

Campbell County School District #1 Gillette, Wyoming

Body of Evidence - Overview

The Body of Evidence (BOE) program is designed to meet the graduation requirements as established in Chapter 31 of the Wyoming Department of Education (WDE) Rules and Regulations. Campbell County School District #1 utilizes a *Common Assessment Approach*. Our performance assessments, called District Student Performance Assessments or DSPAs, are provided in key courses in each content area. These assessments were selected and/or created by a team of teachers under the direction of the curriculum facilitator for each of the nine content areas. The common assessments for each course are administered in all schools regardless of the school attended. The common assessment approach was selected for several reasons including: (1) The approach provides for data-driven instruction; (2) The approach supports consistency, comparability, and fairness; and (3) The approach is practical for a large district. This approach allows for the determination of students' proficiency in the Wyoming Content and Performance Standards. Within the design of this system is the goal of providing each student the opportunity to demonstrate his/her knowledge and skills through multiple assessment opportunities.

Requirements for Proficiency - Background

Chapter 31 of the Wyoming Department of Education Rules and Regulations requires each school district to design a process verifying that any student receiving a high school diploma must have demonstrated proficiency in at least a majority of the content areas. Our district has developed a Body of Evidence system that provides students the opportunity to demonstrate proficiency in each of the nine content areas in accordance with Chapter 31.

The Wyoming State Board of Education has adopted a set of standards for each content area. Within each Standard are Benchmarks that describe the content and cognitive level students are expected to master in order to be considered proficient in the standard. The Wyoming Content and Performance Standards are located at the following web site: <http://www.k12.wy.us/SA/standards.asp>.

District Policies

The CCSD #1 Board of Trustees has adopted a policy which states that students must demonstrate proficiency in the Wyoming Content and Performance Standards as part of the requirements for graduation from Campbell County School District. This requirement is in addition to any credit expectations required by the State and District. The Campbell County School District Graduation Requirements, Policy 5158, may be viewed at the following web site: <http://www.campbellcountyschools.net/departments.cfm?subpage=58857>.

Transcript Endorsement

The Body of Evidence program must provide criteria to determine if students are proficient in each content area. Additionally, the program must also specify the criteria for designating an advanced level of proficiency in each area. Using these criteria, students will be recognized by an endorsement on their transcript as being Advanced, Comprehensive or General.

The Advanced endorsement requires a student to demonstrate an advanced level of proficiency in a majority of the content areas and proficient in the remaining content areas. The Comprehensive endorsement requires at least a proficient level in all content areas. The General endorsement requires a proficient level in a majority of the content areas.

Monitoring Student Achievement for Graduation

After each of the 9th, 10th, and 11th grade years, each student's assessment results are reviewed by curriculum facilitators and their BOE review teams from each respective content area to monitor student progress within the common assessment system. If a student is not successful in consistently demonstrating proficiency or progress toward proficiency in at least five of the nine content areas through his/her performance on District Student Performance Assessments, guidance counselors, building administrators, and/or the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Assessment notify parents of the concern. If the student is not making progress toward meeting BOE graduation requirements following the eleventh grade, a Graduation Review Panel (GRP) is convened to monitor, guide, and determine a course of action to assist the student in meeting graduation requirements. This could include such guidance as further advisement on courses to enroll in during the senior year or remediation coupled with additional instruction and BOE assessments.

Adjustments to the BOE System

Although much thought was put into developing a sustainable BOE system, adjustments may be needed from time to time. Potential changes to the system will be directed by the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Assessment working in consultation with curriculum facilitators, their curriculum committees, and school administrators. Changes deemed minor, such as an improvement to an existing bias review form or an improvement to the inter-rater reliability process, are allowable under the direction of the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Assessment. Significant changes to the BOE system require approval from our Board of Trustees.

