

WASHINGTON SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FRAMEWORK SUPPLEMENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY

Business Rules: 2024 WSIF Supplemental Accountability

2026

Deb Came, Ph.D.

**Assistant Superintendent of Data Analysis and
Support Division**

Prepared by:

- **Dr. Emily Scott**, Assistant Director of Data and Implementation
emily.scott@k12.wa.us | 564-669-4194



Washington Office of Superintendent of
PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Overview.....	3
Framing.....	3
School Groups.....	4
Strand Measures.....	4
WSIF Supplemental Accountability Scoring.....	6
Strands	8
Legal Notice	12

OVERVIEW

Framing

The Washington Accountability system, called the Washington School Improvement Framework (WSIF), is part of the state's Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Consolidated Plan. The plan was originally approved in January 2018; the US Department of Education approved an [amended](#) version in January 2024. As required by ESSA, WSIF uses multiple data measures to calculate a score for each school that is used to determine which schools receive increased support from the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI). However, there are some schools in Washington that do not receive a WSIF score because:

- their student populations are too small to meet the minimum requirements to calculate a WSIF score, or
- they do not have data for enough WSIF measures to calculate a WSIF score.

In these cases, Washington's ESSA Consolidated Plan specifies that schools will be evaluated using WSIF Supplemental Accountability.

WSIF Supplemental Accountability combines available WSIF data with a broad array of measures to calculate an accountability score for each school. These additional measures closely align with the different ways these schools serve students and are used to assign schools into groups with similar educational missions. Like WSIF, OSPI uses three years of data for each additional measure when calculating accountability scores. In Cycle identification years, WSIF Supplemental Accountability scores are used to identify the lowest performing five percent of schools in each school group for Support Tier 3: Comprehensive SA supports; all other schools receive Foundational supports. During Annual identification years, OSPI publishes the WSIF Supplemental Accountability scores for schools to use to monitor their accountability progress.

Part of WSIF Supplemental Accountability involves asking districts to review whether any school included in the process should be removed because it:

1. should be reclassified as a program (and the school code closed),
2. no longer serves students and should be closed, or
3. only serves Prekindergarten students.

To allow districts time to make these determinations, WSIF Supplemental Accountability lags its calculations by one year from WSIF. As a result, data from the three school years used to calculate WSIF Supplemental Accountability scores are one year behind those used to calculate WSIF scores (e.g., For release in the same year, WSIF: SY2023, SY2024, SY2025, WSIF Supplemental Accountability: SY2022, SY2023, SY2024). The final school year of data that are included in the accountability score calculations is used in the title of the data release (e.g., 2024 WSIF Supplemental Accountability has SY2022, SY2023, and SY2024 data).

School Groups

WSIF Supplemental Accountability calculates accountability scores for schools in the following five groups:

1. Primary and Secondary Schools.
2. Kindergarten to Grade 2 Schools.
3. Reengagement Schools.
4. Juvenile Detention Centers/Institutional Facilities.
5. Skills Centers/Vocational Schools.

Evaluating WSIF Supplemental Accountability schools in groups ensures that each school is evaluated only with other schools that have similar educational missions. It also allows OSPI to use data measures that are closely aligned with the specific way each school group serves its students.

Strand Measures

WSIF Supplemental Accountability evaluates schools using a broad array of measures that fall into four overarching Strands (Figure 1):

1. Student Strand.
2. Educator Strand.
3. School Strand.
4. School Improvement Plan Strand.

Each Strand is comprised of multiple data measures that are combined to create a Strand Score. The Strands are weighted to reflect the priorities of Washington State to support student growth and prepare all students for postsecondary pathways. To that end, the School Improvement Plan and Student Strands have greater weight than the Educator and School Strands. For 2024 WSIF Supplemental Accountability, data from the 2021–2022, 2022–2023, and 2023–2024 school years is used to determine scores.

Figure 1: The Four Strands used in WSIF Supplemental Accountability.

Strand	Measure Types	Strand Scoring Weight
Student Strand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Academic Outcomes • English Language Proficiency • Academic Progress • College and Career Readiness 	30%
Educator Strand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Teacher and Administrator Experience • Staff Support 	15%
School Strand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regular Attendance • Student Demographics • Course Offerings • Student Supports 	15%
School Improvement Plan Strand	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SMARTIE Goal Elements • Goal->Activity->Data alignment 	40%

Student Strand Measures

The Student Strand uses measures that capture how students are progressing in their educational journeys in a variety of ways (Figure 3, p. 8). Where possible, WSIF Supplemental Accountability uses measures that are also included in WSIF, such as English Language Arts Proficiency, English Language Proficiency Progress, and Graduation Rate.

