member
Sadler, Kimberly	Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education	Associate State Director for Curriculum, Assessment, Digital Delivery, and Federal Programs
Shirley, Natalie	Oklahoma Governor's Office	Secretary of Education and Workforce Development
Simmons, Shirley Dr.	Norman Public Schools	Asst. Superintendent
Shouse, Jerrod	Owner	Shouse Consulting
Sly, Gloria Dr.	Cherokee Nation	Education Liaison Education Services

Name	Organization	Title
Stanislawski, Gary Sen.	Oklahoma Senate	Oklahoma Senator
Stoycoff, Zack	Tulsa Regional Chamber	Government Affairs Director
Tatum, Sheryl	Oklahoma Virtual Charter Academy	Head of School
Taylor, Etta	Oklahoma Parent Teacher Association	President Elect
Thompson, Shannon	Moore Public Schools	Dean of Academics
Thomsen, Todd Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Tinney, Ginger	Professional OK Educators	Executive Director
Trent, Sean	Mid-Del Schools	Executive Director of Academic Services & Technology
Viles, Susan	Woodward Schools	District Test Coordinator/RSA Test Coordinator
Weeter, Richard Dr.	Oklahoma City Public Schools	Executive Director of Planning, Research, and Evaluation Dept.
Woodard, Johanna Dr.	Owasso Public Schools	Coordinator of Academic Services
Woodard, Petra	Millwood Public Schools	High School Principal
Yunker, Jake	Oklahoma Governor's Office	Deputy Policy Director

Appendix B: Detail on Issues in Subscore Reporting

Subscores serve as achievement reports on subsets of the full set of knowledge and skill represented by a total score. For example, many ELA summative assessments produce a total score for ELA, subscores for at least reading and writing, and often finer-grained subscores for topics such as informational and literary reading. Similarly, a mathematics test typically yields an overall math score and potential subscores in topics such as numbers and operations, algebraic reasoning, measurement and geometry, and statistics and probability. One of the greatest challenges in current large-scale summative assessment design is to create tests that are no longer than necessary to produce a very reliable total score (e.g., grade 5 mathematics) while yielding adequately reliable subscores to help educators and others gain more instructionally-relevant information than gleaned from just the total score.

Unfortunately, there is a little known aspect of educational measurement (outside of measurement professionals) that large-scale tests are generally designed to report scores on a “unidimensional” scale. This means the grade 5 math test, for example, is designed to report overall math performance, but not to tease out differences in performance on things like geometry or algebra because the only questions that survive the statistical review processes are those that relate strongly to the total score of overall math. If the test was designed to include questions that better distinguish among potential subscores, the reliability (consistency) of the total score would be diminished. There are “multidimensional” procedures that can be employed to potentially produce reliable and valid subscores, but these are much more expensive to implement and complicated to ensure the comparability of these subscores and the total score across years. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) is the one example of a well-known assessment designed to produce meaningful results at the subscore level, but NAEP has huge samples to work with and more financial resources and psychometric capacity at its disposal than any state assessment. In other words, it is not realistic at this time to consider moving away from a unidimensional framework for Oklahoma’s next statewide summative assessment, which means the subscores will unfortunately be much less reliable estimates of the total score than useful content-based reports. This is true for essentially all commercially-available interim assessments as well, so in spite of user reports they like assessment X or Y because it produces fine-grain subscores useful for instructional planning, any differences in subscores are likely due to error rather than anything educationally meaningful.

In spite of this widely-held knowledge by measurement professionals, every state assessment designer knows they need to produce scores beyond the total score otherwise stakeholders would complain they are not getting enough from the assessment. Recall, producing very reliable total scores is critical for accountability uses of statewide assessments and, all things being equal, the reliability is related to the number of questions (or score points) on a test.

Therefore, most measurement experts recommend having at least 10 score points for each subscore to achieve at least some minimal level of reliability, so statewide summative tests tend to get longer to accommodate subscore reporting. Therefore, one way to lessen the time required on the statewide summative assessment is to focus the summative assessment on reporting the total score and use the optional modules for districts that would like more detailed and accurate information about particular aspects of the content domain.

ACCOUNTABILITY REPORT

Prepared By:
Marianne Perie, Ph.D.
Center for Assessment and Accountability Research and Design,
University of Kansas

Contents

Executive Summary.....	iii
Purpose of this Report	iii
House Bill 3218.....	iii
Collecting Feedback from Regional Engage Oklahoma Meetings and the Oklahoma Task Force	iv
Key Accountability Recommendations	iv
Recommendations for Accountability in Elementary and Middle Schools.....	iv
Recommendations for Accountability in High School	vi
Key Considerations for Accountability Recommendations	vii
Conclusion	viii
Limitations of This Report	viii
Introduction	1
Purpose of This Report.....	1
House Bill 3218.....	1
Convening the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force	2
Feedback from Regional Meetings and the Oklahoma Task Force	3
Considerations for Developing an Accountability System.....	3
Goals.....	4
Indicators.....	5
Design Decisions.....	5
Identifying Schools and Districts	6
Reports	7
Validation	8
OSDE Recommendations for Oklahoma’s Accountability System.....	8
Goals.....	8
Indicators.....	9
Status	9
Growth.....	12
Postsecondary Opportunities	14
Graduation Rate	15
ELPA Progress	16
Chronic Absenteeism.....	17
Design Decisions.....	17
Identifying Schools and Districts	20
Reports	21
Validation	22
Further Work.....	22
Conclusion.....	23
References	24
Appendix A: Invited Task Force Members	25
Appendix B: Ohio’s School Report Card.....	29
Appendix C: Sample A–F Calculations.....	30

Executive Summary

The Oklahoma Legislature directed the Oklahoma State Board of Education (OSBE) to evaluate Oklahoma’s current school and district accountability system and make recommendations for its future. As a result, the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) held regional meetings across the state and convened the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force to deliberate over the many technical, policy, and practical issues associated with implementing an improved assessment system. The 95 Task Force members met four times between August 4 and November 9, 2016. This report presents the results of those deliberations in the form of recommendations from the OSDE to the OSBE.

Purpose of this Report

This report addresses the requirements stated in House Bill 3218, provisions required under the federal legislation known as the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), provides an overview of key accountability concepts, describes the role of the Task Force, and presents the recommendations made by the OSDE. Additionally, the full body of this report provides considerations relevant to these recommendations.

House Bill 3218

In June 2016, Oklahoma Governor Mary Fallin signed House Bill 3218 (HB 3218), which relates to the adoption of a statewide system of student assessments. HB 3218 requires the OSBE to study and develop assessment recommendations for the statewide assessment system. The House Bill specifically tasks the OSBE, in consultation with representatives from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education, and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development to study and develop assessment requirements. Additionally, HB 3218 requires the State Board to address accountability requirements under ESSA, which will be presented in a separate report for assessment. This report focuses specifically on the accountability requirements of HB 3218, which include:

- A multi-measures approach to high school graduation;
- A determination of the performance level on the assessments at which students will be provided remediation or intervention and the type of remediation or intervention to be provided;
- A means for ensuring student accountability on the assessments, which may include calculating assessment scores in the final or grade-point average of a student;
- Ways to make the school testing program more efficient; and
- A multi-measures approach to accountability.

Collecting Feedback from Regional Engage Oklahoma Meetings and the Oklahoma Task Force

Prior to convening Oklahoma’s Assessment and Accountability Task Force, the OSDE held regional meetings in Broken Arrow, Sallisaw, Durant, Edmond, Woodward, and Lawton. These meetings yielded responses on various questions addressing the desired purposes of accountability and preferred measures. This regional feedback was incorporated in the discussions with the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force. The Task Force included 95 members who represented districts across the state, educators, parents, business and community leaders, tribal leaders, and lawmakers. Additionally, members from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education, and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development were also represented on the Task Force. For a complete list of Task Force members, please refer to Appendix A.

On four occasions, the members of the Task Force met with experts in assessment and accountability to consider each of the study requirements and provide feedback to improve the state’s assessment and accountability systems. Two of those experts also served as the primary facilitators of the Task Force: Juan D’Brot, Ph.D., from the National Center on the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA) and Marianne Perie, Ph.D., from the University of Kansas’ Achievement and Assessment Institute. These meetings occurred on August 4–5, September 19, October 18, and November 9, 2016. At each meeting, the Task Force discussed elements of HB 3218, research and best practices in assessment and accountability development, and feedback addressing the requirements of HB 3218. This feedback was subsequently incorporated into OSDE’s recommendations to the OSBE.

Key Accountability Recommendations

Oklahoma’s Assessment and Accountability Task Force and the OSDE recommend a school and district accountability system based on a set of indicators and design decisions that meet both the state and federal requirements.

Recommendations for Accountability in Elementary and Middle Schools

The Task Force and OSDE recommend that the Oklahoma accountability system begin with seven indicators for elementary and middle schools, focusing on ELA, math, and science status, growth in ELA and math, ELPA progress, and chronic absenteeism as the additional indicator of school quality. These indicators and their weights are shown in Table 1. Equal weight has been given to status and growth, with status focused on each student meeting a targeted scale score and growth based on a value table organized around the achievement levels.

No.	Indicator	Points possible	Points earned	Percentage	Weight	Total
1a.	ELA status (with progress targets)	# students with ELA score	# students meeting goal		15	
1b.	Math status (with progress targets)	# students with math score	# students meeting goal		15	
1c.	Science status (with progress targets)	# students with science score	# students meeting goal		5	
2a.	ELA growth	Highest value on table	Value table average		15	
2b.	Math growth	Highest value on table	Value table average		15	
3.	ELPA progress	# of ELs in US for more than one year	# of ELs meeting goal		15	
4.	Chronic Absenteeism	#students enrolled	#students missing <18 school days		10	

Table 1. Indicators and weights for accountability index

Each school enters the data in the appropriate column, multiplies by the weights shown, and then enters the final numbers in the far right-hand column. Summing the final numbers will produce a score between 0–90 to deter “percent-correct” thinking. In discussing whether it would be clearer to move it to 100, the Task Force members decided that grading on a rubric is a natural education concept. Move to 100 would mean changing the weights or converting to a decimal, both of which would dilute the intention of the system. The rubric assumes that the setting of the cut score on the new assessments will be appropriately rigorous and reflect true readiness for postsecondary work.

The scores convert to A–F grades as follows:

- A. > 70
- B. 57–70.00
- C. 43–56.99
- D. 30–42.99
- F. < 30

This rubric is intentionally weighted toward grades B, C, and D and reserves grades A and F for the best and worst schools. Schools that earn an F or have the lowest 5% of overall points in the states (if fewer than 5% of schools earn an F) will be categorized as comprehensive support schools. Schools with the lowest achievement for one or more student groups, but not in the lowest 5% overall, will be identified for targeted support. The growth rating will be considered as a key indicator for exiting these support designations. “A” schools with no large achievement gaps and a participation rate above 95% will be identified as reward schools. The intent is to effectively distinguish schools, but we expect to see improvement over time. When at least 60%

of Oklahoma schools are scoring at the A or B level, the rubric will be adjusted so that 62 points is needed for a B and 78 points is needed for an A.

In addition, the participation rate will factor into the grade only if it falls below 95% for any student group. Historically, Oklahoma has not had an issue with low participation rates, but incentives are needed to maintain that high bar. Any school with a participation rate below 95% for any student group will have a “minus (–)” placed after its letter grade. The participation rate will also be shown on the report card, with detailed data available by student group.

Recommendations for Accountability in High School

The high school system is parallel to that of elementary and middle schools but has an additional emphasis on college and career readiness. The same approach is used and the table only differs by the two indicators: There are no growth measures, but there are indicators for a graduation rate and postsecondary opportunities. OSDE will look to incorporate a moderate growth measure in 2020 when students who take the grade 8 test in 2017 will take the college-ready test in 2020.

Even with the two different indicators, the total points here also sum to 90, so the same rubrics are used, with the same automatic adjustment applied over time. Likewise, any grade could be adjusted downward by adding a “minus (–)” after the letter grade if the participation rate falls below 95% for any student group in the school or district. An additional bonus point is available for high schools to promote participation in U.S. History. If 95% of students complete the U.S. History class by 11th grade and if 75% of those students either receive a score of “proficient” or above on the Oklahoma end-of-course assessment or receive college credit for the course (through an AP test or concurrent college enrollment), the school will receive one full bonus point added to the final sum. Table 2 displays the indicators and weights for high schools, or any school that includes grade 12.

No.	Indicator	Points possible	Points earned	Percentage	Weight	Total
1a.	ELA status (with progress targets)	# students with ELA score	# students meeting goal		15	
1b.	Math status (with progress targets)	# students with math score	# students meeting goal		15	
1c.	Science status (with progress targets)	# students with science score	# students meeting goal		15	
2.	ELPA progress	# of ELs in US for more than one year	# of ELs meeting goal		15	
3.	Graduation rate	Use state graduation formula to determine percentage			10	
4.	Chronic Absenteeism	# students enrolled	# students NOT missing 10% of school days		10	
5.	Postsecondary opportunity (AP/IB/dual enrollment/internship/apprenticeship/industry certification)	10% of enrollment	# enrolled in one program		10	

Table 2. Indicators and weights for high school accountability index

To identify high schools for comprehensive and targeted support, the same criteria apply, but graduation rates are also a consideration. Based on the federal regulations, any high school with a graduation rate less than 67% must be identified as needing comprehensive support and improvement. Likewise, if one or more student groups has a graduation rate significantly below the others and less than 67%, the school is eligible to be targeted for support and intervention. A reward school must have an overall graduation rate of at least 80% with no student group falling below 70%.

Key Considerations for Accountability Recommendations

As historically demonstrated, we can expect that the OSDE will continue to prioritize fairness, equity, reliability, and validity as the agency moves forward in maximizing the efficiency of Oklahoma's assessment system. The recommendations will need to be examined once two full years of data exist (in summer 2018) to ensure the weights and the rubrics differentiate the schools as intended. A more detailed explanation of the context and considerations for adopting OSDE's recommendations is provided in the full report below.

Conclusion

The goal of this system is to differentiate meaningfully among Oklahoma schools, identifying those in need of additional supports to help all students meet the goal of graduating high school ready for postsecondary success. Careful consideration was given to the list of indicators, their weights, and how they are combined to give each school a letter grade. The Task Force focused on the reliability of the indicators, their link to successful outcomes, and the clarity with which they could be reported and explained to the public.

Limitations of This Report

This report did not detail every indicator considered and rejected or the reasons why. These are all detailed in the extensive notes from the committee meetings and should be considered when the system is adjusted in future years. Because no “real” data was available when making these recommendations, many of the values used are placeholders that must be replaced when the new assessments are in place. For instance, the starting point for the target scores in 2017 should be based on real data, with interim goals set with an understanding of where the cut score for “proficient” is located.

Introduction

The Oklahoma Legislature directed the Oklahoma State Board of Education (OSBE) to evaluate Oklahoma's current state assessment and accountability systems and make recommendations for the future. As a result, the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) held regional meetings across the state and convened the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force to deliberate over the many technical, policy, and practical issues associated with implementing an improved assessment and accountability system. This report presents the results of those deliberations in the form of the OSDE's recommendations to the OSBE regarding a new statewide accountability system.

Purpose of This Report

As part of the response to House Bill 3218, the OSBE was tasked with studying a variety of requirements for Oklahoma's assessment and accountability systems. This report reviews requirements under both state and federal law regarding school accountability, provides an overview of key components in an accountability system, describes the role of the Task Force, and presents the recommendations made by the OSDE. A previous report addressed the requirements stated in House Bill 3218 for the summative assessment system, provided an overview of key assessment concepts, and laid out the recommendations for that system. This report assumes the recommended assessment system will be adopted and become a component of the accountability system.

House Bill 3218

In June 2016, Oklahoma Governor Mary Fallin signed House Bill 3218 (HB 3218), which relates to the adoption of a statewide system of student assessments and clarifies language around the school accountability system. HB 3218 requires the OSBE to study and develop recommendations for both the statewide assessment and accountability systems.

The House Bill specifically tasks the OSBE, in consultation with representatives from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education, and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development, to study accountability requirements under the new federal law, the *Every Student Succeeds Act* (ESSA), and develop recommendations. The House Bill study notes that the OSBE should examine the following requirements for both assessment and accountability:

- A multi-measures approach to high school graduation;
- A determination of the performance level on the assessments at which students will be provided remediation or intervention and the type of remediation or intervention to be provided;

- A means for ensuring student accountability on the assessments, which may include calculating assessment scores in the final or grade-point average of a student;
- Ways to make the school testing program more efficient; and
- A multi-measures approach to accountability.

Additional information on House Bill 3218 can be found on OSDE’s website:

<http://sde.ok.gov/sde/hb3218>.

ESSA requires that an accountability system include the following components:

1. Annual assessments (which may include a measure of student growth);
2. Graduation rates for high schools;
3. Another statewide “academic” indicator for elementary and middle schools
4. English language proficiency for English learners; and
5. At least one additional statewide indicator of school quality or student success (e.g. school climate/safety, student engagement, educator engagement, postsecondary readiness).

Additional information on ESSA can be found on the U.S. Department of Education website at

<http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/index.html>.

Convening the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force

In response to the HB 3218 requirements, the OSDE convened an Assessment and Accountability Task Force that included representatives from the groups noted on page 20 of the House Bill: students, parents, educators, organizations representing students with disabilities and English language learners, higher education professionals, career technology educators, experts in assessment and accountability, community-based organizations, tribal representatives, and business and community leaders. For a complete list of Task Force members, please refer to Appendix A of this report.

The role of the Task Force was to deliberate over the assessment and accountability topics required in the House Bill and provide feedback that the OSDE would incorporate into their recommendations to the OSBE. The Task Force was comprised of 95 members who met with experts in assessment and accountability to consider each of the study requirements and make recommendations to improve the state’s assessment and accountability systems. Two of those experts also served as the primary facilitators of the Task Force: Juan D’Brot, Ph.D., from the National Center on the Improvement of Educational Assessment (NCIEA) and Marianne Perie, Ph.D., from the University of Kansas’ Achievement and Assessment Institute. Additionally, Gary Cook, Ph.D., from the University of Wisconsin joined the first meeting to discuss the inclusion of English learners (ELs) in the accountability system.

The Task Force met four times on August 4–5, September 19, October 18, and November 9, 2016. Throughout these meetings, the Task Force discussed HB 3218, the role of the Task Force, research and best practices in assessment and accountability development, and feedback addressing the requirements of HB 3218. OSDE incorporated this feedback in its recommendations to the OSBE.

Feedback from Regional Meetings and the Oklahoma Task Force

Prior to convening Oklahoma’s Assessment and Accountability Task Force, the OSDE held regional meetings in Broken Arrow, Sallisaw, Durant, Edmond, Woodward, and Lawton. These meetings yielded responses on various questions addressing the desired purposes and types of assessments and goals for the accountability system. This regional feedback was incorporated into the discussions with the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force.

The first Task Force meeting in August served primarily as an introduction to the requirements of the House Bill and to the issues associated with assessment and accountability design. Task Force members were also introduced to ESSA, a bipartisan measure that reauthorized the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)*, and the Act’s requirements for statewide educational systems. The August meeting also served as a foundational meeting that allowed the Task Force members to identify the primary goals of the assessment system. The September meeting served as an opportunity to clarify the goals of the Task Force and provide specific feedback that directly addressed the House Bill requirements. In the October meeting, Task Force members focused on details related to the indicators, measuring and combining them into an overall rating. The November meeting was used to finalize the feedback from the Task Force and discuss next steps for the OSDE to develop recommendations for the OSBE. Throughout the four meetings, Task Force members engaged in discussion that addressed the varied uses, interpretations, and values associated with the state’s assessment system. These discussions were used to establish and refine the Task Force’s feedback, which were subsequently incorporated into the OSDE’s recommendations. The final recommendations are presented in the section titled “OSDE Recommendations for Oklahoma’s Accountability System.”

Considerations for Developing an Accountability System

Before presenting OSDE’s recommendations in response to House Bill 3218 and ESSA, we first provide some critical definitions and necessary context.