Body of Evidence – Alignment

Campbell County School District #1 recognizes the importance of developing curriculum and BOE assessments that appropriately match the knowledge and skills represented in the State Standards and Benchmarks. Our BOE plan addresses adequate sampling, two-way alignment, and cognitive demand. The definition for two-way alignment comes from the Glossary to Wyoming Assessment Handbook found at: http://www.k12.wy.us/SA/BOE/assessment_handbook_glossary.pdf. This definition states, “Alignment is a least a two way process to ensure that the assessments sample the major elements of the standards and that the assessments elicit what is asked for students to know and be able to do as stated in the standards.”

Process

The process to ensure alignment of our BOE system is the responsibility of the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Assessment and our curriculum facilitators. The alignment process is embedded in the work of curriculum facilitators and their respective committees. The State Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors are reviewed to determine what students are expected to know and be able to do by the time they graduate in each content area. The Performance Level Descriptors describe how well a student must perform relative to the Benchmarks. The Content Standards in our district curriculum are frequently reviewed to ensure that our curriculum is aligned to the State Standards and Benchmarks both in terms of content and cognitive demand.

Alignment is reviewed on a five-year cycle and more often if deemed necessary by curriculum facilitators. If there are changes to the Wyoming Content and Performance Standards, this alignment work would ensue soon after approval of any changes by the Wyoming State Board of Education.

Adequate Sampling

All of the benchmarks in all of the standards of each content area are taught and assessed in Campbell County School District #1. Although some benchmarks and standards were given higher priority by curriculum committees as they developed curriculum and assessments, each content area is committed to covering all of the standards and all of the benchmarks in both our curriculum and our BOE assessment system.

Two-Way Alignment

Alignment must be at least a two-way process. Our district ensures at least two-way alignment through several alignment practices:

- *Curriculum and Instruction is aligned to State Standards and Benchmarks.* Campbell County School District’s assessments sample the “major elements of the standards”. Our curriculum is directly linked to the State Standards and Benchmarks as outlined in the curriculum guides we provide to teachers for each course in the district. The major areas of study within each course offered in Campbell County School District are identified as Content Standards. These Content Standards have been reviewed by curriculum committees and correlated to the State Standards and Benchmarks. Facilitators, and their respective

curriculum committees, analyze the State Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors to determine what students should know and be able to do as part of the alignment process. State Standard and Benchmark correlations are provided in our district's curriculum guides and can be found on our web site at:

<http://www.campbellcountyschools.net/departments.cfm?subpage=88553>. Both the curriculum and classroom instruction are designed at the cognitive demand implied in the standards.

- *Assessments are aligned to State Standards and Benchmarks.* The responsibility of ensuring alignment of our assessments to the Standards and Benchmarks is a responsibility of curriculum facilitators. Facilitators, and their respective curriculum committees, analyze the State Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors to determine what students should know and be able to do as part of the alignment process. All assessment items/tasks are also analyzed to determine the appropriate level of cognitive depth as implied by the State Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors. Assessment blueprints, called District Student Performance Assessment Blueprints, are used for each assessment.

A correlation chart is also maintained by the Curriculum and Assessment Department for each content area and grade level. These charts provide additional evidence that our district samples all Standards and Benchmarks and show evidence that our assessments are aligned to the State Standards and Benchmarks. The correlation charts indicate the Benchmarks that are taught in each course by indicating the number of opportunities a student has to demonstrate mastery of each Benchmark in a particular course. Because the Benchmarks are often addressed in multiple courses, these charts are also used to identify the specific courses students may need to take in order to meet remediation needs. Correlation charts are on our district web site at:

<http://www.campbellcountyschools.net/departments.cfm?subpage=64404>.

- *Adequate sampling supports alignment.* As described earlier, our district adequately samples the State Standards and Benchmarks. The alignment of our instruction and our assessments to the all Standards and Benchmarks within each content area ensures that we sample the major elements of the Standards.
- *Curriculum committees perform an analysis of assessment items/tasks to the cognition level implied in the Performance Level Descriptors.* Curriculum facilitators and their respective committees meet to ensure that all “assessments elicit what is asked for students to know and be able to do as stated in the standards”. Cognitive depth is a critical component to ensure that a BOE system is aligned. Curriculum, classroom instruction, and assessments are all at the appropriate cognitive level. Assessments reflect the cognitive depth of the Standards and the types of student performance described in the Standards,

Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors. The following paragraph provides more information about cognitive depth.

