

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 policies 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.

Section 2: Alignment

A. Adequate Sampling

Teacher teams in the district identified the targets needed to adequately and comprehensively sample the state standards and benchmarks. The Sweetwater School District #1 Assessment Blueprint/Matrix (See Appendix 2A) classifies Passport assessment targets by state standard and outlines the specific benchmarks, which are explicitly measured in the assessment collection.

Those benchmarks not represented in the collection are included as instructional targets on curriculum maps.

B. Two-way Alignment Process

Two-way alignment is guaranteed by means of matching all assessment tasks to state standards and benchmarks and reviewing student performance on the assessments in relationship to intent of the standards and benchmarks. (See highlighted items in Appendix 2C). The cognitive complexity of the standards and benchmarks are reflected in the depth of knowledge (DOK) required by the complex, performance assessments (See Appendix 2B). A Content Area Profile (See Appendix 2C) serves as the blueprint and summarizes the state standards, district performance level descriptors, Passport assessment targets and Passport assessments for each common core area.

The alignment process began with the district convening departments and leadership teams to validate alignment among performance level descriptors and state content standards. Department members and community representatives reviewed the performance level descriptors before recommending for adoption. The local Board of Trustees adopted the descriptors in March of 2004. The initial discussions about the Body of Evidence system began with the Board, February of 2002, initial approval was given in March of 2004 followed by the final approval in January of 2006 (Appendix 2D). The Passport assessments have been aligned to state standards through a process in which their creation, piloting, revision and implementation

consistently referenced the state standards. Concern with student performance on some of the assessments resulted in departments identifying possible causes of variation in student performance. Through the curriculum mapping process, teachers identified the pre-requisite knowledge, reasoning and skill underpinnings for the Passport assessments (Appendix 2E). Teachers are developing common assessments for learning to measure student achievement of the underpinnings (Appendix 2F). With the assistance of instructional coaches, department teams reviewed student performance data, set S.M.A.R.T. goals, and developed action plans to improve student performance (Appendix 2G). Similar processes will be utilized to address any changes in the Standards or Benchmarks that result from the Pathway to 2014 (Appendix 2H).

C. Cognitive Depth

Webb's Depth of Knowledge (See Appendix 2B) model was used to align assessments to district performance level descriptors. A DOK level is identified on all Passport Assessments in the system (see Science and Fine & Performing Arts Assessments). Supporting the DOK model, the level of each target is identified on curriculum maps as knowledge, reasoning, skill and product (Appendix 2E).