Educational accountability has been a much-used phrase since the 1970s. The 1980s saw a movement to standards-based accountability. The Improving America’s Schools Act (IASA) of 1994 moved the discussion to state-level educational accountability systems. The onus was initially put on state governments to define their accountability systems. The *No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)* of 2001 laid out a much more prescriptive accountability system, providing a

specific framework within which states must develop their accountability systems. The *Every Student Succeeds Act* of 2016 maintains many of the requirements for the elements of the accountability system, but provides states with more flexibility in determining how to combine the elements to make a judgment about each school and district and in creating a plan for improvement for those deemed in need of assistance.

Accountability systems start with a set of goals and a theory of action that states that a specific act will produce a desired outcome. Those actions are rewarded when successful; other actions that do not produce the desired outcome are sanctioned. The system must undergo constant monitoring to ensure that the action will produce the desired outcome, that the rewards and sanctions are effective, and that the feedback and supports given to the various parties provide useful information on how to adapt their actions to produce the desired outcomes.

According to Carlson (2002), there are five key elements of accountability systems:

1. The goals of the system;
2. The selection of key indicators of success and ways to measure them (multiple measures), rather than merely using information that is available;
3. Decisions about how the selected indicators will be scaled, weighted, combined, and reported;
4. The types of actions that will be taken based on the resulting performance data (rewards and sanctions); and
5. Steps that will be taken to determine and improve the effectiveness of the accountability system itself.

In addition, school report cards are an important component of an accountability system and required by ESSA. Effective report cards communicate results in a clear and accurate manner to stakeholders, including school and district administrators, parents, and community members.

Goals

Linn (2001) encourages state policymakers to be clear about the intended purpose(s) of their educational accountability system. For example, while most states or districts would agree that the purpose of accountability is to improve student learning, Linn argues that states need to be more specific in stating their priorities for achieving such a goal. For instance, beyond improving student learning, state policymakers may specifically desire to:

- Reinforce content standards in priority subjects;
- Support deep understanding and problem-solving ability; and
- Assure a given level of achievement for students before promotion.

Linn also recommends that policymakers clarify the uses of their system, asking specific questions such as:

- What results will be given to parents?
- What will be done with school-level results?
- How much emphasis should be placed on status versus improvement?

Policy context is also important for setting goals. In the case of Oklahoma, goals specified in HB 3218 and ESSA weigh heavily in the design.

Indicators

A major issue in any accountability system is the question of what to measure. Among the considerations in selecting indicators is an understanding of what data are available, the targets of the data collection, the timing of the data collection, and the coherence with the stated goals. In addition, any indicator needs to be measured in a manner allowing for reliable and valid data that will accurately inform the accountability system. Although both NCLB and ESSA require placing large weight on assessment outcomes, there is flexibility in determining which assessments are included and which outcomes are valued. For example, ESSA requires using results from the English language arts (ELA) and mathematics assessments, but Oklahoma also measures student achievement in science and social studies. The assessment results in ELA and math provide the means to report both status (a one-year snapshot of performance) and growth (an across-year calculation at the student level) in grades 3–8. Conversely, science and social studies can only provide status measures, as they are not administered in every grade. Growth measures are also problematic in high school given the current recommendation to use only an off-the-shelf college-ready assessment in eleventh grade. However, any of these assessments can provide information on achievement gaps among various student groups. In addition to assessment scores, ESSA requires states to include an indicator on graduation rates for high schools and at least one additional statewide indicator of school quality or student success. These additional indicators could focus on school climate, student safety, parent engagement, or postsecondary readiness. Finally, for the first time, ESSA requires that English language proficiency for ELs be included in the Title I accountability system. Most importantly, ESSA requires that the indicators differentiate among schools. The selected indicators need to provide unique information and not simply be multiple measures of the same result.

Design Decisions

Once policymakers have decided on a set of indicators, the next question is how to use them to make judgments about school or district effectiveness. The first design decision involves determining how to combine the different performance indicators to determine if the school has met the goal(s). In a coherent system, many of these decisions will be based on the goals. For instance, weighting the various elements in a system relates directly to the values placed on

each element. Another issue is how fine-grained the decision measure should be. While NCLB breaks down all decisions into “meets annual measurable objectives” or “does not meet annual measurable objectives,” Hanushek and Raymond (2002) argue that binary pass/fail decisions lead to a set of complications, which can be avoided by providing more detailed information about the distribution of scores.

A major issue in accountability systems is how to incorporate information on student groups. Experts and advocates agree that group performance should be reported separately; otherwise strong majority performance can overshadow the poor performance of a minority. However, not every indicator reported needs to be included in the accountability system. For example, an overall absentee rate could be reported for every demographic group but only the overall rate included in the accountability system.

Under NCLB, we saw a lot of discussion of “minimum n ” (i.e., sample size). A large minimum n can increase the reliability of the decisions, but because it excludes certain populations from the system who do not meet the minimum sample size, it decreases the validity of the system. A key feature in any educational accountability system is setting annual targets for students, teachers, and/or schools. Targets are measurable steps toward a system’s ultimate goal, but it can be difficult to determine what that target should be – that is, what is good enough.

Identifying Schools and Districts

ESSA lays out two primary categories for identification: comprehensive support and targeted support. States are required to identify the lowest-performing schools in the state as schools in need of comprehensive support and improvement. This category must comprise at least 5% of all Title I schools. In addition, any high school with an overall graduation rate of less than 67% should be identified for comprehensive support. Schools that have one or more student groups consistently performing in the bottom 5% must be identified for targeted support and intervention. Likewise, if one or more student groups have a graduation rate below 67% and in the bottom 5% for the state, that school must also be identified for targeted support.

Outside the scope of this report but important to any accountability system is the system of supports for identified schools. ESSA requires the following steps:

- For Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools, districts must develop, and the state must approve, an evidence-based improvement plan with input from stakeholders, including school leaders, teachers, and parents. The state must monitor progress against the plan and further intervene if the school does not improve within four years; and
- Targeted Support and Improvement Schools must develop an evidence-based school-level plan with input from school leaders, teachers, and parents. This plan must be approved and monitored by the district. The district must monitor implementation and

take action if the school does not improve the performance and/or outcomes for all student groups.

Reports

Another ESSA requirement is that each state develops a system of school report cards. These report cards must include each indicator used in the accountability system as well as staff and financial information. Specifically, each state must publish an annual statewide report card and each district must publish a district report card. District report cards must include information for the district as a whole, as well as for each school in that district. (When used in this document, the term “district” refers to both traditional public school districts and charters.) These report cards must include, at minimum:

1. Details of the state accountability system, including schools identified for Comprehensive Support and Improvement and Targeted Support and Improvement;
2. Disaggregated results on all accountability indicators, including state assessments and graduation rates;
3. Disaggregated assessment participation rates;
4. Disaggregated results on the indicators that the state and its districts are already reporting to the Civil Rights Data Collection, including, but not limited to: a. access to advanced coursework, such as AP, IB, and dual enrollment; b. exclusionary discipline rates; and c. chronic absenteeism;
5. The professional qualifications of educators, including the number and percentage of a. inexperienced teachers, principals, and other school leaders; b. teachers teaching with emergency credentials; and c. teachers who are out of field. Districts and state report cards must include comparisons of high-poverty and low-poverty schools on these metrics;
6. State, local, and federal per-pupil expenditures, by funding source. These expenditures have to include actual personnel expenditures for each school, not just district averages.
7. The number and percentage of students with the most significant cognitive disabilities taking the alternate assessment;
8. At the state level, results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, as compared with national averages; and
9. Disaggregated rates at which high school graduates enroll in higher education, if available.

Finally, the Education Commission of the States recently published a report laying out evaluation criteria for a statewide report card system (Mikulecky & Christie, 2014). They identified the best report cards as the ones that are easy to find, easy to understand, and

include indicators essential for measuring school and district performance. The indicators include:

- Student achievement;
- Student academic growth;
- Achievement gap closure;
- Graduation rates; and
- Postsecondary and career readiness.

The Commission highlighted Illinois, Ohio, and Wisconsin as providing some of the best report cards.

Validation

Finally, the last core concept of accountability systems is the need to monitor, evaluate, and improve the system. Researchers seem to agree that an accountability system should include a mechanism for continuously monitoring and evaluating the effects of the system and potential strategies for adapting and improving the system in response to new information. A key question is how the system design will incorporate the need for revisions over time. State- and district-level policymakers need to have a predetermined plan of how they will manage deficiencies uncovered by the accountability system and how their solutions will feed back into the system itself. As mentioned in a previous section, policymakers should monitor how schools and educators respond to sanctions and rewards.

Gong and the ASR SCASS (2002) also list evaluation and monitoring as key design principles for accountability systems. He recommends asking questions, such as

- Is the system complete?
- Can the system be improved?
- Is the system having the desired effects?
- Is the system producing any undesired effects?
- Have assumptions or circumstances changed to an extent that the system should change?

OSDE Recommendations for Oklahoma’s Accountability System

At the end of the November meeting, the Task Force agreed on a set of recommendations for indicators, measures, and design decisions. Broad advice for report cards and validation was also provided. OSDE incorporated these ideas into their recommendations, summarized in this section.

Goals

The task force quickly agreed on the goal for the Oklahoma public school system. The focus should be on preparing students for college and career readiness, where “college and career ready” means that students graduate from high school prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary opportunities, whether college or career. All parts of the school system,

including elementary and secondary schools, must put students on a trajectory for postsecondary success.

Indicators

All indicators in the final list have a research basis associated with postsecondary success. Throughout the four meetings, multiple indicators were proposed and rejected because either there was no evidence that the indicator supported the goal, there was no reliable way to gather the data, or the measure was susceptible to manipulation or might lead to other undesirable outcomes. A guiding principle of the Task Force was to start with a relatively simple and straightforward list of indicators keyed on successful outcomes. Over time, as the accountability system matures, additional indicators may be added.

The final list of indicators is as follows:

Elementary & Middle School	High school
ELA status	ELA status
Math status	Math status
Science status	Science status
ELA growth	Graduation rate
Math growth	Postsecondary opportunities
ELPA progress	ELPA progress
Chronic absenteeism	Chronic absenteeism

Status

All schools will have indicators for ELA, math, and science status. In grades 3–8, these indicators will be based on the state assessment. The Task Force recommended that achievement in one year be measured in terms of scale score rather than the percentage meeting proficient. The base year will be in 2017. The average scale score for the school at the 40th percentile will set the initial goals for each student group. Then, interim goals will follow a set number of score points, based on progress seen in earlier years. In addition, the goals will be set separately for each student group in a manner that requires more progress from the lower performing groups. As an example, see Figure 1.

This graph shows a simulated set of interim targets from 2017 through 2025. For this example, we assumed a scale of 100 – 400 with the “target” cut score set at 300. Each grade and subject will require a separate graph. Goals increase by a variable number of points each year, ranging from 5 points for whites, the highest-performing group, to 10 points for the lowest-performing groups: economically disadvantaged, ELs, and students with disabilities. By the year 2025, all students will be expected to achieve proficiency on state assessments. The goals will also reduce the achievement gap each year, but at a rate that has been shown to be feasible based

on past performance. This achievement indicator is thus both rigorous and attainable. It also incentivizes schools to work with every student to meet their target and not just those close to proficiency.




Figure 1. Simulated annual targets for elementary and middle schools
 NOTE: The proficiency cut is assumed to be at 300.

An important component of the status indicator is examining progress by each student group. However, a lesson learned from NCLB is that counting a student multiple times does not provide additional information about a school and actually provides a disincentive to work in schools with large disadvantaged populations. To counter these concerns, each student will be assigned a primary student group for accountability purposes. The original *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* of 1965 was founded on the idea of providing an equitable education to those from high poverty areas. This accountability system will reinforce that goal by prioritizing economic disadvantage first. That is, a student who is both Hispanic and economically disadvantaged will be placed in the economically disadvantaged group and required to meet those interim goals. (Economically disadvantaged is defined as eligible for the federal free and reduced price lunch program, also known as the National School Lunch Program.) The prioritized order of student characteristics is based on the degree to which data shows them to be related to achievement outcomes. Thus, the groups will be formed as follows:

1. Economically disadvantaged students;
2. Student with disabilities;
3. English learners;

4. Black/African American students;
5. Hispanic students;
6. Native American/American Indian students; and
7. Other students (white or Asian, not economically disadvantaged, not having an identified disability, not an EL).

If a student is a black student with a disability but not economically disadvantaged, he or she will be categorized as a student with a disability and required to meet that goal. A Hispanic EL will be categorized as an EL. All of those students will have the same interim goal, regardless of their race/ethnicity.

Returning to Figure 1, each student will have a scale score goal for his or her grade level and year, based on his or her student group. Each student will either meet that goal or not. The school will receive credit for the percentage of students meeting the goal. It is important to note that this indicator requires each school to show progress each year, but this is not a growth measure. Growth follows an individual student from one year to the next and calculates how much his or her achievement changed in that time. This measure uses an improvement model comparing cohorts of students. That is, each school will be comparing third-graders in 2018 to third-graders in 2017, for example, and trying to improve the performance of each cohort incrementally.

Similar to Figure 1, Figure 2 provides an example of a similar set of goals using a nationally recognized college-ready assessment in high school. For purposes of the simulation, data from a nationally recognized college-ready assessment was used, as there was a previous report demonstrating Oklahoma performance on that assessment.




Figure 2. Simulated annual targets for high school
 NOTE: Reading/Math College-Ready Benchmark is 22.

In this example, the 2017 data represent the average score in Oklahoma from 2014. These starting points are likely to be lower when every student in the state takes the college-ready assessment. Then, the annual targets are determined by increasing the average by 0.2 – 0.5 points each year, depending on student groups. Again, the goal by 2025 is for all students to reach the college-ready benchmark of 22 in reading and math and simultaneously reduce the achievement gaps.

Growth

For elementary and middle schools, the second academic indicator is growth. To clarify definitions, the previous indicator required each school to show improvement. That is, the cohort of third-graders in 2018 needs to outperform the cohort of third-graders in 2017. In contrast, growth follows an individual student. Growth measures a student’s achievement in fourth grade in 2018 compared to third grade in 2017. Each student receives a growth score, which can then be averaged across schools or districts.

For grades 3–8 in ELA and mathematics, a score is given annually. Thus, growth can be measured at the student level between grades 3–4, 4–5, 5–6, 6–7, and 7–8. A K–5 school will have two growth measures per subject and a middle school with grades 6–8 will have three growth measures.

No growth measures in high school are possible in the short term without adding additional assessments at that level. However, in 2020 a cohort of students will have taken the grade 8

test in 2017 and the college-ready test in 2020. Those data can be used to develop a predictive model, using the grade 8 scores to project performance onto the college-ready test. Then, as students take the college-ready assessment, they can be labeled as exceeding their predictive performance (high growth), meeting the predicted performance (average growth), or failing to meet the predictive performance (low growth). When the data are sufficiently reliable, this indicator can be added to the accountability calculation.

The Task Force was clear that both status and growth are important. Clearly, the best schools are those that have high status and high growth, and the schools needing intervention would be those with low status and low growth. However, there was less clarity on whether a school with high status and low growth should be rated higher than one with low status and high growth. By providing these two different metrics in a manner that does not double the information the way the “growth to target” indicator under NCLB did, making decisions about these schools becomes clearer.

The Task Force discussed many growth models but settled on the value table. Because the status measure focuses on average scale score, Task Force members wanted the growth model to take achievement levels into consideration. The value table model was developed by Richard Hill and his colleagues at NCIEA (Hill, et al., 2005). They describe the basic idea behind a value table as a mechanism to create an indicator that examines the achievement level a student earns one year, compare it to the level earned the previous year, and then assign a numerical value to that change. Higher values are assigned to results that are more highly valued. The Task Force members wanted to give schools credit for growth across the entire scale. Each achievement level would be divided in half so that growth could be measured within as well as across achievement levels. By giving credit for moving a student from a low unsatisfactory to a high unsatisfactory, this indicator will provide different information about schools than the status indicator.

Figure 3 displays one possible table. Stakeholders will need to continue to meet to examine the values in this table, but it meets several criteria. It provides similar credit for moving students to a low score within an achievement level to a high one, regardless of the level. See for example, the points associated with moving from low unsatisfactory to high unsatisfactory: 120. Compare that to the points associated with moving from low proficient to high proficient: 130. The target of staying at a low level 3 is set at 100. Any improvement has a value greater than 100 and any backwards movement results in a value less than 100. Thus, any school with an average score above 100 is showing growth. The tables can be calculated for all students and any student group, but the accountability measure will be for all students.

		Current year (e.g., 2018)							
		Unsatisfactory Low	Unsatisfactory High	Limited Knowledge Low	Limited Knowledge High	Proficient Low	Proficient High	Advanced Low	Advanced High
Previous year (e.g., 2017)	Unsatisfactory Low	0	120	160	185	200	200	200	200
	Unsatisfactory High	0	90	130	150	195	200	200	200
	Limited Knowledge Low	0	50	95	130	165	175	195	195
	Limited Knowledge High	0	30	55	95	130	160	185	195
	Proficient Low	0	0	30	80	100	130	150	175
	Proficient High	0	0	0	30	70	105	135	160
	Advanced Low	0	0	0	0	40	75	115	145
	Advanced High	0	0	0	0	25	50	95	125

Figure 3. Sample value table to measure growth

Postsecondary Opportunities

Because growth cannot be measured in high school with a one-time assessment, another academic indicator is needed. The Task Force selected the indicator on postsecondary opportunities with a focus on participation. Thus, schools will receive credit for every student participating in one of the following programs:

- Advanced Placement (AP) classes;
- International Baccalaureate (IB) program;
- Dual (concurrent) enrollment in higher education courses;
- A work-based internship or apprenticeship; and
- Industry certification.

This list incorporates both college success indicators as well as career preparation activities. Schools are rewarded for helping their students gain early college or career exposure. The initial target was set at 10% of students in high school meeting this goal, or 20% of juniors and seniors. The Task Force felt that was a high but attainable goal. This goal may increase over time. Likewise, the Task Force debated whether participation or outcomes should be rewarded. Task Force members decided that early on, OSDE needs to incentivize schools first to offer the opportunities and that later the system could reward outcomes. Thus, to start, this indicator measures participation, but we expect to gradually move that to crediting successful outcomes in future years. The timeline will be discussed in future Task Force meetings.

Graduation Rate

The system will continue to use the state formula for four-year graduation rates, but also factor in the five-year rate and the six-year rate. The state language appears in the next few paragraphs.

As with the dropout data for middle schools, the **Four-Year Adjusted Cohort Graduation Rate** (hereafter referred to as the four-year graduation rate) will be calculated using graduation data from the previous year in order to allow schools to count summer graduates.

The four-year graduation rate is defined by the U.S. Department of Education in 34 C.F.R. § 200.18 (b)(i)(A) and 70 OS § 3-151.1 as “the number of students who graduate in four years with a regular high school diploma divided by the number of students who form the adjusted cohort for that graduating class” (i.e., entered high school four years earlier, adjusting for transfers in and out, émigrés and deceased students).

In other words, students will be assigned to a cohort based on the year they are expected to graduate on a four-year plan. For example, students entering the ninth grade in the 2013-2014 school year would be assigned to the 2017 cohort. The four-year graduation rate will then be calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{4 year graduation rate for cohort } x = \frac{\text{Number of graduates in cohort } x}{\text{Number of graduates in cohort } x + \text{Number of leavers in cohort } x + \text{Number of students in cohort } x \text{ that are still enrolled}}$$

A student can be removed from a school’s cohort only if he or she enrolls in another institution that offers an accredited high school diploma, emigrates out of the country, or passes away.¹ Each year, the four-year graduation rate will be calculated based on the appropriate cohort. Then, that rate will be supplemented by the additional graduates from that year who fell into the five- or six-year cohort. ESSA requires that the five- and six-year rates be given less weight than the four-year rate. However, the Task Force felt strongly that graduation is important at any time and wanted to incentivize schools to continue to work with all students to meet the graduation requirements. Therefore, the weight is set at 0.85 and 0.50 for five- and six-year rates, respectively. The OSDE will also monitor the use of the six-year graduation rate, and if it appears to be providing perverse incentives to delay graduation, the use of that rate for this indicator will be restricted to students with disabilities who are entitled by their IEP to additional years of schooling.