Cognitive Depth

Curriculum facilitators and their respective curriculum committees analyzed the cognitive depth represented in the State Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors using Webb's Taxonomy. The BOE assessments were then designed to match the cognitive depth of the Wyoming Content and Performance Standards. The cognitive depth, as determined by our curriculum committees, of all assessment item(s)/task(s) is documented on District Student Performance Assessment Blueprints. The curriculum facilitator provides further assurance that every assessment is at the appropriate cognitive level as documented in our District Student Performance Assessment Blueprints Summary & Bias Review.

Assessment Results and Data Management

The results of the DSPA's are entered by the classroom teacher into the computerized PowerTeacher/PowerSchool system. With this system, teachers, counselors and administrators can quickly review student performance and monitor progress in meeting State standards. PowerSchool software is used to maintain the assessment data and generate reports. The individual student reports are used to determine if students are making adequate progress toward meeting State Standards.

Body of Evidence - Consistency

The reliability of our common assessment system is aided by the theory that reliability is increased through multiple opportunities. Providing students with a number of chances to demonstrate proficiency decreases the probability of an unreliable assessment having a negative impact on student proficiency determination.

We engage in the following processes to evaluate reliability on both open-ended and close-ended assessments in our district.

Open-Ended Assessments

Our district has a procedure for determining inter-rater reliability of open-ended assessments. This procedure includes use of common rubrics, scoring workshops and calibration exercises for all teachers. Additional training is provided to new teachers as deemed necessary by curriculum facilitators. The process includes the development of anchor papers and seeded papers to ensure comparability over time. The desired, acceptable rate in our district is to meet or exceed 95% exact plus adjacent agreement. Our district, following conversations at BOE work sessions and input from WDE staff, has determined that this rate is a reasonable standard. We have also outlined interventions that will take place if the acceptable, desired rate is not obtained.

Close-Ended Assessments

After the practice BOE review in Douglas in 2008 and guidance from the BOE Institute in Lander, our district began further investigation of close-ended assessments. We have identified a procedure to evaluate reliability on close-ended assessments beyond the item analysis done in previous years. We have selected Cronbach's Alpha as our reliability coefficient and have selected a desired, acceptable rate of .65. This rate is above the .50 rate suggested by guest speaker, Jason Nicholas, at the November 2008 session of the BOE Institute. At the WDE BOE Table Leader Training in February 2009, Dr. Moore suggested a coefficient above .50 and somewhere between .50 and .70. We selected a rate at the upper end of the suggested range. If our assessments do not meet the desired, acceptable rate, the curriculum facilitator is responsible for further investigation into the assessment to determine potential issues with the assessment and/or instruction.

Five-Year Cycle

At several BOE work sessions throughout 2008 and 2009, WDE staff and consultants recommended that our district create a plan to address reliability in an on-going manner. It was suggested that we conduct reliability analysis on 10-20% of our assessments each year. This guidance led us to adopt 5-year cycle for reliability analysis in our district. Each curriculum facilitator is responsible for the development of a 5-year plan to conduct reliability analysis on each DSPA in their content area.

Body of Evidence – Fairness

There is an expectation that all Campbell County School District #1 students will experience fairness in the Body of Evidence system. This is ensured by reviewing all assessments for bias, providing appropriate accommodations to students with IEPs, students on 504 plans, and ELL students. The system is designed so that students have multiple opportunities using a variety of assessment formats and strategies to demonstrate their knowledge and skills.

Bias

The bias review process is the responsibility of curriculum facilitators. Each facilitator has a curriculum committee that addresses alignment, bias, cognitive complexity, and reliability for each assessment in their content area. Each course's curriculum and respective assessments are analyzed during an on-going five-year review cycle.

