

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 fairness might look like:

Section 4: Fairness

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

- There is evidence the district uses procedures or tools to ensure that **assessment items/tasks** are not **biased** against subgroups of students.
- There is evidence the district uses **accommodations** appropriately.
- There is evidence the district provides **multiple assessment opportunities**.
- A **variety of assessment formats and strategies** are included in the system.
- The district **disaggregates assessment results** (i.e. ethnicity, gender & socio-economic status) and the results are used to search for possible bias in the system.
- Relevant district data are presented to document that **participation rates** are at least 95% for all subgroups.

Evidence in plan to support required criteria for fairness:

- The procedures (e.g., bias committees) used to ensure that items and tasks are not biased against any subgroups of students are described.
- Sample forms and/or notes from bias review committee meetings are included.
- Policies and procedures for ensuring fair participation of all students in the system (e.g. students with disabilities or English language proficiency) are evident.
- There is evidence that illustrates accommodations are used.
- There is evidence that the district system provides students with multiple opportunities, using different formats and strategies, to demonstrate their knowledge and skills.
- The plan includes disaggregated assessment results by identifiable subgroups (i.e. ethnicity, gender & socio-economic status) and describes how the district uses the information to make decisions.
- There is evidence that disaggregated assessment results are used to search for potential bias in the assessment system.
- The plan includes participation rates data for the content area assessments submitted

Section 4: Fairness

The district describes procedures to ensure that **assessment items/tasks** are **not biased against subgroups** of students.

A. ~~Assessment Bias~~

To ensure fairness, the Passport System is based on the provision that all students are enrolled in Indicator Courses (See Appendix 2C and 4A) where instruction is aligned to the Passport targets and access to the assessments is guaranteed. To eliminate bias, the Director of Special Services and the Title III Coordinator reviewed the performance descriptors which define proficiency. Resource teachers and ELL teachers participate in curriculum mapping, district Passport implementation and scoring sessions. The resource and ELL teachers also provide additional support by providing additional time, additional multiple opportunities, and academic support classes on Passport assessments consistent with students' IEP and ILP accommodations (Appendix 4B). In addition, these support teachers participate in double-scoring sessions to ensure that the tasks are free of bias. To address bias, SSD#1, as a part of the standards-setting process, set cut scores by using sub-group data (Appendix 4C). The district is in the process of developing alternative assessments addressing the amount of writing required by certain Passport assessments (Appendix 4D). Bias reviews are conducted on an annual basis by reviewing performance data of student sub-groups to determine disparate performance. S.M.A.R.T. goals and action plans are developed to address gaps in sub-group performance (Appendix 2G).

B. ~~Accommodations and Alternate Assessments~~

The students are provided accommodations consistent with their Individual Learning Plan (ILP), Individual Education Plan (IEP) or 504 Plan. Students retaking Passport assessments a year or more after enrollment in the Indicator Course must use alternate content and repeat the Passport assessment at the same level of difficulty. As described in the overview, a committee has begun work to develop alternative assessments (Appendix 4D). The Wyoming Department of Education guidelines for the participation of all students as outlined in the *Wyoming State Accountability Handbook* are followed.

The district provides evidence that **accommodations** are used appropriately.

C. Multiple Opportunities

There is evidence that the district provides **multiple assessment opportunities**.

Within indicator courses, teachers provide 2 or more classroom opportunities for students to demonstrate proficiency or advanced proficiency. In addition to classroom opportunities, students may access supplemental instruction and assessment opportunities during school, before school, after school, in night school, and during summer school (Appendix 4E). Scores demonstrating improved performance on succeeding attempts, replace previous Passport assessment scores.

As noted earlier, students retaking Passport assessments a year or more after enrollment in the Indicator Course must use alternate content and repeat the Passport assessment at the same level of difficulty (Appendix 4F).

D. Variety of Assessment Strategies

The district describes how a **variety of assessment formats and strategies** are included in their system

The Passport assessments contain a variety of assessment formats and strategies. Examples of the variety include analyzing data from tables, many forms of writing, constructing graphic organizers, performing experiments, diagramming, plotting, attending a public meeting, fitness analysis and critiquing a performance or product. In Science, for example, the assessments include conducting experiments, designing a brochure about a genetic disorder and defending the relationship between an organism and its environment (Appendix 4G). These are complex performance assessments geared to higher thinking levels requiring application, analysis, evaluation and synthesis. All of the performance assessments are at levels 3 and 4 in Webb's DOK model.

E. Disaggregating Assessment Results

The district **disaggregates assessment results** by subgroups. **Data** is presented in appendix.

Passport assessment data are analyzed by department teams annually (See Appendix 4C). The data are disaggregated by all NCLB sub-groups represented in §SD#1. Refusal data are reviewed and plans are developed to increase participation rates (Appendix 2G).

The district presents **data relating to participation rates and outlines procedures** to improve these rates for all groups of students.

F. Participation Rates

Student participation in the 2006/2007 school year was 82% and for the 2007/2008 school year was 87%. While overall participation rates increased, a review of disaggregated participation rates indicates some areas of concern. The areas of concern include the ELL and Hispanic subgroups (many are duplicated count) where participation levels were considerably lower than the general population. Plans are being developed by the ELL coordinator, high school administration and ELL teachers to address the lower participation rate for these subgroups and to develop positive steps to increase their participation (See Appendix 4H).

There is a documented process for the notification of parents when a student refuses to participate in the Passport assessments (See Appendix 4I). Parents and students may also access participation data via the online reporting system (See Appendix 4F).