Continuing the above example, the four-year rate for the graduation year 2017 will be calculated first. Then, the percentage of students who graduated in 2017 who were ninth-

¹ Note that although an exit for homeschooling is not considered a dropout on the Annual Dropout Report, it is considered a non-graduate for purposes of calculating the four-year graduation rate. The same is true for students who exit to receive their GED or to go to any other institution that does *not* grant a high school diploma.

graders in the 2012-2013 school year will be calculated, multiplied by 0.85 and added to the four-year rate. Finally, the percentage of students who graduated in 2017 who were ninth-graders in the 2011-2012 school year will be calculated, multiplied by 0.70, and added to the four-year + five-year rate, for the final 2017 graduation rate.

ELPA Progress

Dr. Gary Cook attended the first Task Force meeting and presented a plan for measuring progress on the English language proficiency assessment, WIDA ACCESS 2.0. The idea is that students should be able to exit an English language development program within five years, depending on their starting point. This approach assumes that a year’s worth of learning should result in growth of one performance level on WIDA. Thus, a student who starts at Level 1 will have five years to exit the program, while a student who starts at level 3 will have three years to exit the program. Figure 4 provides an example of four students following this rule.




Figure 4. Growth to target for ELPA

As seen in Figure 4, each kindergarten student has a trajectory allowing him or her to exit the program in 2–5 years depending on his or her starting point. A similar graph would be created for each grade. Based on these expectations, all ELs would either make their annual target or not. The measure of ELPA progress will be the percentage of students making their target. Clearly, this indicator requires two years of data, so only students who have been in the United States two years or longer will be included.

An important note is that students who are reclassified as non-EL will remain in the EL calculations for four years after exiting as allowed under ESSA rules and regulations.

Additionally, ELs are not included in the subject-specific indicators until they have been in the country two years. They should take the assessments the first year for purposes of establishing a baseline, but the scores should not count in the school’s rating. The second year, these newly entered students will be added to the rating for the growth metric only. Once the students have been in the United States for three years, they will be fully included in all achievement indicators for a school and district.

Chronic Absenteeism

There is a fair amount of research demonstrating a relationship between chronic absenteeism and future success, and recently, The Hamilton Project at the Brookings Institution released a report recommending states adopt chronic absenteeism as the “fifth indicator” of student success and school quality (Schanzenbach, Bauer & Mumford, 2016). Chronic absenteeism is defined as missing 10% or more days of school. Thus, for a student enrolled for the full academic year, missing 10% of the school year would result in missing 18 days, or almost a full month of schooling. Research shows that students who are chronically absent in sixth grade are much less likely to graduate high school on time, if at all (BERC, 2011). Similarly, chronic absence in kindergarten was associated with lower academic performance in first grade (Balfanz & Byrnes, 2012).

All students enrolled in school since January 2 should be included in this indicator for that school year. However, for students enrolled for less than the full academic year, the 10% threshold will result in fewer than 18 days that can be missed before the student is considered chronically absent.

Design Decisions

ESSA requires a summative rating for all schools, and Oklahoma has a history of categorizing all schools by grades A–F. Thus, each of the various indicators was given weights and summed to create an index. The weights are shown in Figures 5 and 6. For elementary and middle schools, equal weight has been given to status and growth, with status focused on each student meeting a targeted scale score and status based on a value table organized around the achievement levels. Oklahoma will also continue with the practice of using 10 as the minimum n size.

No.	Indicator	Points possible	Points earned	Percentage (earned/possible)	Weight	Total
I a.	ELA status (with progress targets)	# students with ELA score	# students meeting goal		15	
I b.	Math status (with progress targets)	# students with math score	# students meeting goal		15	
I c.	Science status (with progress targets)	# students with science score	# students meeting goal		5	

	targets)					
2a.	ELA growth	Highest value on table	Value table average		15	
2b.	Math growth	Highest value on table	Value table average		15	
3.	ELPA progress	# of ELs in US for more than one year	# of ELs meeting goal		15	
4.	Chronic absenteeism	# students enrolled	# students NOT missing 10% of school days		10	

Figure 5. Indicators and weights for elementary and middle school accountability index

Each school enters the data in the appropriate column, multiplies by the weights shown, and then enters the final numbers in the far right-hand column. Summing the final numbers will produce a score between 0–90 to deter “percent-correct” thinking. It was determined by carefully considering the relative weight of each indicator. Then a rubric was developed with the intent of spreading the grades across schools in such a way that the majority of schools would be rated with a grade of B, C, or D, reserving grades A and F for the best and worst schools. As the distribution of grades shifts and schools improve, the rubric will need to change to reflect OSDE goals of continuing improvement. When at least 60% of Oklahoma schools are scoring at the A or B level, the rubric will be adjusted so that 62 points is needed for a B and 78 points is needed for an A.

The initial rubric converting the scores to grades is proposed as follows:

- A. > 70
- B. 57–70.00
- C. 43–56.99
- D. 30–42.99
- F. < 30

If, however, schools have fewer than 10 ELs across all grades, they will not have a score for that part of the index, making their total possible points 75. A second rubric was developed for this scenario:

- A. > 60
- B. 47–60.00
- C. 38–46.99
- D. 25–37.99
- F. < 25

Notice that this rubric does not simply subtract 15 points from every category. The goal was to distribute the weight so that schools with ELs do not feel an undue burden from that population. Instead, strong performance from this group can provide an additional boost to the overall score. Although consideration was given to weighting the ELPA progress indicator differently depending on the proportion of ELs in the school, the decision was made to keep it

static to ensure that every EL had equal consideration regardless if in a school with 30 other students or 300.

In addition, the participation rate will factor into the grade only if it falls below 95% for any student group. Historically, Oklahoma has not had an issue with low participation rates, but incentives are needed to maintain that high bar. Any school with a participation rate below 95% for any student group will have a “minus (-)” placed after its letter grade. The participation rate will also be shown on the report card, with detailed data available by student group.

For high school, the same approach is used and the table only differs by the two indicators: There are no growth measures, but there are indicators for graduation rate and postsecondary opportunities. However, the total points here also sum to 90, so the same rubrics are used, with the same automatic adjustment applied over time. Likewise, any grade could be adjusted downward by adding a “minus (-)” after the letter grade if the participation rate falls below 95% for any student group in the school or district. An additional bonus point is available for high schools to promote participation in U.S. History. If 95% of students complete the U.S. History class by 11th grade and if 75% of those students either receive a score of “proficient” or above on the Oklahoma end-of-course assessment or receive college credit for the course, the school will receive one full bonus point added to the final sum.

Figure 6 displays the indicators and weights for high school.

No.	Indicator	Points possible	Points earned	Percentage (earned/possible)	Weight	Total
1a.	ELA status (with progress targets)	# students with ELA score	# students meeting goal		15	
1b.	Math status (with progress targets)	# students with math score	# students meeting goal		15	
1c.	Science status (with progress targets)	# students with science score	# students meeting goal		15	
2.	ELPA progress	# of ELs in US for more than one year	# of ELs meeting goal		15	
3.	Graduation rate	Use state graduation formula to determine percentage			10	
4.	Chronic absenteeism	# students enrolled	# students NOT missing 10% of school days		10	
5.	Postsecondary opportunity (AP/IB/dual enrollment/ internship/apprenticeship/ industry certification)	10% of enrollment	# enrolled in one program		10	

Figure 6. Indicators and weights for high school accountability index

The total points here also sum to 90, so the same rubrics are used. One difference in weights to notice is the variation of science compared to ELA and math. In elementary and middle schools, science is given once each, while ELA and math are given in grades 3–8. Since science is given one-third as often as ELA and math, it is weighted at one-third of their weight. In high school, however, all three subjects are given once, so they have all been weighted the same. An example of calculations for an elementary school and a high school is provided in Appendix C.

Identifying Schools and Districts

Elementary and middle schools that earn an F or have the lowest 5% of overall points in the state (if fewer than 5% of schools earn an F) will be categorized as comprehensive support schools. Schools with the lowest achievement for one or more student groups, but not in the lowest 5% overall, will be identified for targeted support. The growth rating will be considered as a key indicator for exiting these support designations. “A” schools with no large achievement gaps and a participation rate above 95% will be identified as reward schools.

For high schools, the same criteria apply but graduation rates are also a consideration. Based on the federal regulations, any high school with a graduation rate less than 67% must be identified as needing comprehensive support and improvement. Likewise, if one or more student groups has a graduation rate significantly below the others and less than 67%, the school is eligible to be targeted for support and intervention. A reward school must have an overall graduation rate of at least 85% with no student group falling below 75%.

Note that participation rate does not factor into the identification of comprehensive and targeted support schools. It will be included, however, as a requirement for exiting that status. Schools will need to show improvement in achievement and graduation rates for all students while measuring at least 95% of their student population.

Reports

The Task Force examined report cards from several states and chose Ohio as the model. (A sample Ohio school report card is shown in Appendix B.) However, the group felt more information would be gained by providing comparative information about each indicator rather than simply displaying an icon as Ohio does. Each school will have six to seven indicators, depending on whether they have a sufficient EL population to produce the ELPA indicator. Each indicator will be shown on a dashboard with an overall rating for the school displayed in the header. For each indicator, the measure will show that school's performance, the performance of like schools, the performance of the district, and the performance of the state. The target for the indicator will be clearly displayed, and a grade given for each indicator.

Figure 7 shows an example of how data for each indicator would be displayed.




Figure 7. Sample indicator for the school report card

Similar to the interactive report card system in Ohio, Oklahoma's system would also allow users to drill down to see more information. For example, they could click on "my school" and see the breakdown by student group.

Overall, there will be more information in the school report cards than what counts for accountability. As required by ESSA, there will be information on per-student expenditures, NAEP (National Assessment of Educational Progress) results, participation rates, and

professional qualification of educators. Additionally, all indicators will have information disaggregated by student groups in the detail data.

Importantly, not all data will be available to incorporate into the report card in 2017. With the first year of a new assessment in grades 3–8, there will be no growth data, only status. Likewise, 2017 is the final year of the grade 10 assessment, and the nationally recognized high school assessment will not be required until 2018. Therefore, in 2017, the report card will be designed as if it was final and display data for all possible indicators, but no summative grade will be calculated. As shown in the Ohio example in Appendix B, the spot for the summative grade will display “Coming in 2018” instead. To support the districts and schools during this transition, information about growth targets will be provided, demonstrating to each school how they need to perform in 2018 to hit their targets.

Validation

As described earlier, all accountability systems should be continuously monitored and evaluated. Prior to implementing this system statewide, OSDE will work with a few districts to apply this system to their schools to determine their rating and discuss the face validity of that rating. The rubric could be adjusted accordingly. The second year of the system (2018) will be the first year a growth metric is available and the first year the system can be implemented as intended. The Task Force will reconvene at that point to examine the list of A and F schools to see if they are aligned with the differentiations intended by this system.

Of particular interest to watch over time is the status indicator. Should it be readjusted if students continually fail to meet the targeted increase in scores? That should not be necessary for the first three years, but it will be worth watching.

In addition, other indicators were discussed by the Task Force and designated as indicators of interest to add in future years. As the system stabilizes, OSDE could adjust indicators such as social studies status, school climate surveys, or teacher professional development activities. Furthermore, working with the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and the business community, OSDE may be able to collect data on students’ postsecondary activities that could be used to inform high school ratings.

Further Work

This report primarily addresses the methodology for grading schools and determining which schools should be identified for comprehensive and targeted support. It does not explore school improvement models to implement for those schools. Further work is needed to support the districts with identified schools and determine effective remediation strategies.

Additionally, this plan is based on outdated data. Oklahoma will be implementing new assessments with a new scale and new cut scores in grades 3–8 and a new college-ready assessment in high school. All of the baseline data will need to be calculated and targets set once those data become available. The Task Force will need to continue to meet to discuss the values in the value table and elements of the report card, as well as review the goals and interim targets once data become available.

Finally, additional work is ongoing for non-traditional schools. Those include virtual schools, very small schools, and K–2 schools. Not all of these measures work for such schools, but no school will be excused from the accountability system. A separate group is working to develop rules for these schools that maintain the goals of this system.

This report is intended as a blueprint to construct the accountability system. It is the process that is recommended for adoption here, not the final numbers.

Conclusion

The conversations that occurred among Task Force members, assessment and accountability experts, and the OSDE resulted in a cohesive system developed with the goal of preparing students for college and careers. The system begins with a fairly simple list of indicators that meets the requirements of both HB 3218 and ESSA. Other indicators could be developed, validated, and added to the index over time. The first goal, however, is to establish a system that is reliable and valid and that Oklahoma stakeholders believe provides meaningful data to differentiate among our schools. The Task Force will continue to meet as more data become available to review the details of each measure and work on the accountability report card. The consistent monitoring will help ensure the system is transparent and understandable to all stakeholders.

References

- AERA, APA, & NCME. (2014). *Standards for Educational and Psychological Testing*. Washington, DC: AERA.
- Baltimore Education Research Consortium (BERC; 2011). *Destination Graduation: Sixth Grade Early Warning Indicators for Baltimore City Schools: Their Prevalence and Impact*. Baltimore, MD: author.
- Balfanz, R. & Byrnes, V. (2012). *Chronic absenteeism: Summarizing what we know from nationally available data*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools.
- Carlson, D. (2002). The focus of state educational accountability systems: Four methods of judging school quality and progress. In W. J. Erpenbach et al., *Incorporating multiple measures of student performance into state accountability systems—A compendium of resources* (pp. 285-297). Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Education Commission of the States. (2014). *Rating states, grading schools: What parents and experts say states should consider to make school accountability systems meaningful*. Denver, CO: author.
- Gong, B. & ASR SCASS. (2002). *Designing school accountability systems: Toward a framework and process*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Hanushek, E. & Raymond, M. (2002). Sorting out accountability systems. In W. Evers & H. Walberg (Eds.) *School accountability* (pp. 75-104). Palo Alto, CA: Stanford University, Hoover Press.
- Hill, R., Gong, B., Marion, S, DePascale, C., Dunn, J., & Simpson, M. (2005). Using value tables to explicitly value student growth. Downloaded October 22, 2016 from http://www.nciea.org/publications/MARCES_RH07.pdf.
- King, J. (2016, August) Policing and race relations. Downloaded November 15, 2016, from <https://www.c-span.org/video/?413600-1/loretta-lynch-john-king-discuss-policing-race-relations>.
- Linn, R. (2001). *The design and evaluation of educational assessment and accountability systems*. [Technical Report 539]. Los Angeles, CA: National Center for Research on Evaluation, Standards, and Student Testing.
- Perie, M., Park, J., & Klau, K. (2007). *Key elements for educational accountability models*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers. Downloaded August 1, 2016, from [http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/Key Elements for Educational Accountability Models.html](http://www.ccsso.org/Resources/Publications/Key_Elements_for_Educational_Accountability_Models.html).
- Schanzenbach, D., Bauer, L., & Mumford, M. (2016). *Lessons for broadening school accountability under the Every Student Succeeds Act*. Washington, DC: Brookings.
- U.S. Department of Education (2015). *Non-regulatory guidance for states for meeting requirements of the Elementary and Education Act of 1965, as amended*. U.S. Department of Education. Washington, D.C.

Appendix A: Invited Task Force Members

Name	Organization	Title
Hofmeister, Joy	State Dept. Education	State Superintendent of Public Instruction
Dunlap, Katie Dr.	State Dept. Education	Deputy Superintendent of Assessment and Accountability
Tamborski, Michael Dr.	State Dept. Education	Executive Director of Accountability
Walker, Craig	State Dept. Education	Executive Director of State Assessments
Barnes, Lynn	Oklahoma City Public Schools	Sr. Executive Director of Curriculum & Federal Programs
Bax, Benjamin	American Federation of Teachers	Field Representative
Baxter, Leo J.	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Bendick, Debbie Dr.	Edmond Public Schools	Assoc. Superintendent
Best, Mary	American Federation of Teachers	President
Bishop, Katherine	Oklahoma Education Association	Vice President
Blanke, Debbie Dr.	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	Academic Affairs
Burchfield, Rocky	Fairview Public Schools	Superintendent
Burk, Jana	Tulsa Public Schools	Executive Director of Teacher/Leadership Effectiveness Initiative
Bushey, Brent	Oklahoma Public School Resource Center	Executive Director
Buswell, Robert	Office of Educational Quality and Accountability	Director of Educational Accountability
Caine, Ann	Oklahoma State School Boards Association	Director of Education Leadership
Capps, Staci	Byng Public Schools	Curriculum Director/Grant Developer
Casey, Dennis Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Charney, Randee	Research Associate	Schusterman Family Foundation
Choate, Tony	Chickasaw Nation	Media Relations
Cobb, Rick	Mid-Del Schools	Superintendent
Condit, Donnie Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Cook, H. Gary Dr.	University of Wisconsin	Associate Scientist, Expert in Assessment and Accountability, E.L.L.
Cooper, Donna	Choctaw Nicoma Park Schools	Asst. Superintendent
D'Brot, Juan Dr.	Center for Assessment	Senior Associate, Expert in Assessment and Accountability
DeBacker, Terri Dr.	University of Oklahoma College of Education	Assoc. Dean

Name	Organization	Title
Dossett, J.J. Sen.	Oklahoma Senate	Oklahoma Senator
Dugan, Drew	Greater Oklahoma City Chamber of Commerce	Vice President
Dunlop, Janet Dr.	Broken Arrow Public Schools	Assoc. Superintendent
Dunn, Kathy	Mid-Del Schools	Asst. Superintendent for Teaching and Learning
Elam, Mary Dr.	Oklahoma City Public Schools	Senior Research Associate, Planning, Research, and Evaluation Dept.
Fedore, Stephen	Tulsa Public Schools	Director of Data Quality and Data Use
Flanagan, William	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Font, Raul	Latino Community Dev. Agency	CEO/Executive Director
Ford, John Sen.	Oklahoma Senate	Oklahoma Senator
Foster, Becki	Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education	Associate State Director for Curriculum, Assessment, Digital Delivery and Federal Programs
Franks, Cathryn	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Fulton, Lisa	Ada City Schools	District Test Coordinator
Garn, Gregg A. Dr.	University of Oklahoma	Dean of Education
Grunewald, Angela	Edmond Public Schools	Executive Director of Elementary Education
Guerrero, Julian Jr.	Tribal Education Dept. National Assembly (TEDNA)	Project Director, Native Youth Community Project
Heigl, Brenda	Oklahoma Parent Teacher Association	President
Henke, Katie Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Hernandez, Kristy	Moore Public Schools	Director of Student Services
Hime, Shawn	Oklahoma State School Boards Association	Executive Director
Hooper, Tony	Lawton Public Schools	Director of Accountability and Assessment
House, Sharon	Oklahoma Parents Center, Services for Families of Children with Disabilities	Executive Director
Hutchison, Tony	Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education	Strategic Planning Analysis Workforce and Economic Development
Keating, Daniel	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Lepard, Jennifer	Oklahoma State Chamber	V.P. of Government Affairs
Lester, Erin	Tulsa Public Schools	Director of Educational Indicators
Lora, Aurora	Oklahoma City Public Schools	Superintendent