Curriculum facilitators are allowed to accelerate the review process as warranted. This could include responding to concerns following the annual examination of disaggregated assessment data or reported bias concerns from school stakeholders (student, parent, teacher, administrator, etc.). Bias concerns are brought to the curriculum committee via the curriculum facilitator for review. The procedure is as follows:

1. The concern is identified by or presented to the curriculum facilitator;
2. The curriculum facilitator presents the concern to the curriculum committee;
3. The curriculum committee conducts a review using disaggregated data and specific stakeholder concerns, including any other evidence for consideration;
4. The curriculum committee discusses the concern and accompanying evidence of potential bias;
5. The committee reaches consensus on appropriate action. If the assessment item(s)/task(s) needs to be changed or replaced, the committee must follow the protocol for replacing assessment item(s)/task(s). If the committee fails to reach consensus on whether or not the item(s)/task(s) is biased, the item(s)/task(s) in question should be replaced using the protocol for replacing assessment item(s)/task(s).
6. The curriculum facilitator documents the process and completes the District Student Performance Assessment Blueprint Summary & Bias Review form.

If an assessment is being reviewed as part of the typical five-year cycle, in absence of any concerns, the curriculum committee would review each item for bias and consider recommendations for changes if concerns were identified.

The District Student Performance Assessment Blueprint Summary & Bias Review form is used to document the bias review for every assessment. All assessment items/tasks are reviewed by the curriculum committee for the following assurances:

- Assessment may be completed by ALL students regardless of gender, ethnicity, or economic status.
- Assessment is appropriate for students with disabilities, acknowledging that students with IEPs and 504 Plans receive appropriate accommodations.

- Assessment is appropriate for English Language Learners (ELL), identified as Limited English Proficient (LEP) students, acknowledging that students may receive appropriate accommodations.

Accommodations

Our district follows the guidance provided by WDE for accommodations for students on IEPs, 504 Plans, and English Language Learners. Below is the WDE guidance:

WYOMING DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION RULES AND REGULATIONS (2008):
CHAPTER 31, SECTION 10 (F);

(f) The body of evidence for special needs students shall include accommodations in accordance with their individualized educational programs or 504 plans, and the policies as described in the *Policies for Participation of All Students in District and Statewide Assessment and Accountability Systems*, which is available from the Wyoming Department of Education, 2300 Capitol Avenue, Hathaway Building, 2nd Floor, Cheyenne, Wyoming 82002-0050. These accommodations shall not substantially alter the character of the assessments used to measure student performance.

For the use of accommodations in BOE systems in the state of Wyoming, WDE offers the following key points:

- Use of *accommodations* and administration of *standard accommodations* to promote access to students to demonstrate their acquired knowledge and skills as measured by district assessments should be limited to eligible students defined as students with IEPs, students with 504 Plans, and English Language Learners consistent with the State's definition of these terms and administration of accommodations;
- Access to promote student demonstration of acquired knowledge and skills of students who are not included in one of these three groups should be provided within the BOE systems through the multiple opportunities to be assessed, multiple measures including different assessment formats and types, and should reflect best practices in teaching and assessing with regard to differentiation and individual learning styles;
- Administration of *standard accommodations* during district assessments should be consistent with measurement constructs and result in valid results and comparable test performance;
- Guidance is provided to BOE systems via the Wyoming Accommodations Manual for Instruction and Assessment
http://www.k12.wy.us/SA/Paws/Paws_Info/2009_10/AccommodationsManual.pdf
- And the 2009 Standard Accommodations for PAWS
http://www.k12.wy.us/SA/Paws/Paws_Info/2009_10/PAWS_accomodations.pdf

Only those accommodations consistent with WDE guidance are allowed in our BOE system. Any accommodations or modifications that are used for regular (non-BOE) classroom assessments that are not consistent with WDE guidance are not allowed on the PAWS or District Student Performance Assessments.

Modifications

Modifications to DSPAs are not allowed in our Body of Evidence system.