Unlike WSIF, WSIF Supplemental Accountability draws on a wider range of student progress measures that are more aligned with the specific educational missions of the school groups. For example, Skills Centers, Re-engagement Schools, and Juvenile Detention Centers are evaluated with measures that focus on credit attainment, career/job readiness, and attaining professional certifications. WSIF Supplemental Accountability also uses measures that focus on the processes used to monitor student achievement and progress. For example, WSIF Supplemental Accountability incorporates a measure on the proportion of eligible students that were screened with an English Language Assessment within ten days of enrollment.

Educator Strand Measures

The Educator Strand uses measures that reflect the qualifications and experience of teachers and administrators in the school (Figure 4, p. 9). Many of these measures are pulled from data that OSPI collects around educational staff in Washington. Some measures unique to WSIF Supplemental Accountability are collected using a questionnaire that OSPI provides to schools. For example, the questionnaire asks schools if they have communities of practice in place for staff and whether they have a process for incorporating staff voice in decision-making or school improvement goals.

School Strand Measures

The School Strand uses measures that evaluate the school as an educational system (Figure 5, p. 10). These measures come from data used in WSIF (e.g., Regular Attendance Rate), data measures specific to each school group, and the WSIF Supplemental Accountability questionnaire. For

example, the questionnaire asks schools about the processes they have for collecting student voice, their supports for students' social-emotional learning, and family engagement strategies.

School Improvement Plan Strand Measures

The School Improvement Plan Strand uses measures that characterize the goals, activities, and progress monitoring data that are documented in the School Improvement Plan (SIP) (Figure 6, p. 11). Each SIP is scored with a rubric that awards points based on the presence of different elements in the plan.

- Goals are evaluated with a SMARTIE framework that awards points when plans articulate goals that are specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, timebound, inclusive, and equitable.
- Activities are evaluated on whether they are aligned with the goal and identify at least one evidence-based practice.
- Progress monitoring data are evaluated on how many measures will be used to progress monitor a goal, how often they will be reviewed by a specified person/team, and whether they are aligned with the goal.

Up to three goals will be scored per SIP.

WSIF SUPPLEMENTAL ACCOUNTABILITY SCORING

WSIF Supplemental Accountability generates individual strand scores that are combined to produce a final composite score for each school. Schools are ranked within their school groups by the final scores, with the lowest 5% of schools being identified for Tier 3: Comprehensive SA supports. Because some schools may not have all the measures included in a strand, OSPI uses a within-strand weighting system that adjusts the total points possible that a school can earn based on which measures are present.

Figure 2 illustrates the with-in strand weighting system with three example schools. School 1 has data for all the measures in the Strand, resulting in 100 total possible points. School 2 is missing Measure 1. Its total possible points are reduced by the number of points the measure was worth (i.e., 30 points) for a resulting 70 total possible points. School 3 is missing two data measures, so has its total possible points reduced to 35.

Figure 2: Internal Strand weighting based on the presence or absence of measures.

Strand 1					
	Measure 1	Measure 2	Measure 3	Measure 4	Total Possible Points
School 1	30	25	15	30	100
School 2	0	25	15	30	70
School 3	30	0	5	0	35

Each school receives a Strand score that represents the percentage of points the school earned out of that school’s total possible points. The schools are then ranked by their Strand score, the Strand Scoring Weight is applied to the rank (see Figure 1 for Strand weights), and the four weighted Strand ranks are summed to produce a final composite score between 0 and 1. The schools are then ranked by the final composite score.

The data measures used within a Strand may be different depending on the school group being evaluated. For example, schools in the Kindergarten to Grade 2 school group do not have state assessment data that can be used as a measure in the Student Strand. Instead, OSPI uses measures around [WaKIDS](#) implementation to evaluate this school group. Where possible, data measures:

- are aligned with WSIF Measures, and
- the same within a Strand across school groups.

The lowest five percent of schools in each group are identified for Tier 3: Comprehensive SA supports during Cycle identification years, which occur every three years. The remaining schools are identified for Foundational supports.

STRANDS

Figure 3: Student Strand measures for each school group. Where possible, measures that appear in multiple school groups are aligned in a row.