Name	Organization	Title
Love, Courtney	Oklahoma Virtual Charter Academy	Operations Manager
Mack, Marcie	Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education	State Director
McDaniel, Tracy	KIPP Charter Oklahoma City	Founding School Leader & Principal
Monies, Jennifer	Oklahoma Educated Workforce Initiative	Executive Director
Mouse, Melanie Dr.	Putnam City Schools	Asst. Superintendent
Nollan, Jadine Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Ogilvie, Clark	Owasso Public Schools	Superintendent
Owens, Beecher	Mannford HS	2016 Graduate
Owens, Rick	Lawton Public Schools	Secondary Education
Owens, Ryan	CCOSA	Co-Executive Director/General Counsel; Director Legislative Services
Parks, Tammy	Howe Public Schools	PDC Coordinator
Parrish, Jim	Choctaw Nation	Executive Director of Education
Pennington, David	Ponca City Public Schools	Superintendent
Perie, Marianne Dr.	University of Kansas	Director Center for Assessment and Accountability Research and Design; Expert in Assessment and Accountability
Pittman, Anatasia Sen.	Oklahoma Senate	Oklahoma Senator
Polk, Jamie	Lawton Public Schools	Asst. Superintendent
Price, Bill	Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board Member
Priest, Alicia	Oklahoma Education Association	President
Reavis, Madison	Muskogee HS	2016 Graduate
Riggs, Ruthie	Edmond Public Schools	Assoc. Superintendent
Roberts, Kuma	Tulsa Regional Chamber	Education Program Manager
Roberts, Sarah	Inasmuch Foundation	Senior Program Officer
Rogers, Michael Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Roman Nose, Quinton	Tribal Education Departments National Assembly (TEDNA)	Executive Director, Board of Directors
Ross, Robert	Inasmuch Foundation & Oklahoma State Board of Education	Board of Directors, Board Member
Sadler, Kimberly	Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education	Associate State Director for Curriculum, Assessment, Digital Delivery and Federal Programs
Shirley, Natalie	OK Governor's Office	Secretary of Education and Workforce Dev.
Shouse, Jerrod	Owner	Shouse Consulting







Name	Organization	Title
Simmons, Shirley Dr.	Norman Public Schools	Asst. Superintendent
Sly, Gloria Dr.	Cherokee Nation	Education Liaison Education Services
Stanislawski, Gary Sen.	Oklahoma Senate	Oklahoma Senator
Stoycoff, Zack	Tulsa Regional Chamber	Government Affairs Director
Tatum, Sheryl	Oklahoma Virtual Charter Academy	Head of School
Taylor, Etta	Oklahoma Parent Teacher Association	President Elect
Thompson, Shannon	Moore Public Schools	Dean of Academics
Thomsen, Todd Rep.	Oklahoma House of Representatives	Oklahoma House Representative
Tinney, Ginger	Professional OK Educators	Executive Director
Trent, Sean	Mid-Del Schools	Executive Director of Academic Services & Technology
Viles, Susan	Woodward Schools	District Test Coordinator/RSA Test Coordinator
Weeter, Richard Dr.	Oklahoma City Public Schools	Executive Director of Planning, Research, and Evaluation Dept.
Woodard, Johanna Dr.	Owasso Public Schools	Coordinator of Academic Services
Woodard, Petra	Millwood Public Schools	High School Principal
Yunker, Jake	Oklahoma Governor's Office	Deputy Policy Director

Appendix B: Ohio's School Report Card

2015 - 2016 Report Card for Dublin Scioto High School

SCHOOL GRADE

Coming in
2018

 <p>Achievement The Achievement component represents the number of students who passed the state tests and how well they performed on them.</p> <p>Performance Index C Indicators Met 53.8%..... D</p>	<p>COMPONENT GRADE</p> <p>C</p>	 <p>Progress The Progress component looks closely at the growth that all students are making based on their past performances.</p> <p>Value Added Overall..... A Gifted..... A Students with Disabilities..... D Lowest 20% in Achievement..... A</p>	<p>COMPONENT GRADE</p> <p>B</p>
 <p>Gap Closing The Gap Closing component shows how well schools are meeting the performance expectations for our most vulnerable populations of students in English language arts, math and graduation.</p> <p>Annual Measurable Objectives 45.5%..... F</p>	<p>COMPONENT GRADE</p> <p>F</p>	 <p>Graduation Rate The Graduation Rate component looks at the percent of students who are successfully finishing high school with a diploma in four or five years.</p> <p>Graduation Rates 92.3% of students graduated in 4 years..... B 93.9% of students graduated in 5 years..... B</p>	<p>COMPONENT GRADE</p> <p>B</p>
 <p>K-3 Literacy The K-3 Literacy component looks at how successful the school is at getting struggling readers on track to proficiency in third grade and beyond.</p> <p>K-3 Literacy Improvement NC..... NR</p>	<p>COMPONENT GRADE</p> <p>Not Rated</p>	 <p>Prepared for Success Whether training in a technical field or preparing for work or college, the Prepared for Success component looks at how well prepared Ohio's students are for all future opportunities.</p>	<p>COMPONENT GRADE</p> <p>C</p>

Downloaded from <http://reportcard.education.ohio.gov/Pages/default.aspx>.

Appendix C: Sample A–F Calculations

Elementary School

Total score=62.2 B

No.	Indicator	Points possible	Points earned	Percentage	Weight	Total
1a.	ELA status (with progress targets)	# students with ELA score	# students meeting goal	0.65	15	9.75
1b.	Math status (with progress targets)	# students with math score	# students meeting goal	0.59	15	8.85
1c.	Science status (with progress targets)	# students with science score	# students meeting goal	0.62	5	3.10
2a.	ELA growth	Highest value on table	Value table average	0.67	15	10.05
2b.	Math growth	Highest value on table	Value table average	0.71	15	10.65
3.	ELPA progress	# of ELs in US for more than one year	# of ELs meeting goal	0.68	15	10.20
4.	Chronic absenteeism	# students enrolled	# students NOT missing 18+ days of school	0.96	10	9.60

High School

Total score = 55.9 C

No.	Indicator	Points possible	Points earned	Percentage	Weight	Total
1a.	ELA status (with progress targets)	# students with ELA score	# students meeting goal	.55	15	8.25
1b.	Math status (with progress targets)	# students with math score	# students meeting goal	.42	15	6.30
1c.	Science status (with progress targets)	# students with science score	# students meeting goal	.52	15	7.80
2.	ELPA progress	# of ELs in US for more than one year	# of ELs meeting goal	.75	15	11.25
3.	Graduation rate	Use state grad formula to determine percentage		.92	10	9.20
4.	Chronic absenteeism	# students enrolled	#students NOT missing 18+ days of school	.96	10	9.60
5.	Postsecondary opportunity (AP/IB/dual enrollment/internship/apprenticeship)	10% of enrollment	# enrolled in one program	.35	10	3.50

GRADUATION REQUIREMENTS

Prepared By:
Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE)

Introduction

House Bill 3218 specifically tasks the Oklahoma State Board of Education (OSBE), in consultation with representatives from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education, and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development, to conduct a study and develop assessment requirements in five areas, including:

“Establishment of a multimeasures approach to high school graduation. For purposes of this paragraph, “multimeasures” may include but are not limited to designated statewide assessments, alternative assessments, local performance assessments, nationally recognized assessments, assessment performance bands, grades, and course records.”

In developing the requirements, the OSBE was charged with providing reasonable opportunity for public comment from a variety of representatives and organizations. To that end, the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) solicited feedback at its annual EngageOK Conference sites in Broken Arrow, Sallisaw, Durant, Edmond, Woodward, and Lawton and from the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force, Superintendents Advisory Council and the Teaching and Learning Advisory Council.

College and Career Ready Definition

In developing new graduation requirements, it was important that the OSDE establish the value of a high school diploma and therefore adopted the following definition for college and career readiness:

College and career ready means that students graduate from high school prepared to enter and succeed in postsecondary opportunities, whether college or career.

Graduation requirements should support this vision and identify students’ demonstration of the preparedness and skills defined in our college and career ready definition.

Goals for New Graduation Requirements

In adopting new graduation requirements, the OSDE’s recommendations will provide value, access, and equity for all students.

- **Value**
 - Student is engaged and finds relevance in learning; and
 - Student learning is validated and valued.
- **Access**
 - Each student’s learning is personalized to his or her needs and interests;
 - Each student is supported by a caring, responsible adult; and
 - Students have access to high-quality course content.

- **Equity**
 - Students' opportunity to learn is equitable; and
 - Student learning is relevant and rigorous in order to prepare him or her for college and career.

Blueprint for College Readiness

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) *Blueprint for College Readiness* provides a framework describing policy goals, challenges, and opportunities that define the multiple education reform efforts related to building an improved education pipeline and improving student success.

The two forces driving state and federal policymaking are:

1. Improving the college and career readiness of graduating high school students; and
2. Decreasing remedial education and improving the rate of students who earn a degree or credential (ECS, 2014).

Below are the ECS framework policy goals designed to improve student success in postsecondary opportunities. Oklahoma has current policy supporting each of these identified goals in order to prepare Oklahoma students to be college and career ready.

ECS Policy Goals	Current Oklahoma Policy
Ensure exposure to college and career readiness content.	✓
Help student achieve college and career readiness before high school graduation.	✓
Align statewide high school minimum graduation requirements with statewide minimum higher education admission standards.	✓
Increase number of high school graduates entering postsecondary institutions.	✓
Introduce early interventions for high school students not meeting graduation and college readiness standards by 11 th grade.	✓
Include multiple measures to determine a student's college and career readiness.	✓
Provide competency-based options to show proficiency in course requirements.	✓

In order to effectively meet the policy goals, Oklahoma is continuing to support student transitions and decisions which include:

- College and career advising throughout the student's high school experience, including an Individual Career Academic Plan (ICAP);
- Content acceleration, including dual enrollment, advanced placement, concurrent enrollment, and career academies;
- College readiness standards communicated to students, PK-12 schools, parents, and the public; and

- Evidence-based remediation to successfully progress to and through college-level mathematics and English courses.

Recommendations

Multi-Measure Approach to High School Graduation Requirements

- Ensure continued alignment of Oklahoma’s graduation course requirements with Oklahoma college admission course requirements;
- Administer college and career ready assessment (CCRA) to all students in their junior year;
- Require students to take all required state and federal assessments;
- Phase in Individual Career Academic Plans (ICAP)* beginning in 2017-2018 school year; and
- Explore a system of advanced diplomas based on a review of research

*Individual Career Academic Plan Phase-In

2017-2018	Pilot Individual Career Academic Plan for grades 6-12 Study Lessons Learned Establish ICAP Advisory
2018-2019	Continue ICAP Pilot with Additional Districts/Schools Study Lessons Learned Convene Quarterly ICAP Advisory Meetings
2019-2020	Require all high schools to implement ICAP beginning with 9 th -grade cohort

Individual Career Academic Plan (ICAP)

The Individual Career Academic Plan is a multi-year process that intentionally guides students as they explore career, academic, and postsecondary opportunities. Beginning with the family and student involvement in the ICAP process and with support from educators, students develop the awareness, knowledge, and skills to create their own meaningful pathways to be career and college ready.

The ICAP process helps students consider a future career and helps them design the way to get there. Students have an opportunity to determine their interests and passions and ways to explore and experience career opportunities. With increased knowledge, students – with family and educator support – can create their individual career pathway to success.

Why Is the Individual Career Academic Plan Valuable?

Life beyond high school requires different competencies than in the past. Most jobs in Oklahoma now and in the future require training or education beyond high school. Students who graduate and work in Oklahoma will need in-demand skills that meet business, industry, and higher education standards.

By 2025, three out of four jobs in Oklahoma will require education or training beyond high school. (See Figure 1.) When students complete a meaningful ICAP, they will discover which

pathways fit their unique talents and what kind of academic preparation and experiences will prepare them for in-demand careers now and in the future.


ICAP will give students ownership of a process to help them explore their unique talents and aspirations, participate in career and postsecondary options, and create pathways to financial success after high school.

When students complete a meaningful ICAP process, they will:

1. Connect the relevance of education to their future goals;
2. Create secondary and postsecondary course plans to pursue their career and life goals;
3. Select a postsecondary pathway more strategically to align with self-defined career, college, and life goals; and
4. Establish better communication and engagement between their school and home; and
5. Understand and demonstrate career exploration and career planning.

When students take the initiative to complete a meaningful ICAP, they will find out which pathway(s) fit their learning styles and their unique talents, which careers ignite their imagination, and what kind of training and academic experiences will prepare them for in-demand jobs and those that may not exist when they graduate from high school.

Figure 1.



What Is an Individual Career Academic Plan?

An Individual Career Academic Plan has a strong, intentional connection with readiness for career and college. An ICAP includes several areas of consideration to identify student interests, skills, postsecondary and workforce goals, and experiences that lead to a meaningful plan that identifies the progress needed to prepare students for college, career, and life.

Areas to Include in Individual Career Academic Plan:

- Career and college interest surveys;
- Written postsecondary and workforce goals and information of progress toward those goals;
- Scores on assessments (required state and federal assessments and college and career ready assessment);
- Experiences in service learning and/or work environments including but not limited to apprenticeships, internships, mentorships, and job shadowing;
- Intentional sequence of courses that reflect progress toward the postsecondary goal (this may include identified career pathways or career endorsements); and
- Academic progress.

How Will the Individual Career Academic Plan Process Be Implemented?

Schools and districts will pilot the ICAP program in the 2017-2018 and 2018-2019 school year, moving to implementation during the 2019-2020 school year. Students may start the ICAP process in sixth grade and must update the ICAP every year. With the guidance of adults, including their parents, students will build their ICAP.

Students, families, school counselors, educators, and school leaders can access an online tool to create their ICAP. Oklahoma has two free online tools to help guide students on their ICAP journey. Through the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education *OK Career Guide* and the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education *OK College Start*, students and their families can access an ICAP online. The Oklahoma State Department of Education is working with these partners to include elements in their online tools so that students have a meaningful ICAP.

Beginning in 2017-2018, districts/schools are invited to work with existing programs to identify opportunities and challenges with building ICAPs beginning with students in 6th grade. In addition, the OSDE will establish an ICAP Advisory Council to meet regularly to determine best practices, lessons learned, and ways to provide professional development for everyone engaged in the ICAP process.


Individual Career Academic Plan Advisory Council

The ICAP advisory will include stakeholders from across the state who will be charged with valid, reliable, meaningful implementation. In pursuit of this effort, the advisory council will:

- Identify opportunities, challenges, and best/promising practices;
- Develop implementation recommendations;

- Explore and outline resources and tools;
- Align skills, abilities, and knowledge that are valued by business, industry, career technology, and higher education;
- Outline systematic pathways for students to explore and develop these skills;
- Identify stakeholder connections and messages;
- Maintain a written record of implementation recommendations, tools, and resources, best/promising practices, and relevant discussions; and
- Conduct a survey to gauge the status of ICAP in districts across the state.

Figure 2.



Source: Individual Learning Plans (U.S. Department of Labor, Fall 2016)

Definitions of ICAP Basics

Self-Awareness — Provide interest inventories for students to identify talents and aspirations that play a role in decision-making as students and families complete an ICAP.

Career Awareness — Articulate a wide range of local, regional, national, and global career pathways and opportunities.

Postsecondary Aspirations — Participate in career exploration activities centered on students' passions, interests, dreams, and visions of their future options.

Postsecondary Options — Make students aware of and encourage participation in a variety of postsecondary and career opportunities, using tools such as career clusters and learning style inventories to highlight individual strengths and interests.

Academic Planning — Apply the skills and knowledge necessary to map out and pass the academic courses required to achieve postsecondary goals.

Employability Skills — Define, develop, and hone skills that increase the likelihood of becoming and remaining successfully employed and civically responsible citizens.

References

- Bangser, M. (2009). National High School Center. *Preparing High School Students for Successful Transitions to Postsecondary Education and Employment*. USDE.
- Barnett, E.A., Fay, M.P. Pheatt, L. (January 2016). *Implementation of High School to College Transition Courses in Four States*. Community College Research Center, Columbia University.
- Bromberg, M. and Theokas, C. (April 2016). *Meandering Toward Graduation*. Education Trust. Washington, D.C.
- Colorado Department of Education and Colorado Department of Higher Education. (December 2014). *The High School Graduation Initiative. ICAP Toolkit*. CO. Retrieved from www.cde.state.co.us/postsecondary/icap.
- Darling-Hammond, L., Rustique-Forrester, E., & Pecheone, R.L. (2005). *Multiple Measures Approaches to High School Graduation*. Stanford, CA: School Redesign Network, Stanford University.
- Education Commission of the States (2014). *Developmental Strategies for College Readiness and Success. Countdown to 2015*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. www.ecs.org/docs/DevEdStratgies/pdf.
- Glancy, E. Fulton, M. Anderson, L. Dounay Zinth, J. and Millard, M. (2014). *Blueprint for College Readiness: A 50 – State Policy Analysis*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from <http://www.ecs.org/docs/BlueprintforCollegeReadiness.pdf>.
- SREB Policy Brief. (January 2013). *Essential Elements of State Policy for College Completion*.
- Symonds, W.C., R.B. Schwartz and R. Ferguson. *Pathways to Prosperity: Meeting the Challenge of Preparing Young Americans for the 21st Century*. Report issued by the Pathways to Prosperity Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education, February 2011.
- The College Board, National Office for School Counselor Advocacy. (2010). *Eight Components of College and Career Readiness Counseling*. New York, NY: The College Board. Retrieved from http://advocacy.collegeboard.org/sites/default/files/10b_2217_EightComponents_WEB_100625.pdf.
- United States Department of Labor – Office of Disability Employment Policy (Fall 2016). *Individualized Learning Plans Across the U.S.* Retrieved from <https://www.dol.gov/odep/ilp/map/>.

REMEDICATION AND INTERVENTIONS

Prepared By:
Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE)

Introduction and Purpose of This Report

House Bill 3218 specifically tasks the Oklahoma State Board of Education (OSBE), in consultation with representatives from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education, and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development, to conduct a study and develop assessment requirements in five areas, including:

“A determination of the performance level on the assessments at which students will be provided remediation or intervention and the type of remediation or intervention to be provided.”

In developing the requirements, the OSBE was charged with providing reasonable opportunity for public comment from a variety of representatives and organizations. To that end, the Oklahoma State Department of Education (OSDE) solicited feedback at its annual EngageOK Conference sites in Broken Arrow, Sallisaw, Durant, Edmond, Woodward, and Lawton and from the Oklahoma Assessment and Accountability Task Force, Superintendents Advisory Council and the Teaching and Learning Advisory Council.

Oklahoma’s current challenge is that a significant number of students need remediation as they enter postsecondary education. The remediation rate in Oklahoma was 38.9% for students taking at least one developmental course during the 2014-2015 school year, while the remediation rate for mathematics was 34.3%. (See Table 1.) A focus on remediation while students are in high school can ensure that students are prepared for success in college and career. In response, the OSDE is piloting the SREB (Southern Regional Education Board) Math Ready Course — discussed in more detail later in this report — for the 2016-2017 school year in partnership with the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and the Oklahoma Department of Career and Technology Education.

Table 1.

Number and Percent of Fall, First-Time Freshmen Enrolled in Developmental Courses by Subject Area (2014-2015)

Tier	Number of Fall 2014 First-Time Freshmen	Number of Fall 2014 First-Time Freshmen (unduplicated) Enrolled in At Least One Developmental Education Course During the 2014-15 Academic Year	Percent of Fall 2014 First-Time Freshmen Taking At Least One Developmental Course During the 2014-15 Academic Year	Students* Taking at Least One Developmental English Course During 2014-15		Students* Taking at Least One Developmental Math Course During 2014-15		Students* Taking at Least One Developmental Science Course During 2014-15		Students* Taking at Least One Developmental Reading Course During 2014-15	
				N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Research	8,893	693	7.8%	90	1.0%	536	6.0%	16	0.2%	158	1.8%
Regional	8,057	3,527	43.8%	1,353	16.8%	3,138	38.9%	147	1.8%	748	9.3%
Liberal Arts	169	51	30.2%	10	5.9%	45	26.6%	13	7.7%	0	0.0%
Community	15,056	8,252	54.8%	3,844	25.5%	7,308	48.5%	167	1.1%	1,681	11.2%
State System	32,175	12,523	38.9%	5,297	16.5%	11,027	34.3%	343	1.1%	2,587	8.0%

Note: Some reading developmental education is reported as English developmental education and vice-versa.

*Unduplicated annual headcount within each subject because some students enrolled in the same developmental course more than once or in more than one developmental course per subject area.

Source: Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, Remediation Report, May 2016

Blueprint for College Readiness

The Education Commission of the States (ECS) *Blueprint for College Readiness* provides a framework describing policy goals, challenges, and opportunities that define multiple education reform efforts related to building an improved education pipeline and improving student success.

The two forces driving state and federal policymaking are:

1. Improving the college and career readiness of graduating high school students; and
2. Decreasing remedial education and improving the rate of students who earn a degree or credential (ECS, 2014).