Multiple Assessment Opportunities & Variety of Assessment Formats and Strategies

Students in Campbell County School District have multiple opportunities, using a variety of formats and strategies, to demonstrate proficiency of their knowledge and skills. These include both BOE Consortium assessments and district-created assessments. Each content area curriculum facilitator is responsible for the maintenance of correlation charts that represent the multiple opportunities available to students. These charts can be found on-line at <http://www.campbellcountyschools.net/departments.cfm?subpage=64404>. Additionally, students who perform at the proficient or advanced level on PAWS in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science are allowed to utilize those scores as demonstrations of proficiency and advanced status in our BOE system.

Disaggregation of Assessment Results

Data is collected to determine the fairness and correctness of the District Student Performance Assessment system. The data includes a disaggregation of performance results by gender, socioeconomic status, ethnicity, and IEP status. In addition to the district profile, individual school profiles are provided so each school's staff may evaluate their respective programs. DSPA results are posted at <http://www.campbellcountyschools.net/departments.cfm?subpage=64356>. For the internal review of our system, we look at all results. For our web site and for external BOE reviews, we do not include information from subgroups with less than 10 students in order to avoid inadvertently identifying a student.

The disaggregated assessment results are produced by our Technology Department. They are then compiled by the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Assessment and presented to principals and content area curriculum facilitators in August of each year. At this meeting, the data is reviewed and discussed as necessary with attention to subgroup differences. Curriculum facilitators are responsible for discussing the disaggregated results with their respective curriculum committees. Although differences in subgroup performance do not necessarily equate to bias in an assessment, differences do initiate a conversation that could lead to a bias review; hence, disaggregated assessment results are used to search for possible bias in the BOE system. The Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Assessment is responsible for posting disaggregated results on the district web site.

Participation Rates

The participation rate of the student population and sub-populations is monitored to verify compliance with WDE expectations. Because of our common assessment approach, students automatically participate in the assessments as part of ordinary classroom activities. Our district expectation is that at least 95% of students, and 95% of students in each subgroup, participate in our BOE assessment system. To ensure compliance with our stated participation rate, teachers enter the assessment scores into

PowerSchool. This data is monitored by building administration and the Curriculum and Assessment Department.

Students with special needs who are not enrolled in regular education classes participate in the assessment program based on the guidelines of their Individualized Education Plan. Accommodations are provided for in an effort to maintain a high level of assessment participation.

Body of Evidence – Standard Setting

Campbell County School District #1 used the Dominant Profile (DP) method to set cut scores for determining proficiency in each of the nine content areas. A standard setting committee was convened in 2003 to make cut score recommendations to the Board of Trustees. Those recommendations were approved in 2003. In 2005, the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Assessment recommended a change in cut scores in the areas of Health and Career/Vocational Education based on teacher and facilitator data analysis and recommendation. The request was approved by the Board of Trustees and those proficiency cut scores remain today.

Dominant Profile Method

In this standard setting method, panelists participate in a process used to determine the proficiency cut scores for an assessment system. The DP method asks panelists to provide their direct input in creating score profiles that demonstrate minimally acceptable proficiency. The DP method consists of the following components:

- Panelists must become familiar with the assessment system.
- Panelists must understand the scoring scheme.
- Panelists individually examine profiles of student scores and determine the profile that meets minimally acceptable proficiency.
- Panelists discuss the profile of the minimally acceptable performance with the standard setting committee.
- The committee reaches consensus on the profile of a proficient performance.
- The committee creates a policy recommendation for determining proficiency.

Defensible Method

The DP method is a recognized approach to standard setting. At the Body of Evidence Leadership Academy held at Eaton's Ranch on June 2-6, 2008, Scott Marion and Karin Hess provided guidance on standard setting with a presentation titled, *Establishing Cutscores on Body of Evidence Assessment Systems*. This presentation validated the process used in our district.

