The Wyoming Department of Education would like to thank all the districts that willingly shared their current Body of Evidence plans for this project. The intent of posting sample BOE plans is to provide clear examples of different approaches that satisfied the criterion when reviewed during the 2009 BOE Peer Review. Since the BOE plans are the property of the identified districts, please contact the individual district directly should you want to use any part of their plan.

The following example is what a **common assessment approach** section for alignment might look like:

Section 2: Alignment

In order to meet the alignment criterion on the BOE Peer Review Rubric, the submitted plan must include evidence of the following:

- There is documentation of **adequate sampling** of benchmarks as well as all the standards within the two representative content areas.
- There is evidence of a **two-way alignment process**: all assessment items and tasks align to standards and are represented in the assessments within the two representative content areas.
- The assessments from the representative content areas reflect the **cognitive depth** of the content standards and the types of student performance described in the performance standards.

Evidence in plan to support required criteria for alignment:

- ☐ Assessment samples for the representative content areas (1 core & 1 non-core) are included.
- ☐ Blueprints for the assessment samples are included in the plan.
- ☐ Matrices indicating all the assessments in the representative content areas (1 core & 1 non-core) and the standards and benchmarks assessed by each are included.
- ☐ The processes used by the district to ensure alignment of current standards and benchmarks as well as future changes are described.
- ☐ If the district Body of Evidence system includes course-based information (e.g., grades), the process for assuring alignment among the course curriculum, standards, assessments, and grading practices are described and appropriate polices included.
- ☐ Evidence of the processes used to ensure alignment of assessment items/tasks to the levels of cognition called for in the performance standards is present.
- ☐ Evidence of “think aloud” protocols and/or careful examination of student work is used to evaluate/document, and revise, if necessary, the alignment of its standards and assessment system.

ALIGNMENT

Alignment of State and District Standards

Adopted State Content Standards

Big Horn School District #1 has adopted the state content and performance standards. We have aligned district standards to these content standards and benchmarks. Performance descriptors for each content area have been developed and utilized as a gage in determining proficiency. (See end of standard setting section pages 14-17.) This process for the alignment of district standards to state standards is summarized below.

Stakeholders Involved

Dedicated Time

The district has facilitated this process by providing district in-service days for grade level and content area teams to accomplish alignment. Additional time is provided for grade level and content level teams by hiring substitute teachers so staff can have quality time together.

Alignment Teams

All curriculum teams consist of a secondary subcommittee and an elementary subcommittee**.** Initially the entire team met to review the alignment process. The teams then broke up into appropriate levels and began the process of horizontally aligning the State standards to our district standards by grade and subject. Performance descriptors were also developed patterned after the State models.

Horizontal standard alignment

Vertical standard alignment

Team members then solicited input from their own faculties. Once it was determined that alignment was completed by the elementary and secondary subcommittees, the entire content area committee met to review the vertical alignment of the standards from grades K-12 across all content areas.

Stakeholder input

When the teams completed their work, the standards were disseminated for comment. This was done at the individual school buildings through public notice and through review of standards at Parent Advisory Committee meetings. The standards were also reviewed at District Advisory Committee meetings. Once an appropriate period of time for public input was granted, a final draft of the standards was taken to the school board for adoption.

Alignment of Curriculum to Standards

Content Matrix

Standards have been aligned to specific grade levels and courses. District teams then developed common district assessments based on this alignment. (See pages 10-28.) The standard/course alignment chart and alignment matrices identify the specific areas standards are taught and assessed. These matrices list the course and assessment; they correlate the standard and benchmarks that each course and assessment cover. The cognitive level of each assessment task is noted with a 1-4 correspondence to Webb's Depth of Knowledge Descriptors. (1-Recall, 2-Basic Application of Skill, 3-Strategic Thinking, 4-Extended Thinking.) Adequate sampling is reflected in these matrices. (See examples at the end of this section on pages 4-5.) Standards are covered in more than one assessment and more than one course to ensure multiple opportunities for students.

Webb's Depth of Knowledge

Multiple Opportunities

Two-way Alignment

Adequate Sampling

Assessments have been two-way aligned to ensure that all assessment items and tasks align to standards and are adequately sampled at the appropriate cognitive level as dictated by the standards and performance descriptors. An assessment blueprint was utilized to map this two-way alignment (See samples at end of this section on pages 6-9.) These blueprints call for an in-depth analysis of each assessment and assessment item or task. Content teams reviewed the standards being covered. All standards were prioritized according to importance in developing proficiency in the content area. This prioritization was noted on the blueprint and referred to as assessments were developed and the number of times each benchmark would be assessed was determined. The cognitive level of each assessment item was also checked for alignment with what the standards and performance descriptors demanded.

Blueprints

Standard Prioritization

Cognitive Level

Examination of Student Work

Student work is examined to check alignment. Teachers look to see if the products students are producing provide a clear demonstration of standard mastery at appropriate cognitive levels based on our performance

descriptors. This examination leads to assessment item revision. This process is detailed in the comparison section of this plan. We also have begun to annotate student work as we review it to use as anchor papers. (See pages 29-38.)

Alignment of Instruction to Standards

Curriculum Maps

To insure that our instruction and courses are standards-based, we are developing course curriculum maps. These maps provide an overview of the course, content covered, assessments and units of study for the year. (See pages 39-43 at end of this section for examples).

These curriculum maps also demonstrate an alignment of instruction and assessment across the district. Each map provides a teacher an instructional framework for any particular course.

Dual System

Our Body of Evidence is a dual system so course grades are tracked separately from our standard proficiency levels. Grades count toward Carnegie credits. Standard proficiency is determined through demonstrated success on the carefully aligned assessments over time.

Future Standard Changes

Future Alignment

Over time as the State changes or revises State Standards, our district will follow the above outlined process for aligning to our district standards and assessments.