Oklahoma will provide opportunities for students with academic deficits to receive the interventions and remediation they need to successfully progress to and through college-level math and English courses by:

- Communicating college readiness standards to students, K-12 schools, parents, and the public;
- Providing remediation opportunities for students to successfully progress to and through college-level math and English courses; and
- Expanding advising to support student transitions and decisions.

Interventions and Remediation

The OSDE will provide list of resources and information for districts and schools so that they can deliver evidence-based interventions and remediation through:

- Early intervention initiatives to address remedial needs at all grade levels;
- Alignment of course rigor at the high school and postsecondary levels, including but not limited to concurrent enrollment, dual enrollment, career academies, and Advanced Placement coursework; and
- High school transition courses that provide remediation in high school in order to prepare for success in postsecondary entry-level courses.

Recommendations

- After administration of the 2016-2017 assessments, the OEQA (Office of Educational Quality and Accountability) will make recommendations to define performance levels for the assessments. Based on those levels, the OSDE will provide the aforementioned opportunities and resources to students and school districts for students needing interventions and remediation;
- Beginning in the 2017-2018 school year, the OSDE will pilot the SREB Math Ready Senior Transition Course;
- As required by the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the OSDE will share evidence-based practices for interventions and remediation for schools to use – particularly for the lowest-performing schools – in formulating school improvement plans; and
- The OSDE will continue to implement the Reading Sufficiency Act and provide schools with training and resources for early literacy intervention and remediation.

Southern Regional Education Board – Math Ready

The Southern Regional Education Board (SREB) has worked with states to develop Ready for College courses, including **Math Ready**, which schools can use to help prepare students for college-level coursework before they graduate from high school. For more information about SREB Readiness courses, visit <http://www.sreb.org/ready-college>.

The *Math Ready* course emphasizes understanding of mathematics concepts rather than merely memorizing procedures. By engaging students in real-world applications, Math Ready develops critical thinking skills students will use in college and career. For more information about Math Ready, visit <http://www.sreb.org/math-ready>.

“The *Ready for High School* courses offer an earlier intervention, reaching underprepared students as they enter high school, which for many students is the most critical time in their education in determining future success.” (SREB, February 2016)

Evidence-Based Interventions as Required by the Every Student Succeeds Act

The term “evidence-based” appears 58 times throughout ESSA (excluding references to the term in the paragraph which defines evidence-based). The term “evidence-based intervention” is used to govern the use of funds and selection of activities and interventions throughout nearly all major programs of ESEA. One area of note that requires the use of evidence-based activities and interventions includes interventions in schools identified for comprehensive interventions and supports under Title I (as the bottom 5% of schools, those which are graduating less than 67% of their students and those with consistent subgroup underperformance).

The OSDE will provide an evidence-based resource list that is available through the *What Works Clearinghouse – Institute of Education Sciences* for districts to use based on their data and needs assessment as required in the *Every Student Succeeds Act*.

Early Literacy Intervention as Defined in the Oklahoma Reading Sufficiency Act (RSA)

RSA requires that schools give benchmark assessments in kindergarten through third grade to identify students who need intensive intervention in reading, and that schools notify parents in writing about their student’s skill level. Many Oklahoma schools assess pre-kindergarten students in literacy as well to provide early intervention.

As described in the schools’ program of reading instruction, students found not to be reading at grade level must be provided with intensive interventions to remediate their specific areas of reading deficiency. These intervention strategies are defined in statute (70 O.S. §1210.508C(N)(2)) and may include:

- a. Small group instruction;
- b. Reduced teacher-student ratios;
- c. More frequent progress monitoring;
- d. Tutoring or mentoring;

- e. Transition classes containing third- and fourth-grade students;
- f. Extended school day, week, or year; and
- g. Summer reading academies.

The OSDE requires in its administrative rules (210:15-27) a “program of reading instruction” to be based upon a three-tiered Response to Intervention (“RtI”) model that includes:

1. For students identified for Tier I intervention, a minimum of ninety (90) minutes of uninterrupted daily scientific research-based reading instruction.
2. For students identified for Tier II intervention, at least an amount of uninterrupted scientific research-based reading instructional time that is:
 - A. Based on specific student needs;
 - B. Reflects the needed intensity and/or frequency as identified on a screening tool, diagnostic assessment, and/or progress monitoring instrument
 - C. Is determined by the classroom teacher, reading specialist (if available), and building principal
3. For students identified for Tier III intervention, at least forty-five (45) to sixty (60) minutes of additional uninterrupted daily scientific research-based reading instruction in addition to the ninety (90) minutes of uninterrupted daily reading instruction provided under Tier I.

Students in elementary school who have not demonstrated reading proficiency as defined in the RSA law continue to be provided with an individualized reading plan that fulfills the remediation requirements listed above until they can demonstrate reading proficiency.

References

Bangser, M. (2009) National High School Center. *Preparing High School Students for Successful Transitions to Postsecondary Education and Employment*. USDE.

Barnett, E.A., Fay, M.P. Pheatt, L. (January 2016). *Implementation of High School to College Transition Courses in Four States*. Community College Research Center, Columbia University.

Bromberg, M. and Theokas, C. (April 2016). *Meandering Toward Graduation*. Education Trust, Washington, D.C.

Darling-Hammond, L., Rustique-Forrester, E., & Pecheone, R.L. (2005). *Multiple Measures Approaches to High School Graduation*. Stanford, CA: School Redesign Network, Stanford University.

Education Commission of the States (2014). *Developmental Strategies for College Readiness and Success. Countdown to 2015*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the State. www.ecs.org/docs/DevEdStrategies/pdf.

Getting Students Ready for College and Careers: Transitional Senior Mathematics. Southern Regional Education Board, 2010. http://publications.sreb.org/2010/10V26_Senior_Transitional_Math.pdf.

Glancy, E. Fulton, M. Anderson, L. Dounay Zinth, J. and Millard, M. (2014). *Blueprint for College Readiness: A 50 – State Policy Analysis*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Retrieved from <http://www.ecs.org/docs/BlueprintforCollegeReadiness.pdf>.

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education Remediation Report (May 2016). Retrieved from www.okhighered.org/studies-reports/preparation/remediation%20report/14-15-fall-first-time-fresh-by-subject.pdf.

Squires, John. (February, 2016). *SREB Readiness Courses: Preparing Students for Success*. www.Ready@SREB.org.

SREB Policy Brief. (January 2013). *Essential Elements of State Policy for College Completion*.

State College and Career Readiness Initiative: Statewide Transitional Courses for College Readiness. Southern Regional Education Board, 2011. http://publications.sreb.org/2011/11E03_Trans%20CrS_Sum.pdf.

Symonds, W.C., R.B. Schwartz and R. Ferguson. *Pathways to Prosperity: Meeting the Challenge of Preparing Young Americans for the 21st Century*. Report issued by the Pathways to Prosperity Project, Harvard Graduate School of Education, February 2011.

United States Department of Labor – *Individualized Learning Plans Across the U.S.* (Fall 2016). Retrieved from <https://www.dol.gov/odep/ilp/map/>.

What Works Clearinghouse – Institute of Education Sciences. Retrieved from www.ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc.

Zinth, K. and Bush, M. (October 2008.) *High School Remediation*. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

**HOUSE BILL
3218**

An Act

ENROLLED HOUSE

BILL NO. 3218

By: Hickman, Casey, Strohm,
 Brumbaugh, Martin, Derby,
 Osborn, Johnson, Bennett,
 Walker, Ownbey, Newell,
 Rogers, Faught, Pfeiffer,
 Murdock, Jordan, Cockroft,
 Henke, Kannady, Wallace,
 Wright, Mulready, Banz,
 Leewright, Nollan, Coody
 (Ann), Kirby, Biggs,
 Cleveland, Christian, Hall,
 Dunlap, Caldwell, Roberts
 (Dustin), O'Donnell,
 McCullough, Moore, Condit,
 Wood, Montgomery, Roberts
 (Sean), McBride, Russ,
 Denney, Thomsen, Billy and
 Sears of the House

and

Bingman, Treat, Smalley,
 Ford, Sparks, Newberry,
 Silk, Fry, Dossett, Brooks,
 Halligan, Crain, Simpson,
 Floyd, Sharp, Standridge,
 Paddack, Thompson, Jech,
 Matthews, Loveless, Quinn,
 Boggs, Pittman, Bice, Holt,
 Allen, Barrington and Brown
 of the Senate

An Act relating to schools; amending 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1-116, as amended by Section 1, Chapter 124, O.S.L. 2014 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1-116), which relates to definitions of positions in a school system; amending 70 O.S. 2011, Section 6-101.3, as last amended by Section 1 of Enrolled House Bill No. 2957 of the 2nd

Session of the 55th Oklahoma Legislature, which relates to teacher definitions; modifying definitions; amending 70 O.S. 2011, Sections 1210.507, as last amended by Section 7, Chapter 430, O.S.L. 2014 and 1210.508, as last amended by Section 8, Chapter 430, O.S.L. 2014 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Sections 1210.507 and 1210.508), which relate to the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act; changing the word test to assessment; requiring the State Board of Education to administer assessments by certain means; authorizing school districts to select the means for administering assessments; directing the Board to adopt a statewide system of student assessments by a certain date; requiring system to be aligned with certain standards; requiring the Board to issue request for proposals for assessments and adopt assessments from selected proposals; providing for administration of selected assessments for a certain period beginning during certain school year; listing certain criteria for assessments; specifying assessment subjects to be administered during certain school years; allowing certain types of assessments to be included in the statewide student assessment system; requiring students to take certain assessments in order to graduate from high school; requiring students to meet certain other high school graduation requirements adopted by the Board; directing school districts to adopt an assessment plan for certain students; directing the Board to promulgate rules to ensure that certain transferred students can be awarded a standard diploma; requiring assessments scores to be reported on the high school transcript of students; modifying remediation requirement; deleting requirement to administer certain criterion-referenced tests; deleting requirement to administer certain end-of-instruction tests; deleting certain retake requirements; deleting requirement to report end-of-instruction test scores on high school transcripts; deleting arts assessment requirements and reports; changing references from criterion-referenced tests and end-of-instruction tests to assessments; adding date for reporting preliminary results; modifying uses of certain data; deleting certain coordination requirement; changing duty of the Board to set the testing window dates; deleting certain testing window requirements; changing date for reporting certain results; deleting authorization to

participate in a multistate or multigovernmental cooperative; requiring the Board to study and develop assessment requirements in conjunction with certain entities; specifying certain criteria to be included in the assessment requirements; requiring an opportunity for public comment; directing the Board to make a report by a certain date; requiring the Board to adopt the assessment requirements by a certain date; making the assessment requirements subject to legislative review; requiring submission of requirements to certain persons by certain date; providing process for legislative review and approval; allowing the Board to revise or adopt new requirements and submit for legislative review; establishing assessment requirements if requirements are not approved; considering requirements final agency rules upon final approval; requiring submission of requirements to the Secretary of State and certain publication; exempting certain joint resolutions from regular legislative cutoff dates; amending 70 O.S. 2011, Sections 1210.508B, as amended by Section 9, Chapter 430, O.S.L. 2014 and 1210.508C, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 364, O.S.L. 2015 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Sections 1210.508B and 1210.508C), which relate to the Reading Sufficiency Act; amending 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.515, as amended by Section 1, Chapter 337, O.S.L. 2013 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.515), which relates to reading ability required for a driver license or permit; amending 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.541, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 163, O.S.L. 2014 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.541), which relates to student performance levels and cut scores; amending 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.545, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 362, O.S.L. 2015 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.545), which relates to annual reports of the Oklahoma School Testing Program; changing references from criterion-referenced tests and end-of-instruction tests to assessments; clarifying statutory language; updating statutory citation; directing the State Department of Education to include certain explanation in school report cards during certain years; requiring the Department to issue school report cards using certain data; repealing 70 O.S. 2011, Sections 1210.506 and 1210.508-1, which relate to the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act; repealing 70

O.S. 2011, Sections 1210.521, 1210.522, 1210.523, as last amended by Section 26, Chapter 4, O.S.L. 2014, 1210.525 and 1210.526, as last amended by Section 2 of Enrolled Senate Bill No. 1105 of the 2nd Session of the 55th Oklahoma Legislature (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.523), which relate to the Achieving Classroom Excellence Act of 2005; providing for noncodification; providing an effective date; and declaring an emergency.

SUBJECT: Education

BE IT ENACTED BY THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA:

SECTION 1. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1-116, as amended by Section 1, Chapter 124, O.S.L. 2014 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1-116), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1-116. As used in this act ~~act~~ title:

1. "Teacher" means any person who is employed to serve as ~~district superintendent, principal, supervisor, a counselor, librarian, school nurse or classroom teacher, or in any other instructional, supervisory, or administrative capacity, is defined as a teacher.~~ Such The person shall not be deemed qualified unless the person holds a valid certificate issued by and in accordance with the rules of the State Board of Education, to perform the particular services for which the person is employed;

2. "Superintendent" or "superintendent of schools" means the executive officer of the board of education and the administrative head of the school system of a district maintaining an accredited school, provided the person holds an administrator's certificate recognized by the State Board of Education;

3. "Principal" means any person other than a district superintendent of schools having supervisory or administrative authority over any school or school building having two or more teachers. A teaching principal shall be a principal who devotes at least one-half (1/2) the time school is in session to classroom teaching. Teaching principals shall be required to hold administrative certificates;

4. "Teachers" means, for purposes of complying with the State Aid Law and other statutes, but not any other provision of law, which apportion money on the basis of teaching units or the number of teachers employed or qualified, all persons holding proper certificates and connected in any capacity with the instruction of pupils;

5. "Resident teacher" means any certified teacher who is employed in a local school to serve as a classroom teacher under the guidance and assistance of a mentor teacher or teachers and residency committee. ~~Any such person~~ A resident teacher shall have completed ~~the program of~~ the college or school of education program of the accredited institution of higher learning from which the ~~person has been~~ resident teacher graduated;

6. "Student teacher" means any student who is enrolled in an institution of higher learning approved by the State Board of Education for teacher training and who is jointly assigned by ~~such~~ the institution of higher learning and a ~~school district's~~ board of education of a school district to perform practice teaching under the direction of a regularly employed and certified teacher. A student teacher, while serving a nonsalaried internship under the supervision of a certified teacher, shall be accorded the same protection of the laws as that accorded the certified teacher;

7. "School nurse" means a person employed full time by a board of education who is a registered nurse licensed by the Oklahoma State Board of Nurse Registration and Nursing Education, and is certified the same as a teacher by the State ~~Department~~ Board of Education. Provided, that any person who is employed as a full-time school nurse in any school district in Oklahoma, ~~but~~ who is not registered on the effective date of this act, may continue to serve in the same capacity; however, such person shall, under rules adopted by the State Board of Education, attend classes in nursing and prepare to become registered.

A school nurse employed by a board of education shall be accorded the same protection of laws and all other benefits accorded a certified teacher; and

8. "Support employee" means an employee who provides those services which are not performed by certified teachers, principals, superintendents or administrators and which are necessary for the efficient and satisfactory functioning of a school district.

SECTION 2. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 2011, Section 6-101.3, as last amended by Section 1 of Enrolled House Bill No. 2957 of the 2nd Session of the 55th Oklahoma Legislature, is amended to read as follows:

Section 6-101.3 As used in Section 6-101 et seq. of this title:

1. "Administrator" means a duly certified person who devotes a majority of time to service as a superintendent, elementary superintendent, principal, supervisor, vice principal or in any other administrative or supervisory capacity in the school district;

2. "Dismissal" means the discontinuance of the teaching service of an administrator or teacher during the term of a written contract, as provided by law;

3. "Nonreemployment" means the nonrenewal of the contract of an administrator or teacher upon expiration of the contract;

4. "Career teacher" means a teacher who:

a. is employed by a school district prior to the 2017-2018 school year and has completed three (3) or more consecutive complete school years as a teacher in one school district under a written continuing or temporary teaching contract, or

b. is employed for the first time by a school district under a written continuing or temporary teaching contract during the 2017-2018 school year and thereafter:

(1) has completed three (3) consecutive complete school years as a teacher in one school district under a written continuing or temporary teaching contract and has achieved a district evaluation rating of "superior" as measured pursuant to the TLE as set forth in Section 6-101.16 of this title for at least two (2) of the three (3) school years,

(2) has completed four (4) consecutive complete school years as a teacher in one school district under a written continuing or temporary teaching

contract, has averaged a district evaluation rating of at least "effective" as measured pursuant to the TLE for the four-year period, and has received district evaluation ratings of at least "effective" for the last two (2) years of the four-year period, or

- (3) has completed four (4) or more consecutive complete school years in one school district under a written continuing or temporary teaching contract and has not met the requirements of subparagraph a or b of this paragraph, only if the principal of the school at which the teacher is employed submits a petition to the superintendent of the school district requesting that the teacher be granted career status, the superintendent agrees with the petition, and the school district board of education approves the petition. The principal shall specify in the petition the underlying facts supporting the granting of career status to the teacher;

5. "Teacher hearing" means the hearing before a school district board of education after a recommendation for dismissal or nonreemployment of a teacher has been made but before any final action is taken on the recommendation, held for the purpose of affording the teacher all rights guaranteed by the United States Constitution and the Constitution of Oklahoma under circumstances and for enabling the board to determine whether to approve or disapprove the recommendation;

6. "Probationary teacher" means a teacher who:

- a. is employed by a school district prior to the 2017-2018 school year and has completed fewer than three (3) consecutive complete school years as a teacher in one school district under a written teaching contract, or
- b. is employed for the first time by a school district under a written teaching contract during the 2017-2018 school year and thereafter and has not met the requirements for career teacher as provided in paragraph 4 of this section;

7. "Suspension" or "suspended" means the temporary discontinuance of the services of an administrator or teacher, as provided by law;

8. "Teacher" means a ~~duly certified person who is employed to serve as a counselor, librarian or school nurse or in any instructional capacity; an administrator shall be considered a teacher only with regard to service in an instructional, nonadministrative capacity~~ defined as a teacher in Section 1-116 of this title; and

9. "District evaluation rating" means the rating issued based on the components of the TLE as set forth in subsection B of Section 6-101.16 of this title.

SECTION 3. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.507, as last amended by Section 7, Chapter 430, O.S.L. 2014 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.507), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1210.507 A. The State Board of Education shall promulgate rules necessary for the implementation and administration of the provisions of the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act.

B. The State Board of Education shall require school district boards of education to annually provide information to the district's students, parents of students, and the public at large about the proper meaning and use of ~~tests~~ assessments administered pursuant to the provisions of the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act. The Department shall develop materials and make them available to school districts regarding the Oklahoma School Testing Program.

C. 1. Students enrolled in an online course or program that is offered by a school district or charter school that is not the district of residence or is not located in the district of residence of the student shall be provided the opportunity to take any ~~test~~ assessment required pursuant to the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act or any other ~~test~~ assessment generally required of students by the school district in which the student is enrolled at an alternative testing location approved by the State Board of Education. The alternative testing locations may be at sites that are not in the school district that is offering the online course or program or the district of residence. Alternative testing locations may include technology center school sites or any other testing location selected by the school district or charter school offering the online course or program. All alternative testing locations

shall be subject to testing location rules promulgated by the State Board of Education. The school district or charter school offering the online course or program shall be responsible for any cost incurred in providing an alternative testing location and any additional cost of administering a ~~test~~ an assessment at an alternative testing location. In order to provide alternative testing locations at geographically dispersed sites, the school district or charter school offering the online course or program shall, at a minimum, provide not less than six alternative testing locations, with at least one location in each quadrant of the state and in each of the two metropolitan areas in the state. Additional alternative testing locations may be provided by the school district or charter school offering the online course or program.

2. The performance of students on any ~~test~~ assessment required pursuant to the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act or any other ~~test~~ assessments generally required of students by the school district who are enrolled full-time in an online program that is offered by a school district or charter school that is not the district of residence or is not located in the district of residence of the student shall be reported separately by the school district or charter school and shall not be included when determining the performance levels of the school district or charter school in the Oklahoma School Testing Program as reported in the Oklahoma Educational Indicators Program.