Rationale for the Dominant Profile Method

The DP method was selected as our district's standard setting method for several reasons:

- The approach allows for the examination of an assessment system in its entirety.
- Participants are able to participate in a direct process looking at the entire system rather than an indirect process focused on parts of an assessment system and the results of which are later used to indirectly aggregate performance standard policies. These methods often result in participant dissatisfaction and unintended consequences.
- It is a reasonable and practical approach for our district.
- It does not require sophisticated statistical analysis beyond our capabilities.
- It is a research-based method.

Aggregation Rules

In making graduation decisions with regard to BOE, there are many aggregation or decision-making rules that must be in place. Some of these decisions were made at the district level and some were made at the State level by the WDE and Wyoming State Legislature. The decision-making rules expected by the WDE and the Wyoming State Legislature are and will continue to be followed in our BOE system. The district-created decision-making rules were presented to and approved by our district's Board of Trustees as part of approving the Body of Evidence system.

The following questions and responses provide clarification about the aggregation or decision-making rules used to determine proficiency in our BOE system.

What demonstration is necessary to be considered proficient for graduation?

This question is answered in Chapter 31 of the Wyoming Department of Education Rules and Regulations. In order for a student to receive a diploma in Wyoming, the student must demonstrate proficiency in a majority of the nine Content Areas.

What demonstration is necessary to be considered proficient in a Content Area?

At the State level, the answer to this question provides for some flexibility in that a compensatory model may be used by districts to define proficiency in a Content Area. This means a student could be strong in some Standards and weak in others in the same Content Area but when considered as a whole, the student would be judged proficient in the Content Area.

The DP method was used during a standard setting exercise (called a Community Forum and described later in this section) to determine proficiency at the Content level and the standard setting committee recommended a conjunctive approach for all nine Content Areas. The Board of Trustees approved the recommendation which meant that students were required to demonstrate proficiency in all Standards of all Content Areas.

In 2005, this expectation was changed after considering the recommendation of teachers, facilitators, and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum & Assessment. The Board of Trustees approved a compensatory model for the Content Areas of Health and Career/Vocational Education and students are now required to demonstrate proficiency in five of the seven Health Standards and four of the six Career/Vocational Education Standards.

What demonstration is necessary to be considered proficient in a Standard?

To define the expectation for proficiency in a Standard, the district held a standard setting exercise (Community Forum) and used the DP method to establish profiles for proficient students in each Standard of each Content Area. School stakeholders gathered to review the expectations of the Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors and from that, determined how many Benchmarks a student would need to demonstrate proficiency in to be considered proficient in each Standard. This process followed a compensatory model and provided for prioritization by the setting of higher or lower expectations for various Standards. The recommendations from the standard setting

committee regarding proficiency at the Standard level were approved by the Board of Trustees in 2003.

What demonstration is necessary to be considered proficient in a Benchmark?

The decision-making rule regarding proficiency on Benchmarks was determined by the Curriculum and Assessment Department with input from curriculum facilitators, administrators and teachers. After much discussion and review of student assessment data, it was determined that in order for a student to be considered proficient on a Benchmark, the student would need to demonstrate proficiency on at least half of the DSPAs that were correlated to that Benchmark. This information was provided to participants in the standard setting process.

What demonstration is necessary to be considered proficient on an individual assessment?

The question of determining proficiency on a specific assessment was answered by the Curriculum and Assessment Department with input from curriculum facilitators, administrators and teachers. On a four-point rubric, proficiency is defined as a score of “3” or better. On close-ended assessments, we have established proficiency as a score of 80% or better. This percentage is accepted as appropriate in the research-based Mastery Learning Model. For Yes/No DSPAs, proficiency is defined by a score of “yes”. This information was provided to participants during the standard setting process.

Are PAWS results utilized in the district’s assessment system?

Yes. Chapter 6 of the Wyoming Department of Education Rules and Regulations states in Section 8 (f) (ii) that “Among other measures, the district shall incorporate the state assessment system into its district assessment system by using state assessment results to measure the Wyoming Content and Performance Standards in mathematics, reading, and writing for fourth, eighth, and eleventh grade students”. In our district, students who perform at the proficient or advanced level on the 11th grade PAWS in Reading, Writing, Mathematics, and Science are allowed to utilize those scores as demonstrations of proficiency and advanced status in our BOE system.