Primary and Secondary Measures	Points	Kindergarten to Second Grade Measures	Points	Skills Center/ Vocational School Measures	Points	Reengagement School Measures	Points	Juvenile Justice Center and Institutional School Measures	Points
ELA Proficiency Rate	30	# WaKIDS objectives assessed	30	% Students earned Industry Recognized Certification	30	% Students completed one high school equivalency measure	15	% Students increased in Reading scores	20
ELA Median SGP	10	# Teachers with current WaKIDS IRR certification	20	% Students participated in a work-based learning activity	30	% Students with three or more subject area gains	15	% Students increased in Math scores	20
ELA Participation Rate	5	# Administrators with WaKIDS training	10	% Students earning attempted credits	30	% Students earned at least 3 high school credits	15	% Students earned high school credits	20
Math Proficiency Rate	30					% Students earned a high school diploma	20	% Students earned a high school diploma	20
Math Median SGP	10					% Students earned high school equivalency certificate	20	% Students earned a GED	20
Math Participation Rate	5					% Students completed one or more college readiness courses	10		
English Language Progress Rate	15	English Language Progress Rate	15			% Students earned one or more college credits	10		
WIDA Screening Rate	5	WIDA Screening Rate	5						
Four-year Graduation Rate	20								
Ninth Grade on Track Rate	10								
Dual Credit Rate	10			Dual Credit Rate	10				
Total	150		80		100		105		100

Figure 4: Educator Strand measures for each school group. Where possible, measures that appear in multiple school groups are aligned in a row.

Primary and Secondary Measures	Points	Kindergarten to Second Grade Measures	Points	Skills Centers/ Vocational School Measures	Points	Reengagement School Measures	Points	Juvenile Center and Institutional School Measures	Points
% Teachers with full certificates	15	% Teachers with full certificates	15						
% Teachers teaching out-of-field	15	% Teachers teaching out-of-field	15						
Average years of teaching experience	20	Average years of teaching experience	20						
Average years of administrator experience	10	Average years of administrator experience	10						
# of principals since 2019	10	# of principals since 2019	10						
Presence of a staff community of practice	15	Presence of a staff community of practice	15	Presence of a staff community of practice	15	Presence of a staff community of practice	15		
Process for including staff voice in decision making	15	Process for including staff voice in decision making	15	Process for including staff voice in decision making	15	Process for including staff voice in decision making	15		
Total	100		100		100		100		70

Figure 5: School Strand measures for each school group. Where possible, measures that appear in multiple school groups are aligned in a row.

Primary and Secondary Measures	Points	Kindergarten to Second Grade Measures	Points	Skills Centers/ Vocational School Measures	Points	Reengagement School Measures	Points	Juvenile Center and Institutional School Measures	Points
Regular attendance	20	Regular attendance	20	Regular attendance	20	Regular attendance	20		
Title I status	20	Title I status	20	% Students qualify for free or reduced lunch	10	% Students qualify for free or reduced lunch	10	% Students enrolled in secondary education	10
Process for collecting student voice	20	Process for collecting student voice	20	% Students identified for SPED	10	% Students identified for SPED	10	% Students enrolled in GED program	10
Support Student SEL	20	Support Student SEL	20	% Students multilingual learners	10	% Students multilingual learners	10	% Students enrolled in job training course	10
Process for family engagement	20	Process for family engagement	20	% CTE statewide equivalency courses	15	% Students completed at least one job search/retention course	20	% Students received job offers	10
				% CTE dual credit courses	15	Provide student supports	20	% Students enrolled in local school	10
				% CTE courses offer Industry Recognized Certification	15			Process to obtain High School and Beyond Plan	15
								Process to review/update High School and Beyond Plan	15
								% Students receive Reading diagnostic	15
								% Students receive Math diagnostic	15
Total	100		100		95		90		110

Figure 6: School Improvement Strand measures for each school group.

Primary and Secondary Measures	Points	Kindergarten to Second Grade Measures	Points	Skills Centers/ Vocational School Measures	Points	Reengagement School Measures	Points	Juvenile Center and Institutional School Measures	Points
School and Contact Identified	4								
Goal 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 1 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32
Goal 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32
Goal 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32	Goal 3 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Goal articulated • Activities identified • Progress monitoring process in place 	32

LEGAL NOTICE



Except where otherwise noted, this work by the [Washington Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction](#) is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution License](#). Alternate material licenses with different levels of user permission are clearly indicated next to the specific content in the materials.

This resource may contain links to websites operated by third parties. These links are provided for your convenience only and do not constitute or imply any endorsement or monitoring by OSPI.

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

Download this material in PDF at [Washington School Improvement Framework](#). This material is available in alternative format upon request. Contact the Front Desk at 360-725-6000.