D. The State Board of Education shall seek to establish and post on the Internet a sample ~~test~~ assessment item bank that will be made available to teachers and will allow them to create and deliver classroom assessments throughout the school year to check for student mastery of key concepts assessed by the ~~riterion-referenced tests~~ assessments administered to students pursuant to the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act. Subject to the availability of funds, the Board shall annually release ~~end-of-instruction test~~ assessment items and make them available to the public.

E. The State Board of Education shall post on the Internet ~~riterion-referenced~~ sample ~~tests~~ assessments for each grade level and subject matter ~~test~~ assessment administered to students pursuant to the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act for the purpose of communicating expectation concerning ~~test~~ the difficulty level and format to teacher, parents and students. The Board shall maintain the sample ~~tests~~ assessments on the Internet throughout the year and, as changes are made in the state academic content standards, shall update the sample ~~tests~~ assessments. The Board shall seek to

expand the number of sample ~~test~~ assessments items each year and to revise ~~test~~ items as needed. The ~~sample tests~~ assessments shall reflect the actual ~~test~~ assessments administered to students and may contain questions used on actual ~~tests~~ assessments given in previous years.

F. The State Board of Education ~~shall seek to~~ may implement an electronic delivery system for all ~~tests~~ assessments administered pursuant to the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act that will allow students to participate in computer-based assessments in order to expedite the delivery and use of the ~~test~~ results. ~~Notwithstanding the requirement to implement online or computer-based assessments as otherwise provided by law, in~~ If the Board implements an electronic delivery system for assessments, the Board shall continue to administer all assessments by another means, including but not limited to printed assessments. If options are available, school districts shall have the authority to select the means of administration of all assessments administered in that district. In circumstances where the administration or delivery of an online or computer-based assessment has been or will be disrupted, delayed or cause problems with student participation, the Board may stop or cancel the online or computer-based assessment and administer the assessment by another means.

SECTION 4. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.508, as last amended by Section 8, Chapter 430, O.S.L. 2014 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.508), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1210.508 A. 1. ~~The~~ By no later than December 31, 2016, the State Board of Education shall ~~develop and administer a series of criterion referenced tests designed to indicate whether the subject matter standards, as defined by the State Board of Education, which Oklahoma public school students are expected to have attained have been achieved. The Board may develop and administer any criterion referenced test in any subject not required by federal law, contingent upon the availability of funding~~ adopt a statewide system of student assessments in compliance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as reauthorized and amended by P.L. No. 114-95, also known as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

2. The statewide student assessment system adopted by the Board pursuant to this subsection shall be aligned with the Oklahoma Academic Standards as adopted by the Board and which prepare students for college and careers.

B. 1. The Board shall issue a request for proposals for the selection of assessments to be administered to students in grades three through twelve as a part of the statewide student assessment system adopted by the Board pursuant to this section.

2. The Board shall adopt assessments from the selected proposals that were submitted pursuant to paragraph 1 of this subsection. The adopted assessments shall be administered by the Board for a period that is in coordination with the six-year subject area textbook adoption cycle unless the vendor does not fulfill the terms of the contract or fails to comply with or violates the terms of the contract. The Board shall administer the assessments beginning with the 2017-2018 school year.

C. The statewide student assessment system adopted by the Board pursuant to this section shall include assessments that:

1. Are aligned with the Oklahoma subject matter standards as adopted by the Board;

2. Provide a measure of comparability among other states;

3. Yield both norm-referenced scores and criterion-referenced scores;

4. Have a track record of statistical reliability and accuracy;
and

5. For assessments administered in high school, provide a measure of future academic performance.

D. For the 2016-2017 school year, the Board shall administer assessments in:

1. English Language Arts or Reading and Mathematics in grades three through eight and at least once in high school, during the grade span of nine through twelve;

2. Science not less than once during each grade span of three through five, six through nine and ten through twelve; and

3. United States History not less than once during the grade span of nine through twelve.

E. 1. Beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, the statewide student assessment system shall include assessments in:

- a. English Language Arts and Mathematics in grades three through eight and at least once in high school, during the grade span of nine through twelve,
- b. Science not less than once during each grade span of three through five, six through nine and ten through twelve, and
- c. United States History not less than once during the grade span of nine through twelve.

2. Beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, the statewide student assessment system may include:

- a. assessments in Reading and Writing in certain grades as determined by the Board, and
- b. contingent upon the availability of funds, an additional nationally recognized college- and career-readiness assessment or assessments as recommended by the State Department of Education which will be administered to students in high school at no cost to the student.

F. 1. Beginning with students entering the ninth grade in the 2017-2018 school year, each student shall take the assessment or assessments included in the statewide student assessment system adopted by the Board pursuant to subsection A of this section in order to graduate from a public high school with a standard diploma. All students shall take the assessment or assessments prior to graduation, unless otherwise exempt by law.

2. Beginning with students entering the ninth grade in the 2017-2018 school year, each student, in addition to taking the assessment or assessments included in the statewide student assessment system adopted by the Board pursuant to subsection A of this subsection, shall meet any other high school graduation requirements adopted by the Board pursuant to Section 5 of this act in order to graduate from a public high school with a standard diploma.

3. For students who start the ninth grade prior to or during the 2016-2017 school year, school districts shall adopt a plan that establishes the assessment or assessments those students are required to take in order to graduate from a public high school with a standard diploma. The plan may also include any or all of the other high school graduation requirements adopted by the Board pursuant to Section 5 of this act that those students will be required to meet in order to graduate from a public high school with a standard diploma.

4. The Board shall promulgate rules to ensure that students who transfer into an Oklahoma school district from out-of-state after the junior year of high school shall not be denied the opportunity to be awarded a standard diploma due to differing testing requirements.

G. In order to provide an indication of the levels of competency attained by the student in a permanent record for potential future employers and institutions of higher education, school districts shall report on the high school transcript of the student the highest-achieved score on the assessment or assessments included in the statewide student assessment system adopted by the Board pursuant to subsection A of this subsection and any business- and industry-recognized endorsements attained.

H. Students who do not perform at least at the proficient a proficiency level on tests assessments shall be remediated as established in the assessment requirements adopted by the Board pursuant to Section 5 of this act, subject to the availability of funding.

~~2. Contingent upon the availability of state and federal funds, the Board, in accordance with federal law, shall administer criterion referenced tests for grades three and four in:~~

- ~~a. reading, and~~
- ~~b. mathematics.~~

~~3. Contingent upon the availability of funds, the Board shall administer criterion referenced tests for grade five in:~~

- ~~a. reading,~~
- ~~b. mathematics,~~

- ~~e. science,~~
- ~~d. social studies, which shall consist of the history, Constitution and government of the United States, and geography, and~~
- ~~e. writing of English.~~

~~4. Contingent upon the availability of state and federal funds, the Board, in accordance with federal law, shall administer criterion referenced tests for grades six and seven in:~~

- ~~a. reading, and~~
- ~~b. mathematics.~~

~~In addition, the Board shall administer a criterion referenced test in geography in grade seven.~~

~~5. Contingent upon the availability of funds, the Board shall administer criterion referenced tests for grade eight in:~~

- ~~a. reading,~~
- ~~b. mathematics,~~
- ~~e. science,~~
- ~~d. social studies, which shall consist of the history, Constitution, and government of the United States, and~~
- ~~e. writing of English.~~

~~The Board shall administer the tests for grade eight in reading and mathematics online with raw score test results reported immediately and complete results reported in less than two (2) weeks beginning in the 2007-08 school year.~~

~~6. Except as otherwise provided for in Section 1210.523 of this title, each student who completes the instruction for English II, English III, United States History, Biology I, Algebra I, Geometry, and Algebra II at the secondary level shall complete an end-of-instruction test, when implemented, to measure for attainment in the appropriate subject matter standards in order to graduate from a~~

~~public high school with a standard diploma. All students shall take the tests prior to graduation, unless otherwise exempt by law. The State Board of Education shall administer the criterion referenced tests. The Board shall develop and field test the end of instruction tests in English III, Geometry, and Algebra II during the 2006-07 school year, implement the tests during the 2007-08 school year, and administer them each year thereafter. The Board shall administer the multiple choice portion of the end of instruction tests online with raw score test results reported immediately and complete results reported in less than two (2) weeks beginning in the 2008-09 school year.~~

~~The end of instruction tests shall serve the purpose of the criterion referenced tests as provided in paragraph 1 of this subsection. The English II and English III end of instruction tests shall include a writing component. Students who do not score at least at the proficient level shall be afforded the opportunity to retake each test up to three (3) times each calendar year until at least achieving at the proficient level. In order to provide an indication of the levels of competency attained by the student in a permanent record for potential future employers and institutions of higher education, for students who enter the ninth grade in or prior to the 2007-08 school year, school districts shall report the highest achieved state test performance level on the end of instruction tests on the student's high school transcript. Beginning with students who enter the ninth grade in the 2008-09 school year, school districts shall report the highest achieved state test performance level on the end of instruction tests and any business and industry recognized endorsements attained on the student's high school transcript. Any student at the middle school level who completes the instruction in a secondary course specified in this paragraph shall be administered the appropriate end of instruction test.~~

- ~~7. a. Each school district shall administer to each student in the school district in grades three through eight an assessment designed to assess the student in the fine arts area in which the student has received instruction.~~
- ~~b. Each school district shall prepare an annual report for approval by the State Board of Education outlining the fine arts assessment strategies used by the district, when the assessments were administered, how~~

~~many students were assessed during the previous year, and the results of the assessments.~~

~~B. I.~~ 1. All ~~critierion referenced tests~~ assessments required by this section shall measure academic competencies in correlation with the subject matter standards adopted by the Board pursuant to Sections 11-103.6 and 11-103.6a of this title and referred to as the Oklahoma Academic Standards. The State Board of Education shall evaluate the subject matter standards to ensure the competencies reflect high standards, are specific, well-defined, measurable, challenging, and will prepare elementary students for next-grade-level course work and secondary students for postsecondary studies at institutions of higher education or technology center schools without the need for remediation. All subject matter standards shall reflect the goals as set forth in Section 11-103.6 of this title and of improving the state average ACT score.

2. The State Department of Education shall annually evaluate the results of the ~~critierion referenced tests~~ assessments. The State Board of Education shall ensure that ~~test~~ preliminary results for all statewide assessments are reported to districts no later than June 1 of each year and are presented in a manner that yields detailed, diagnostic information for the purpose of guiding instruction and student remediation. As improvements are made to the ~~critierion referenced tests~~ assessments required by this section, the Board shall seek to increase the depth of knowledge assessed for each subject. The State Board of Education shall seek to ensure that data yielded from the ~~tests~~ assessments required in this section are utilized at the school district level to prescribe reinforcement and/or remediation by requiring school districts to develop and implement a specific program of improvement based on the test results inform instruction, professional development, school improvement and remediation for students.

3. ~~The State Board of Education in coordination with the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability shall review, realign, and recalibrate, as necessary, the tests in reading and mathematics in third through eighth grade and the end of instruction tests. The Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability shall determine the cut scores for the performance levels on the end of instruction tests developed pursuant to paragraph 6 of subsection A of this section~~ all statewide assessments. The Commission shall conduct an ongoing review to compare the ~~end of instruction test~~ statewide assessment content and performance descriptors with those

of other states. Upon receipt of the review, the Commission may adjust the cut scores as necessary.

4. The State Board of Education, for the purposes of conducting reliability and validity studies, monitoring contractor adherence to professionally accepted testing standards, and providing recommendations for testing program improvement, shall retain the services of an established, independent agency or organization that is nationally recognized for its technical expertise in educational testing but is not engaged in the development of aptitude or achievement tests for elementary or secondary level grades. These national assessment experts shall annually conduct studies of the reliability and validity of the end of instruction tests statewide assessments administered pursuant to this section. Validity studies shall include studies of decision validity and concurrent validity.

~~C. J.~~ 1. The State Board of Education shall set promulgate rules setting the testing assessment window dates for each criterion referenced test required in paragraphs 1 through 5 of subsection A of this section for grades three through eight statewide assessment so that, ~~with the exception of the writing assessments,~~ the tests assessments are administered to students no earlier than April 10 each year according to recommended testing protocols, and so that the test assessment results are reported back to school districts in a timely manner. ~~Each criterion referenced test required in paragraph 6 of subsection A of this section may be administered to students at a time set by the State Board of Education as near as possible to the end of the course; provided, if a school district is unable to administer the tests online to all students taking the test for the first time and all students retaking the test during the testing window time set by the Board,~~ the school district may elect to administer any of the tests to students retaking the test at any time not more than two (2) weeks prior to the start of the testing window time set by the Board. ~~All results and reports of the criterion referenced test series required in paragraphs 1 through 5 of subsection A of this section for grades three through eight shall be returned to each school district prior to the beginning of the next school year.~~ The vendor shall provide a final electronic data file of all school site, school district, and state results to the State Department of Education and the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability prior to ~~September~~ August 1 of each year. The Department shall forward the final data files for each school district and each school site in that district to the school district. The Board shall ensure the contract with the ~~testing~~ vendor includes a provision that the vendor report ~~test~~

assessment results directly to the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability at the same time it is reported to the Board.

2. State, district, and site level results of all ~~tests~~ assessments required in this section shall be disaggregated by gender, race, ethnicity, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in a case in which the number of students in a category is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or the results would reveal personally identifiable information about an individual student. Each school site shall notify the student's parents of the school's performance levels in the Oklahoma School Testing Program as reported in the Oklahoma Educational Indicators Program at the end of each school year.

~~D. K.~~ The State Board of Education shall be responsible for the ~~development, field-testing, and validation of the criterion-referenced test series~~ statewide assessment system required in subsection A of this section. ~~In the interest of economy the Board may participate in a multistate or multigovernmental cooperative pursuant to the requirements of The Oklahoma Central Purchasing Act, but shall not bind the state, contractually or otherwise, to the authority of any other state, organization or entity which may supersede the authority of the Board, for the purpose of adapting criterion-referenced tests, to the extent that such tests are appropriate for use in the testing program to be administered to Oklahoma students.~~

~~E. L.~~ The State Board of Education shall develop, administer, and incorporate as a part of the Oklahoma School Testing Program, other ~~testing~~ assessment programs or procedures, including appropriate accommodations for the ~~testing~~ assessment of students with disabilities as required by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), 20 ~~USE~~ U.S.C., Section 1400 et seq.

~~F. M.~~ For purposes of developing and administering alternate assessments for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities, the State Board of Education shall not be subject to subsections D and E of Section 11-103.6a of this title.

SECTION 5. NEW LAW A new section of law not to be codified in the Oklahoma Statutes reads as follows:

A. The State Board of Education in consultation with the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development shall study and develop assessment requirements which upon final approval shall be implemented in conjunction with the statewide system of student assessments adopted pursuant to Section 1210.508 of Title 70 of the Oklahoma Statutes. In developing the assessment requirements, the State Board of Education in consultation with the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, the Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability, the State Board of Career and Technology Education and the Secretary of Education and Workforce Development shall include:

1. Establishment of a multimeasures approach to high school graduation. For purposes of this paragraph, "multimeasures" may include but are not limited to designated statewide assessments, alternative assessments, local performance assessments, nationally recognized assessments, assessment performance bands, grades and course records;
2. A determination of the performance level on the assessments at which students will be provided remediation or intervention and the type of remediation or intervention to be provided;
3. Establishment of a means for ensuring student accountability on the assessments which may include calculating assessment scores in the final grade or grade-point average of a student;
4. Ways to make the school testing program as set forth in the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act that is in operation as of the effective date of this act more efficient and effective while still achieving the objective of having assessments designed to indicate whether students have attained an understanding of the Oklahoma subject matter standards, including but not limited to, combining different subject area assessments into one assessment, combining different grade-level assessments into one assessment or adding additional subject area assessments; and
5. Establishment of a multimeasures approach to accountability, as required in Section 1210.545 of Title 70 of the Oklahoma Statutes and in accordance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as reauthorized and amended by P.L. No. 114-95, also known as

the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and any federal regulations, and that include, but are not limited to, the following indicators:

- a. statewide assessments including the establishment of student performance bands,
- b. graduation rates for high schools,
- c. statewide academic measures for elementary and middle schools,
- d. English language proficiency for English learners, and
- e. at least one additional statewide measure of school quality or student success, including but not limited to school climate, school safety, student engagement, educator engagement, advanced coursework and postsecondary readiness.

B. In developing the assessment requirements, the Board shall provide reasonable opportunity for public comment, including but not limited to comments from students, parents, educators, organizations representing students with disabilities and English language learners, higher education representatives, career technology education representatives, experts in the areas of assessments and accountability, community-based organizations, Indian tribal representatives and business community representatives.

C. 1. The Board shall make a report of the study of the assessment requirements by October 31, 2016.

2. By January 1, 2017, the Board shall adopt the assessment requirements as studied and developed pursuant to this section. The requirements shall be subject to legislative review as set forth in this section. The assessment requirements shall not be implemented by the Board until the legislative review process is completed as provided for in this section.

3. After adoption of the assessment requirements, the Board shall submit the adopted requirements to the Speaker of the House of Representatives or a designee and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate or a designee on or prior to the first day of the 1st Session of the 56th Oklahoma Legislature.

4. By adoption of a joint resolution, the Legislature shall approve the assessment requirements in whole and with or without instructions or disapprove the requirements in whole and with or without instructions, provided that such joint resolution becomes law in accordance with Section 11 of Article VI of the Oklahoma Constitution. If the joint resolution is vetoed by the Governor in accordance with Section 11 of Article VI of the Oklahoma Constitution and the veto has not been overridden, the requirements shall be deemed disapproved. If the Legislature fails to adopt a joint resolution within thirty (30) calendar days following submission of the assessment requirements, the requirements shall be deemed disapproved.

5. If the assessment requirements are disapproved in whole with or without instructions as provided for in this section, the Board may adopt new requirements or revise the requirements and submit the new or revised requirements prior to the last thirty (30) calendar days of the legislative session for legislative review pursuant to this section. If the assessment requirements are adopted in whole with instructions, the Board may revise the requirements in accordance with the legislative instructions and implement the requirements.

6. If the assessment requirements are disapproved in whole and the Board does not act to resubmit new requirements or revised requirements, the assessment or assessments adopted pursuant to Section 1210.508 of Title 70 of the Oklahoma Statutes shall be administered by the Board beginning with the 2017-2018 school year, and the performance level on the assessment or assessments shall be calculated in the final grade or grade point average of the student until otherwise provided for by law.

7. Upon final approval of the assessment requirements, the requirements shall be considered final agency rules. The Board shall submit a copy of the assessment requirements to the Secretary of State, who shall include the requirements in the publication known as the "Oklahoma Administrative Code" in the same manner as agency rules are published in the Code as provided for in the Administrative Procedures Act. All assessment requirements approved and published as provided for in this subsection shall have the same force and effect of law as agency rules promulgated pursuant to the Administrative Procedures Act.

8. Unless otherwise provided by specific vote of the Legislature, joint resolutions introduced for purposes of approving

or disapproving the assessment requirements shall not be subject to regular legislative cutoff dates, shall be limited to such provisions as may be necessary for approving or disapproving the requirements and any such other direction or mandate regarding the requirements deemed necessary by the Legislature. The joint resolution shall contain no other provisions.

SECTION 6. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.508B, as amended by Section 9, Chapter 430, O.S.L. 2014 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.508B), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1210.508B A. The Legislature finds that it is essential for children in the public schools to read early and well in elementary school. The Legislature further finds that clear and visible goals, assessments to determine the reading level at each elementary school, annual measurements of elementary school reading improvement, and accountability in each level of the educational system will result in a significant increase in the number of children reading at or above grade level.

B. The purpose of the Reading Sufficiency Act is to ensure that each child attains the necessary reading skills by completion of the third grade which will enable that student to continue development of reading skills and to succeed throughout school and life.