Levels of Performance Requiring Cut Scores

It is our district’s philosophy that the proficiency determination is the most critical standard setting decision. These are high-stakes decisions that result in a student graduating or not. At the WDE BOE Table Leader Training on February 2, 2009, WDE staff, WDE consultants, and Table Leaders decided that it was not necessary for districts to set Content level cut scores differentiating between Basic and Below Basic Performance but that districts needed to have at least three performance areas, namely Not Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced. Our district has chosen not to differentiate between Basic and Below Basic at the Content level as this determination makes no difference in the graduation decision for a student. We used the DP method to determine cut scores that provide for Not Proficient, Proficient, and Advanced determinations at the Content level.

Process for Determining Proficiency Levels

On May 5, 2003, a Community Forum involving teachers, parents, students, administrators, and community members was held to establish proficiency recommendations for each *Standard* and *Content Area* of the Wyoming Content and Performance Standards.

The DP standard setting method was used at the Community Forum to make determinations at both the *Standard* and *Content* level.

Proficiency at the *Standard* Level:

Working in Content Area groups, each participant reviewed the Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors of their respective Content Area. With an understanding of what a student should know and be able to do, each participant was given a set of ten student assessment reports. The reports showed the number of times a student had been proficient or not proficient on numerous assessments correlated to each Benchmark within each Standard. Each participant was asked to rank the ten letter-coded reports from highest to lowest performance. Then the participants were asked to work in pairs and discuss their rankings and agree on a single ranking between them. Finally, the pairs were asked to share their rankings with the group and then the entire group was asked to agree on a single rank-ordering of the ten reports. With the ranking finalized, the group was asked to determine which student would represent the minimum profile of a proficient student. Those above that cut score were determined to be proficient and those below were determined to not be proficient.

With the profile of the minimally proficient student, examples of other proficient students, and an understanding of the expectations implied in the Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors, each group further discussed and then agreed upon the minimal level of Benchmark proficiency necessary to be deemed proficient at the Standard level. Each Standard was considered separately with weight or importance being recognized by requiring more or fewer Benchmarks to demonstrate proficiency. This resulted in a compensatory model at this level in that proficiency was not required on all Benchmarks of all the Standards. Profiles were created that described the number of Benchmarks in which a student must be proficient to be considered proficient at the Standard level.

Proficiency at the *Content* Level:

The standard setting committees then used the profiles from the Standard level to make profile recommendations for the Content level. With an understanding of what a student should know and be able to do as implied by the Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level descriptors, the standard setting committees developed profiles of Content level proficiency. Each of the standard setting committees recommended that students be proficient in all Standards of all Content Areas. This recommendation was initially adopted in 2003 and later amended in 2005 by the Board of Trustees as previously described.

Standards Requirements Chart

This chart lists the Standards for each Content Area and the number of Benchmarks that define the eleventh-grade level of the Standards. The right column indicates the number of Benchmarks in which a student must demonstrate proficiency in order to be considered proficient in the Standard.

#	Content Area and State Standard	# Benchmarks	# Required
Language Arts – All Standards Required			
1	Reading	3	3
2	Writing	2	2
3	Speaking and Listening	9	6
Mathematics – All Standards Required			
1	Number Concepts and Operations	4	2
2	Geometry	5	3
3	Measurement	5	3
4	Algebra	5	3
5	Data Analysis	4	2
Science – All Standards Required			
1	Concepts and Processes	14	11
2	Science as Inquiry	5	3
3	History & Nature of Science in Personal/Social Decisions	2	1
Social Studies – All Standards Required			
1	Citizenship, Government, and Democracy	5	3
2	Culture and Cultural Diversity	2	1
3	Production, Distribution, and Consumption	4	2
4	Time, Continuity, and Change	4	2
5	People, Places, and Events	3	2
Health – Five of Seven Standards Required			
1	Health Promotion and Disease Prevention	9	6
2	Assessing Health Information, Products, and Services	1	1
3	Self-Management	3	2
4	Influences of Culture, Media, and Technology	3	2
5	Interpersonal Communication	3	2
6	Goal-Setting and Decision-Making Skills	3	2
7	Advocating for Health	4	3
Physical Education – All Standards Required			
1	Movement	3	2
2	Fitness	4	3
3	Personal and Social Behavior	4	3

Fine and Performing Arts – All Standards Required			
1	Creative Expression Through Production	3	1
2	Aesthetic Perception	4	2
3	Historical and Cultural Context	2	1
4	Applications to Life	3	2
Foreign Language – All Standards Required			
1	Communication	4	2
2	Culture	1	1
Career-Vocational Education – Four of Six Standards Required			
1	Resources	3	2
2	Interpersonal Skills	4	2
3	Information	4	2
4	Systems	2	1
5	Technology	4	2
6	Careers	4	2

Process for Determining Advanced Levels

The cut score determinations for advanced status in each content area were identified using the DP method and were grounded in the advanced descriptors of Performance Level Descriptors of the Wyoming Content and Performance Standards. Curriculum facilitators and their committees served as the standard setting committees for the determination of advanced status in their respective content areas. The facilitators and committees reviewed the State Standards, Benchmarks, and Performance Level Descriptors to develop a profile of an advanced student. As part of this process, the committees determined the cognition implied in the advanced descriptors of the Performance Level Descriptors and matched that expectation to courses that most reflected that level of cognition. Each content area identified advanced courses and further developed the profile of advanced students based on performance results in each course.

Body of Evidence – Comparability

Comparability in a Given Year

The common assessment approach utilized in our district helps ensure comparability of assessments for all students in a given year regardless of classroom, program, or school in the district. For example, whether a student takes a common course at Campbell County High School, Wright Junior/Senior High, or Westwood High School, all students take the same assessments regardless of the school they attend.

Each open-ended assessment has standard expectations tied to a common rubric that supports a common administration from teacher to teacher and school to school. Close-ended assessments are also administered in a standardized way in each classroom.

Our comparability is enhanced by the production of assessment booklets for each teacher. Curriculum facilitators are responsible for ensuring that assessment booklets are accurate and distributed to all teachers each year. These booklets provide curriculum guides, assessments, assessment guides, common rubrics, and common administration guidelines for each course with common assessments. Curriculum facilitators are also expected to meet with new teachers as necessary to ensure their understanding of the system.

District-wide trainings are on-going and include scoring workshops, reliability exercises, and other content area curriculum meetings scheduled as necessary.

Comparability Across Years

In order to provide comparability across years, the district uses common scoring rubrics that remain consistent from year-to-year. Any changes in our rubrics are strategic with the purpose of improving our system in a calculated and thoughtful way. Because consistent scoring of open-ended assessments from year-to-year is necessary, we are developing/maintaining anchor papers (or anchor assessments) and “seeded” papers (or “seeded” assessments) for our inter-rater reliability work. Anchor papers/assessments enhance comparability and are utilized as exemplars to guide scoring year after year. Papers/assessments scored from past semesters or years can be seeded into the inter-rater reliability process to further ensure comparability across years. The ongoing curriculum meetings and scoring workshops referred to above contribute to comparability across years.

Replacing Assessment Tasks/Items

After the practice BOE practice peer review in April of 2008, the peer review teams suggested our district refine its process to replace assessment tasks/items. In an effort to clarify this issue, a formal procedure was created in the fall of 2008 to be used for future changes.

The district assessment system may need to be adjusted from time to time. If tasks/items become memorable, are poorly aligned, or are deemed biased, they should be replaced with comparable tasks/items in terms of content, focus, and cognitive demand.

Additionally, the Wyoming Content and Performance Standards are reviewed and revised on a five-year cycle which could lead to changes in the alignment between our assessments and the State Standards. When changes are made to our district's assessment system, they are done intentionally and with considerable thought by our curriculum facilitators and their respective committees.