C. Each public school district in this state shall ensure that a majority of the instructional time each day of the school year in kindergarten through third grade is focused on reading and mathematics. The State Board of Education shall encourage school districts to integrate the teaching of the other curricular areas in the subject matter standards adopted by the Board with the instruction of reading and mathematics. All teachers of reading in the public schools in this state in kindergarten through third grade shall incorporate into instruction the five elements of reading instruction which are phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

D. The reading goal for Oklahoma public schools is as follows: By July 1, 2008, and each year thereafter, all third-grade students will read at or above grade level by the end of their third-grade year, excluding up to fifteen percent (15%) of those students who have an individualized education program (IEP), pursuant to the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), and excluding those students who are English language learners who have been determined not to be proficient in English as defined by a state-

designated English proficiency assessment. To achieve the reading goal, each public elementary school shall:

1. Determine its baseline no later than September 1, 2005, which shall be the percentage of students reading at or above third-grade level as determined by the percentage of students scoring proficient or above on the third-grade ~~riterion-referenced test assessment~~ in reading, administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title; and

2. Set and achieve annual improvement goals necessary to progress from the baseline established in 2005 to the reading goal by July 1, 2008. The annual improvement goals shall be included in the district's reading sufficiency plan required in Section 1210.508C of this title.

E. The State Board of Education shall recognize schools and districts that attain or make progress toward achieving the reading goal and shall provide technical assistance to schools and districts that do not make progress toward the reading goal. The district reading sufficiency plan shall be submitted to the State Board if the district has any schools that are not achieving the required annual improvement goals pursuant to this section.

SECTION 7. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.508C, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 364, O.S.L. 2015 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.508C), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1210.508C A. 1. Each student enrolled in kindergarten in a public school in this state shall be screened for reading skills including, but not limited to, phonemic awareness, letter recognition, and oral language skills as identified in the subject matter standards adopted by the State Board of Education. A screening instrument approved by the State Board shall be utilized for the purposes of this section.

2. For those kindergarten children at risk for reading difficulties, teachers shall emphasize reading skills as identified in the subject matter standards adopted by the State Board of Education, monitor progress throughout the year and measure year-end reading progress.

3. Classroom assistants, which may include parents, grandparents, or other volunteers, shall be provided in kindergarten

classes to assist with the screening of students if a teacher aide is not already employed to assist in a kindergarten classroom.

B. 1. Each student enrolled in kindergarten, first, second and third grade of the public schools of this state shall be assessed at the beginning and end of each school year using a screening instrument approved by the State Board of Education for the acquisition of reading skills including, but not limited to, phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

2. Any student who is assessed and found not to be reading at the appropriate grade level shall be provided a program of reading instruction designed to enable the student to acquire the appropriate grade level reading skills. Beginning with students entering the first grade in the 2011-2012 school year, the program of reading instruction shall include provisions of the READ Initiative adopted by the school district as provided for in subsection 0 of this section.

3. Throughout the year progress monitoring shall continue, and diagnostic assessment, if determined appropriate, shall be provided. Year-end reading skills shall be measured to determine reading success.

C. The State Board of Education shall approve screening instruments for use at the beginning and end of the school year, for monitoring of progress, and for measurement of reading skills at the end of the school year as required in subsections A and B of this section; provided, at least one of the screening instruments shall meet the following criteria:

1. Assess for phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, and comprehension;
2. Document the validity and reliability of each assessment;
3. Can be used for diagnosis and progress monitoring;
4. Can be used to assess special education and limited-English-proficient students; and
5. Accompanied by a data management system that provides profiles for students, class, grade level and school building. The profiles shall identify each student's instructional point of need

and reading achievement level. The State Board shall also determine other comparable reading assessments for diagnostic purposes and for periodic and post assessments to be used for students at risk of reading failure. The State Board shall ensure that any assessments approved are in alignment with the subject matter standards adopted by the State Board of Education.

D. 1. The program of reading instruction required in subsection B of this section shall align with the subject matter standards adopted by the State Board of Education and shall include provisions of the READ Initiative adopted by the school district as provided for in subsection O of this section. A program of reading instruction may include, but is not limited to:

- a. sufficient additional in-school instructional time for the acquisition of phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension,
- b. if necessary, tutorial instruction after regular school hours, on Saturdays and during summer; however, such instruction may not be counted toward the one-hundred-eighty-day or one-thousand-eighty-hour school year required in Section 1-109 of this title, and
- c. assessments identified for diagnostic purposes and periodic monitoring to measure the acquisition of reading skills including, but not limited to, phonemic awareness, phonics, reading fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, as identified in the student's program of reading instruction.

2. A student enrolled in first or second grades who has been assessed as provided for in subsection B of this section and found not to be reading at the corresponding grade level, shall be entitled to individualized remediation in reading until the student is determined by the results of a screening instrument to be reading on grade level. The program of reading instruction for each student shall be developed by a Student Reading Proficiency Team and shall include individualized remediation. Each team shall be composed of:

- a. the parent or guardian of the student,
- b. the teacher assigned to the student who had responsibility for reading instruction in that academic year,

- c. a teacher who is responsible for reading instruction and is assigned to teach in the next grade level of the student, and
- d. a certified reading specialist, if one is available.

E. The program of reading instruction shall continue until the student is determined by the results of approved reading assessments to be reading on grade level.

F. 1. Every school district shall adopt, and implement a district reading sufficiency plan which has had input from school administrators, teachers, and parents and if possible a reading specialist, and which shall be submitted electronically to and approved by the State Board of Education. The plan shall be updated annually. School districts shall not be required to electronically submit the annual updates to the Board if the last plan submitted to the Board was approved and expenditures for the program include only expenses relating to individual and small group tutoring, purchase of and training in the use of screening and assessment measures, summer school programs and Saturday school programs. If any expenditure for the program is deleted or changed or any other type of expenditure for the program is implemented, the school district shall be required to submit the latest annual update to the Board for approval. The district reading sufficiency plan shall include a plan for each site which includes an analysis of the data provided by the Oklahoma School Testing Program and other reading assessments utilized as required in this section, and which outlines how each school site will comply with the provisions of the Reading Sufficiency Act.

2. The State Board of Education shall adopt rules for the implementation and evaluation of the provisions of the Reading Sufficiency Act. The evaluation shall include, but not be limited to, an analysis of the data required in subsection S of this section.

G. For any third-grade student found not to be reading at grade level as determined by reading assessments administered pursuant to this section, a new program of reading instruction, including provisions of the READ Initiative adopted by the school district as provided for in subsection O of this section, shall be developed and implemented as specified in this section. If possible, a fourth-grade teacher shall be involved in the development of the program of

reading instruction. In addition to other requirements of the Reading Sufficiency Act, the plan may include specialized tutoring.

H. 1. Any first-grade, second-grade or third-grade student who demonstrates proficiency in reading at the third-grade level through a screening instrument which meets the acquisition of reading skills criteria pursuant to subsection B of this section shall not be subject to the retention guidelines found in this section. Upon demonstrating the proficiency through the screening, the district shall provide notification to the parent(s) and/or guardian(s) of the student that they have satisfied the requirements of the Reading Sufficiency Act and will not be subject to retention pursuant to this section.

2. If a third-grade student is identified at any point of the academic year as having a significant reading deficiency, which shall be defined as scoring below proficient on a screening instrument which meets the acquisition of reading skills criteria pursuant to subsection B of this section, the district shall immediately begin a student reading portfolio as provided by subsection K of this section and shall provide notice to the parent of the deficiency pursuant to subsection I of this section.

3. If a student has not yet satisfied the proficiency requirements of this section prior to the completion of third grade and still has a significant reading deficiency, as identified based on assessments administered as provided for in subsection B of this section, has not accumulated evidence of third-grade proficiency through a student portfolio as provided in subsection K, or is not subject to a good cause exemption as provided in subsection K, then the student shall not be eligible for automatic promotion to fourth grade.

4. a. For the 2015-2016 school year, a student not eligible for automatic promotion as provided for under paragraph 3 of this subsection and who scores at the unsatisfactory level on the reading portion of the third-grade statewide criterion-referenced test may be evaluated for "probationary promotion" by the Student Reading Proficiency Team. For the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years, a student not eligible for automatic promotion as provided for under paragraph 3 of this subsection and who scores at the unsatisfactory or limited knowledge levels on the reading portion of the third-grade statewide

criterion-referenced test may be evaluated for "probationary promotion" by the Student Reading Proficiency Team. The Student Reading Proficiency Team shall be composed of:

- (1) the parent(s) and/or guardian(s) of the student,
 - (2) the teacher assigned to the student who had responsibility for reading instruction in that academic year,
 - (3) a teacher in reading who teaches in the subsequent grade level, and
 - (4) a certified reading specialist.
- b. The student shall be promoted to the fourth grade if the team members unanimously recommend "probationary promotion" to the school principal and the school district superintendent and the principal and superintendent approve the recommendation that promotion is the best option for the student. If a student is allowed a "probationary promotion", the team shall continue to review the reading performance of the student and repeat the requirements of this paragraph each academic year until the student demonstrates grade-level reading proficiency, as identified through a screening instrument which meets the acquisition of reading skills criteria pursuant to subsection B of this section, for the corresponding grade level in which the student is enrolled or transitions to the requirements set forth by the Achieving Classroom Excellence Act.

5. Beginning with the 2016-2017 school year, students who score below the proficient level on the reading portion of the statewide third-grade ~~criterion referenced test~~ assessment administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title, who are not subject to a good cause exemption as provided in subsection K of this section, and who do not qualify for promotion or "probationary promotion" as provided in this subsection, shall be retained in the third grade and provided intensive instructional services and supports as provided for in subsection N of this section.

6. Each school district shall annually report to the State Department of Education the number of students promoted to the fourth grade pursuant to this subsection. Following the 2015-2016, 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school years, each school district shall report the number of students promoted to a subsequent grade pursuant to the provisions in paragraph 4 of this subsection. The State Department of Education shall publicly report the aggregate and district specific number of students promoted on their website and shall provide electronic copies of the report to the Governor, Secretary of Education, President Pro Tempore of the Senate, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the respective chairs of the committees with responsibility for common education policy in each legislative chamber.

7. Nothing shall prevent a school district from applying the principles of paragraphs 3 and 4 of this subsection in grades kindergarten through second grade.

8. To determine the promotion and retention of third-grade students pursuant to the Reading Sufficiency Act, the State Board of Education shall use only the reading comprehension and vocabulary scores portion of the statewide third-grade ~~riterion-referenced test~~ assessment administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title and shall not use the other language arts scores portions of the ~~test~~ assessment.

I. The parent of any student who is found to have a reading deficiency and is not reading at the appropriate grade level and has been provided a program of reading instruction as provided for in subsection B of this section shall be notified in writing of the following:

1. That the student has been identified as having a substantial deficiency in reading;

2. A description of the current services that are provided to the student pursuant to a conjoint measurement model such that a reader and a text are placed on the same scale;

3. A description of the proposed supplemental instructional services and supports that will be provided to the student that are designed to remediate the identified area of reading deficiency;

4. That the student will not be promoted to the fourth grade if the reading deficiency is not remediated by the end of the third

grade, unless the student is otherwise promoted as provided for in subsection H of this section or is exempt for good cause as set forth in subsection K of this section;

5. Strategies for parents to use in helping their child succeed in reading proficiency;

6. The grade-level performance scores of the student;

7. That while the results of the statewide ~~critierion-referenced tests~~ assessments administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title are the initial determinant, they are not the sole determiner of promotion and that portfolio reviews and assessments are available; and

8. The specific criteria and policies of the school district for midyear promotion implemented as provided for in paragraph 4 of subsection N of this section.

J. No student may be assigned to a grade level based solely on age or other factors that constitute social promotion.

K. For those students who do not meet the academic requirements for promotion and who are not otherwise promoted as provided for in subsection H of this section, a school district may promote the student for good cause only. Good-cause exemptions for promotion shall be limited to the following:

1. Limited-English-proficient students who have had less than two (2) years of instruction in an English language learner program;

2. Students with disabilities whose individualized education program (IEP), consistent with state law, indicates that the student is to be assessed with alternate achievement standards through the Oklahoma Alternate Assessment Program (OAAP);

3. Students who demonstrate an acceptable level of performance on an alternative standardized reading assessment approved by the State Board of Education;

4. Students who demonstrate, through a student portfolio, that the student is reading on grade level as evidenced by demonstration of mastery of the state standards beyond the retention level;

5. Students with disabilities who participate in the statewide ~~critierion referenced tests~~ assessments administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title and who have an individualized education program that reflects that the student has received intensive remediation in reading for more than two (2) years but still demonstrates a deficiency in reading and was previously retained in prekindergarten for academic reasons, kindergarten, first grade, second grade, or third grade;

6. Students who have received intensive remediation in reading through a program of reading instruction for two (2) or more years but still demonstrate a deficiency in reading and who were previously retained in prekindergarten for academic reasons, kindergarten, first grade, second grade, or third grade for a total of two (2) years; and

7. Students who have been granted an exemption for medical emergencies by the State Department of Education.

L. A student who is otherwise promoted as provided for in subsection H of this section or is promoted for good cause as provided for in subsection K of this section shall be provided intensive reading instruction during an altered instructional day that includes specialized diagnostic information and specific reading strategies for each student. The school district shall assist schools and teachers to implement reading strategies for the promoted students that research has shown to be successful in improving reading among low-performing readers.

M. Requests to exempt students from the retention requirements based on one of the good-cause exemptions as described in subsection K of this section shall be made using the following process:

1. Documentation submitted from the teacher of the student to the school principal that indicates the student meets one of the good-cause exemptions and promotion of the student is appropriate. In order to minimize paperwork requirements, the documentation shall consist only of the alternative assessment results or student portfolio work and the individual education plan (IEP), as applicable;

2. The principal of the school shall review and discuss the documentation with the teacher and, if applicable, the other members of the team as described in subsection H of this section. If the principal determines that the student meets one of the good-cause

exemptions and should be promoted based on the documentation provided, the principal shall make a recommendation in writing to the school district superintendent; and

3. After review, the school district superintendent shall accept or reject the recommendation of the principal in writing.

N. Each school district shall:

1. Conduct a review of the program of reading instruction for all students who score below the proficient level on the reading portion of the statewide ~~criteria-referenced test~~ assessment administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title and did not meet the criteria for one of the good-cause exemptions as set forth in subsection K of this section. The review shall address additional supports and services, as described in this subsection, needed to remediate the identified areas of reading deficiency. The school district shall require a student portfolio to be completed for each retained student;

2. Provide to students who have been retained as set forth in subsection H of this section with intensive interventions in reading, intensive instructional services and supports to remediate the identified areas of reading deficiency, including a minimum of ninety (90) minutes of daily, uninterrupted, scientific-research-based reading instruction. Retained students shall be provided other strategies prescribed by the school district, which may include, but are not limited to:

- a. small group instruction,
- b. reduced teacher-student ratios,
- c. more frequent progress monitoring,
- d. tutoring or mentoring,
- e. transition classes containing third- and fourth-grade students,
- f. extended school day, week, or year, and
- g. summer reading academies as provided for in Section 1210.508E of this title, if available;

3. Provide written notification to the parent or guardian of any student who is to be retained as set forth in subsection H of this section that the student has not met the proficiency level required for promotion and was not otherwise promoted and the reasons the student is not eligible for a good-cause exemption. The notification shall include a description of proposed interventions and intensive instructional supports that will be provided to the student to remediate the identified areas of reading deficiency;

4. Implement a policy for the midyear promotion of a retained student who can demonstrate that the student is a successful and independent reader, is reading at or above grade level, and is ready to be promoted to the fourth grade. Tools that school districts may use in reevaluating any retained student may include subsequent assessments, alternative assessments, and portfolio reviews, in accordance with rules of the State Board of Education. Retained students may only be promoted midyear prior to November 1 and only upon demonstrating a level of proficiency required to score at the proficient level on the statewide third-grade ~~riterion-referenced test~~ assessment administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title, or upon demonstrating proficiency in reading at the third-grade level through a screening instrument administered pursuant to subsection B of this section, and upon showing progress sufficient to master appropriate fourth-grade-level skills, as determined by the school. A midyear promotion shall be made only upon agreement of the parent or guardian of the student and the school principal;

5. Provide students who are retained with a high-performing teacher who can address the needs of the student, based on student performance data and above-satisfactory performance appraisals; and

6. In addition to required reading enhancement and acceleration strategies, provide students who are retained with at least one of the following instructional options:

- a. supplemental tutoring in scientific-research-based reading services in addition to the regular reading block, including tutoring before or after school,
- b. a parent-guided "Read at Home" assistance plan, as developed by the State Department of Education, the purpose of which is to encourage regular parent-guided home reading, or
- c. a mentor or tutor with specialized reading training.

O. Beginning with the 2011-2012 school year, each school district shall establish a Reading Enhancement and Acceleration Development (READ) Initiative. The focus of the READ Initiative shall be to prevent the retention of third-grade students by offering intensive accelerated reading instruction to third-grade students who failed to meet standards for promotion to fourth grade and to kindergarten through third-grade students who are exhibiting a reading deficiency. The READ Initiative shall:

1. Be provided to all kindergarten through third-grade students at risk of retention as identified by the assessments administered pursuant to the Reading Sufficiency Act. The assessment used shall measure phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension;

2. Be provided during regular school hours in addition to the regular reading instruction; and

3. Provide a state-approved reading curriculum that, at a minimum, meets the following specifications:

- a. assists students assessed as exhibiting a reading deficiency in developing the ability to read at grade level,
- b. provides skill development in phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension,
- c. provides a scientific-research-based and reliable assessment,
- d. provides initial and ongoing analysis of the reading progress of each student,
- e. is implemented during regular school hours,
- f. provides a curriculum in core academic subjects to assist the student in maintaining or meeting proficiency levels for the appropriate grade in all academic subjects,
- g. establishes at each school, where applicable, an Intensive Acceleration Class for retained third-grade students who subsequently score below the proficient

level on the reading portion of the statewide ~~riterion referenced tests~~ assessment administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title. The focus of the Intensive Acceleration Class shall be to increase the reading level of a child at least two grade levels in one (1) school year. The Intensive Acceleration Class shall:

- (1) be provided to any student in the third grade who scores below the proficient level on the reading portion of the statewide ~~riterion referenced tests~~ assessments and who was retained in the third grade the prior year because of scoring below the proficient level on the reading portion of the statewide ~~riterion referenced tests~~ assessments,
 - (2) have a reduced teacher-student ratio,
 - (3) provide uninterrupted reading instruction for the majority of student contact time each day and incorporate opportunities to master the fourth-grade state standards in other core subject areas,
 - (4) use a reading program that is scientific-research-based and has proven results in accelerating student reading achievement within the same school year,
 - (5) provide intensive language and vocabulary instruction using a scientific-research-based program, including use of a speech-language therapist,
 - (6) include weekly progress monitoring measures to ensure progress is being made, and
 - (7) provide reports to the State Department of Education, in the manner described by the Department, outlining the progress of students in the class at the end of the first semester,
- h. provide reports to the State Board of Education, upon request, on the specific intensive reading

interventions and supports implemented by the school district. The State Superintendent of Public Instruction shall annually prescribe the required components of the reports, and

- i. provide to a student who has been retained in the third grade and has received intensive instructional services but is still not ready for grade promotion, as determined by the school district, the option of being placed in a transitional instructional setting. A transitional setting shall specifically be designed to produce learning gains sufficient to meet fourth-grade performance standards while continuing to remediate the areas of reading deficiency.

P. In addition to the requirements set forth in this section, each school district board of education shall annually report to the parent or guardian of each student in the district the progress of the student toward achieving state and district expectations for proficiency in reading, writing, science, and mathematics. The school district board of education shall report to the parent or guardian of each student the results on statewide ~~riterion-referenced tests~~ assessments administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title. The evaluation of the progress of each student shall be based upon classroom work, observations, tests, district and state assessments, and other relevant information. Progress reporting shall be provided to the parent or guardian in writing.

Q. 1. Each school district board of education shall annually publish on the school website, and report in writing to the State Board of Education by September 1 of each year, the following information on the prior school year:

- a. the provisions of this section relating to public school student progression and the policies and procedures of the school district on student retention and promotion,
- b. by grade, the number and percentage of all students in grades three through ten performing below the proficient level on the reading portion of the statewide ~~riterion-referenced tests~~ assessment administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title,

- c. by grade, the number and percentage of all students retained in grades three through ten,
- d. information on the total number and percentage of students who were promoted for good cause, by each category of good cause as specified above, and
- e. any revisions to the policies of the school district on student retention and promotion from the prior year.

2. The State Department of Education shall establish a uniform format for school districts to report the information required in this subsection. The format shall be developed with input from school districts and shall be provided not later than ninety (90) days prior to the annual due date. The Department shall annually compile the information required, along with state-level summary information, and report the information to the public, the Governor, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

R. The State Department of Education shall provide technical assistance as needed to aid school districts in administering the provision of the Reading Sufficiency Act.

S. On or before December 1 of each year, the State Department of Education shall issue to the Governor and members of the Senate and House of Representatives Education Committees a Reading Report Card for the state and each school district and elementary site which shall include, but is not limited to, trend data detailing three (3) years of data, disaggregated by student subgroups to include economically disadvantaged, major racial or ethnic groups, students with disabilities, and English language learners, as appropriate for the following:

1. The number and percentage of students in kindergarten through third grade determined to be at risk for reading difficulties compared to the total number of students enrolled in each grade;

2. The number and percentage of students in kindergarten who continue to be at risk for reading difficulties as determined by the year-end measurement of reading progress;

3. The number and percentage of students in kindergarten through third grade who have successfully completed their program of reading instruction and are reading on grade level as determined by the results of approved reading assessments;

4. The number and percentage of students scoring at each performance level on the reading portion of the statewide third-grade ~~riterion-referenced test~~ assessment administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title;

5. The amount of funds for reading remediation received by each district;

6. An evaluation and narrative interpretation of the report data analyzing the impact of the Reading Sufficiency Act on students' ability to read at grade level; and

7. Any recommendations for improvements or amendments to the Reading Sufficiency Act.

The State Department of Education may contract with an independent entity for the reporting and analysis requirements of this subsection.

T. Copies of the results of the assessments administered shall be made a part of the permanent record of each student.

SECTION 8. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.515, as amended by Section 1, Chapter 337, O.S.L. 2013 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.515), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1210.515 A. Pursuant to the provisions of paragraph 2 of subsection A of Section 6-107.3 of Title 47 of the Oklahoma Statutes, any person under the age of eighteen (18) years wishing to apply for a driver license or permit shall successfully demonstrate a satisfactory reading ability at the eighth-grade reading level by meeting the following criteria:

1. A student enrolled in a public school shall successfully complete the reading portion of the ~~state criterion-referenced test~~ statewide assessment administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title and that is offered in the eighth grade. Following the administration of this ~~test~~ assessment in the eighth grade, any student not successfully completing the reading portion shall be assigned a plan of remedial reading. Any student not successful in

completing the reading portion of the state ~~riterion-referenced test~~ assessment may take a comparable alternative reading proficiency test in order to satisfy the criteria for a driver license or permit. Alternative reading proficiency tests shall be approved by the State Department of Education. Subsequent successful completion of an alternative reading proficiency test shall serve to satisfy any ~~test-retaking~~ retake requirement ~~which may be required~~ for the reading portion of the state ~~riterion-referenced test~~ assessment in the eighth grade in the Oklahoma School Testing Program. School districts shall notify, in writing, each student who takes the reading portion of the state ~~riterion-referenced test~~ assessment for the eighth grade or who takes an alternative reading proficiency test and the student's parent or legal guardian of the ~~test~~ results. If the student fails to perform satisfactorily on the test, the notice shall inform the student of the reading proficiency driver license requirement and the school's remediation plan for the student. Upon the student's successful completion of the test, the school shall furnish the student with the documentation needed for the driver license application in Oklahoma;

2. Unless alternatively documented according to the provisions of subsection C of this section, students under the age of eighteen (18) years shall successfully complete a reading proficiency test approved by the State Department of Education; and

3. Any student who wishes to apply for a restricted license to operate a motorcycle may take an alternative reading proficiency test, subject to the provisions of this section.

B. Alternative reading proficiency tests shall be offered by testing sites, which shall include the public schools at least four times per calendar year, and may include any of the following which chose to participate, the technology center school districts, Regional Education Service Centers, colleges, accredited private schools, and other sites approved by the State Department of Education. A student may take the test as often as wished, subject to the provisions of this section. Testing sites shall provide the first alternative reading proficiency test for each student at no cost to the student. Students may be assessed a fee not to exceed Twenty-five Dollars (\$25.00) by the testing site for each subsequent alternative reading proficiency test taken.

C. A school district shall provide for alternative documentation of reading proficiency for the purposes of paragraph 2

of subsection A of Section 6-107.3 of Title 47 of the Oklahoma Statutes for any student with an individualized education program that, at a minimum, is in an area related to reading. The alternative documentation shall be furnished to such student who is performing satisfactorily in reading pursuant to the individualized education program of the student. Parents of disabled students educated pursuant to the provisions of Section 4 of Article XIII of the Oklahoma Constitution may satisfy the requirement of paragraph 2 of subsection A of Section 6-107.3 of Title 47 of the Oklahoma Statutes by signing an affidavit that, based upon their best information and belief, their child would qualify for an individualized education program that, at a minimum, is in an area related to reading if enrolled in public school, and that in their judgment their child is performing satisfactorily in reading and is therefore academically qualified to satisfy the requirement of paragraph 2 of subsection A of Section 6-107.3 of Title 47 of the Oklahoma Statutes.

D. Any person under the age of eighteen (18) who has previously completed and successfully passed a reading proficiency test from another state may submit the results of such test to the State Department of Education for verification and approval. The State Department of Education shall have thirty (30) days from receipt of the reading proficiency results submitted by the person to verify that the reading proficiency requirements from the other state are equivalent or comparable to the reading proficiency requirements established for Oklahoma students pursuant to this section. Upon verification and approval by the State Department of Education, the Department shall furnish the person with the documentation needed for the driver license application in Oklahoma. If the reading proficiency documentation submitted by the person is disapproved by the Department, the person may take an alternative reading proficiency test as provided for in subsection B of this section.

SECTION 9. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.541, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 163, O.S.L. 2014 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.541), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1210.541 A. The Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability shall determine and adopt a series of student performance levels and the corresponding cut scores pursuant to the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act.

B. The Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability shall have the authority to set cut scores using any method which

the State Board of Education was authorized to use in setting cut scores prior to July 1, 2013.

C. The performance levels shall be set by a method that indicates students are ready for the next grade, course, or level of education, as applicable. The Commission for Educational Quality and Accountability shall establish panels to review and revise the performance level descriptors for each subject and grade level. The Commission shall ensure that the ~~critierion referenced tests~~ assessments developed and administered by the State Board of Education pursuant to the Oklahoma School Testing Program Act in grades three through eight and ~~the end of instruction tests~~ administered at the secondary level are vertically aligned by content across grade levels to ensure consistency, continuity, alignment and clarity. The Commission shall adopt performance levels that are labeled and defined as follows:

1. Advanced, which shall indicate that students demonstrate superior performance on challenging subject matter;

2. Proficient, which shall indicate that students demonstrate mastery over appropriate grade-level subject matter and that students are ready for the next grade, course, or level of education, as applicable;

3. Limited knowledge, which shall indicate that students demonstrate partial mastery of the essential knowledge and skills appropriate to their grade level or course; and

4. Unsatisfactory, which shall indicate that students have not performed at least at the limited knowledge level.

D. The State Board of Education shall develop and implement in accordance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of ~~2001~~ 1965 (ESEA), as reauthorized and amended by P.L. No. ~~107-110~~ 114-95, also known as the ~~No Child Left Behind Act of 2001~~ Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), an accountability system as provided for in 20 U.S.C., 6311 and any related federal regulations. The accountability system shall be implemented beginning with the 2002-2003 school year and shall be based on the data as established pursuant to Section 1210.545 of this title and as modified to meet the mandates of the ESEA. For the 2002-2003 school year and every year thereafter the State Board of Education shall publish and ensure that each local education agency is provided with data annually by site so that the local education agency can make

determinations to identify schools for rewards and sanctions. The State Board of Education shall establish a system of recognition, rewards, sanctions and technical assistance, as required by state law and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of ~~2001~~ 1965 (ESEA) as reauthorized and amended by P.L. No. 114-95, also known as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

E. A school that is identified as in need of improvement by the State Board of Education pursuant to this section, because of failure to meet either an academic performance target or an attendance or graduation performance target, or both, and is identified as in need of improvement pursuant to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), as reauthorized and amended by P.L. No. 114-95, also known as the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), shall utilize the assistance of a school support team or other similar team formed by the State Department of Education to provide support for schools in need of improvement, subject to school support team capacity. The school support team shall review and analyze all facets of operation of the school including the design and operation of the instructional program. The school support team shall assist the school in:

1. Incorporating strategies based on scientifically based research that will strengthen the core academic subjects in the school and address the specific academic issues that caused the school to be identified for school improvement;

2. Incorporating strategies to promote high quality professional development; and

3. Training teachers to analyze classroom and school-level data and use the data to inform instruction.

SECTION 10. AMENDATORY 70 O.S. 2011, Section 1210.545, as last amended by Section 1, Chapter 362, O.S.L. 2015 (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.545), is amended to read as follows:

Section 1210.545 A. 1. Except as otherwise provided, as part of the accountability system developed as provided for in Section 1210.541 of this title, the State Board of Education shall prepare annual reports of the results of the Oklahoma School Testing Program which describe student achievement in the state and each school site.

2. The Board shall study and may recommend revisions to the Legislature to the calculation metrics of all components of the school report cards to ensure that the evaluation system is clear, transparent, statistically trustworthy, credible, and aligned with the state assessment system. The Board shall seek certification from the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education that recommended revisions, if adopted, will improve the clarity, transparency, statistical trustworthiness, credibility, and alignment of the evaluation system. The State Regents shall provide the Board a detailed description of the certification process and results, including a list of any deficiencies the State Regents find with the study or the resulting recommendations. The Board shall issue a report by December 31, 2015, and submit a copy of the report to the Governor, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Minority Leader of the House of Representatives, and the Minority Leader of the Senate. The Board shall prescribe the design and content of the reports, which shall include, without limitation, descriptions of the performance of all schools participating in the Oklahoma School Testing Program and all of the major student populations as determined by the Board, and shall also include the median scores of all eligible students who scored at or in the lowest twenty-fifth percentile of the state in the previous school year. The confidentiality of individual student records shall be preserved as required by law.

B. The annual report as required pursuant to subsection A of this section shall identify school sites as having one of the following grades, defined according to rules of the State Board of Education:

1. "A" means schools making excellent progress;
 2. "B" means schools making above average progress;
 3. "C" means schools making satisfactory progress;
 4. "D" means schools making less than satisfactory progress;
- and
5. "F" means schools failing to make adequate progress.

C. Each school that has students who are tested and included in the school grading system as provided for in this section shall receive a school grade, except as follows:

1. A school shall not receive a school grade if the number of students tested and included in the school grading system is less than the minimum sample size necessary for statistical reliability and prevention of the unlawful release of personally identifiable student data. The State Board of Education is directed to establish the lowest minimum sample size necessary to meet the requirements of this paragraph;

2. A school that serves any combination of students in kindergarten through grade three which does not receive a school grade because the students are not tested and included in the school grading system shall receive the school grade designation of a feeder pattern school identified by the State Department of Education and verified by the school district. A school feeder pattern exists if at least sixty percent (60%) of the students in the school serving a combination of students in kindergarten through grade three are scheduled to be assigned to the graded school; and

3. The academic performance of students who are enrolled full-time in an online program that is offered by a school district or charter school that is not the district of residence or is not located in the district of residence of the student shall be reported separately by the school district or charter school and shall not be included when determining the grade of the school site or charter school.

D. The grade of a school shall be based on a combination of:

1. Fifty percent (50%) on whole school performance, as measured by allocating one point for each student who scores proficient or advanced on the ~~critierion referenced tests and end of instruction tests~~ assessments administered under Section 1210.508 of this title and alternative test scores administered to students ~~pursuant to Section 1210.523 of this title~~ divided by the number of students taking the ~~tests~~ assessments;

2. Twenty-five percent (25%) on whole school growth, as measured by allocating one point for each student who improves proficiency levels or improves substantially within a proficiency level on ~~critierion referenced tests and end of instruction tests~~ assessments administered under Section 1210.508 of this title divided by the number of students taking the ~~tests~~ assessments; and

3. Twenty-five percent (25%) on growth in the bottom quartile of students, as measured by allocating one point for each student in the bottom quartile who improves proficiency levels or improves substantially within a proficiency level on ~~eriterion-refereneed tests and end-of-instruction tests~~ assessments administered under Section 1210.508 of this title divided by the number of students taking the ~~tests~~ assessments.

E. In addition to the components outlined in subsection D of this section, the following bonus points shall be considered in determining the grade of a school site:

1. For schools comprised of high school grades:
 - a. five points for meeting the criteria for an "A" for the high school graduation rate of the school, as defined by rules adopted by the Board,
 - b. one point for meeting the criteria for an "A" for performance or participation of students in College Board Advanced Placement courses, International Baccalaureate courses, concurrent enrollment courses, Advanced International Certificate of Education courses, or the achievement of students on national industry certification, as defined by rules adopted by the Board,
 - c. one point for meeting the criteria for an "A" for participation or performance in SAT tests administered by the College Board or the American College Test (ACT), as defined by rules adopted by the Board,
 - d. one point for meeting the criteria for an "A" for the high school graduation rate of students who scored at limited knowledge or unsatisfactory on the eighth-grade ~~eriterion-refereneed tests~~ assessments in reading and mathematics administered pursuant to Section 1210.508 of this title,
 - e. as valid data becomes available, one point for the performance of students on the ~~end-of-instruction tests~~ high school assessments administered under Section 1210.508 of this title, as defined by rules adopted by the Board, and

- f. one point for the growth or decline in the components listed in subparagraphs a through e of this paragraph from year to year, as defined by rules adopted by the Board;

2. For schools comprised of middle school grades:

- a. two points for meeting the criteria for an "A" for the drop-out rate of the school, as defined by rules adopted by the Board,
- b. two points for meeting the criteria for an "A" for the percentage of students who are taking higher level coursework at a satisfactory or higher level, as defined by rules adopted by the Board, and
- c. six points for meeting the criteria for an "A" for attendance, as defined by rules adopted by the Board; and

3. For schools comprised of elementary school grades, ten points for meeting the criteria for an "A" for attendance, as defined by rules adopted by the Board.

F. Student test data used in determining school grades shall include:

1. The aggregate scores of all eligible students enrolled in the school who have been administered the ~~critierion referenced tests and end of instruction tests~~ assessments administered under Section 1210.508 of this title; and

2. For schools comprised of high school grades, the data listed in paragraph 1 of this subsection, and the following data as the State Department of Education determines the data are valid and available:

- a. the high school graduation rate of the school as calculated by the Department,
- b. the participation rate of all eligible students enrolled in the school in College Board Advanced Placement courses whether taught at a high school, a technology center school, or a regional site of the Oklahoma School of Science and Mathematics,

International Baccalaureate courses, concurrent enrollment courses, Advanced International Certificate of Education courses, courses or sequence of courses leading to national industry certification identified pursuant to rules adopted by the Board, courses or sequence of courses granted cooperative college alliance credit taken at a technology center school, and science, technology, engineering and mathematics courses taken at a regional site of the Oklahoma School of Science and Mathematics,

- c. the aggregate scores of all eligible students enrolled in the school in College Board Advanced Placement courses whether taught at a high school, a technology center school, or a regional site of the Oklahoma School of Science and Mathematics, International Baccalaureate courses, and Advanced International Certificate of Education courses,
- d. earning of college credit by all eligible students enrolled in the school in concurrent enrollment programs as provided for in Section 628.13 of this title and in cooperative college alliance courses taken at a technology center school,
- e. earning of a national industry certification identified pursuant to rules adopted by the Board,
- f. the aggregate scores of all eligible students enrolled in the school in reading, mathematics, and other subjects as measured by the SAT test administered by the College Board and the ACT,
- g. the high school graduation rate of all eligible students enrolled in the school who scored at limited knowledge or unsatisfactory on the eighth-grade ~~eriterion-referenced tests~~ assessments in reading and mathematics administered under Section 1210.508 of this title,
- h. the performance of students on statewide ~~end-of-instruction tests~~ high school assessments administered under Section 1210.508 of this title, and

- i. the growth or decline in the data components listed in subparagraphs a through h of this paragraph from year to year.

G. Grades shall be calculated by combining the points earned for whole school performance, whole school growth and growth in the bottom quartile of students, measured pursuant to subsection D of this section, and any bonus points earned pursuant to subsection E of this section. Grades shall be assigned based on the following scale:

1. Ninety-seven percent (97%) to one hundred percent (100%) = A+;
2. Ninety-three percent (93%) to ninety-six percent (96%) = A;
3. Ninety percent (90%) to ninety-two percent (92%) = A-;
4. Eighty-seven percent (87%) to eighty-nine percent (89%) = B+;
5. Eighty-three percent (83%) to eighty-six percent (86%) = B;
6. Eighty percent (80%) to eighty-two percent (82%) = B-;
7. Seventy-seven percent (77%) to seventy-nine percent (79%) = C+;
8. Seventy-three percent (73%) to seventy-six percent (76%) = C;
9. Seventy percent (70%) to seventy-two percent (72%) = C-;
10. Sixty-seven percent (67%) to sixty-nine percent (69%) = D+;
11. Sixty-three percent (63%) to sixty-six percent (66%) = D;
12. Sixty percent (60%) to sixty-two percent (62%) = D-; and
13. Fifty-nine percent (59%) and below = F.

H. The annual report shall identify the performance of each school as having improved, remained the same, or declined. This school improvement rating shall be based on a comparison of the student and school performance data of the current year to the

previous year data. Schools that improve at least one grade level are eligible for school recognition as established by the Board through the accountability system developed pursuant to Section 1210.541 of this title.

I. The State Department of Education shall annually develop, in collaboration with school districts and the Office of Educational Quality and Accountability, a school site report card to be delivered to parents throughout each school district. The report card shall include the grade for the school, information regarding school improvement, an explanation of school performance as evaluated in accordance with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of ~~2001~~ 1965 (ESEA), as reauthorized and amended by P.L. No. 107-110 114-95, also known as the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), and indicators of return on investment. The report card for each school site shall be published annually by the Department on its website, and every school district shall provide the school site report card to the parent or guardian of each student enrolled in the school site. In order to provide information regarding school performance for school site report cards issued during the 2016-2017 and 2017-2018 school year, the Department shall include an explanation of the changes to the statewide system of student assessments as required in Section 1210.508 of this title and how the transition in assessments may impact school performance. The Department shall issue school site report cards using the 2016-2017 school year assessment data that is available.

J. The Legislature may factor in the performance of schools in calculating any performance-based funding policy that is provided to public school districts.

K. The State Board of Education shall promulgate rules to implement the provisions of this section.

SECTION 11. REPEALER 70 O.S. 2011, Sections 1210.506 and 1210.508-1, are hereby repealed.

SECTION 12. REPEALER 70 O.S. 2011, Sections 1210.521, 1210.522, 1210.523, as last amended by Section 26, Chapter 4, O.S.L. 2014, 1210.525 and 1210.526, as last amended by Section 2 of Enrolled Senate Bill No. 1105 of the 2nd Session of the 55th Oklahoma Legislature (70 O.S. Supp. 2015, Section 1210.523), are hereby repealed.

SECTION 13. This act shall become effective July 1, 2016.

SECTION 14. It being immediately necessary for the preservation of the public peace, health and safety, an emergency is hereby declared to exist, by reason whereof this act shall take effect and be in full force from and after its passage and approval.

Passed the House of Representatives the 23rd day of May, 2016.

Jeffrey W. Hufman
Presiding Officer of the House
of Representatives

Passed the Senate the 25th day of May, 2016.

Eddie Finkel
Presiding Officer of the Senate

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR

Received by the Office of the Governor this 26th

day of May, 2016, at 9:44 o'clock A M.

By: Audrey Redwell

Approved by the Governor of the State of Oklahoma this 6th

day of June, 2016, at 3:36 o'clock P M.

Mary Fallin
Governor of the State of Oklahoma

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE

Received by the Office of the Secretary of State this 6th

day of June, 2016, at 4:53 o'clock P M.

By: Chris Benz