

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 **course-based, common assessment approach** section for comparability might look like:

Section 6: Comparability

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

- The district provides evidence that specific procedures are in place for ensuring comparability of assessments for all students **in a given year**, regardless of classroom, program, or school in the district.
- The district provides evidence that specific procedures are in place for ensuring comparability **across years**.
- The district provides evidence that specific procedures are in place for **replacing assessment tasks/items** with comparable tasks/items in terms of content, focus, and cognitive demand.

Evidence in plan to support required criteria for comparability:

- There is documentation of on-going district-wide trainings, common rubrics, the use of “seeded” papers, and common administration guidelines used to ensure comparability.
 - The district has a process for ensuring the assessments are administered similarly from year-to-year.
 - There is evidence that the district ensures that assessments are scored the same as in previous years (e.g., the use of anchor papers and common scoring rubrics, and scoring workshops for new teachers).
 - The plan includes evidence of procedures for replacing assessment tasks/items such as the use of assessment blueprints and protocols
-

Section 6: Comparability

Purpose of Comparability

The purpose of this section is to ensure that the district's Body of Evidence assessment results are comparable across teachers and schools and year to year throughout the district and to ensure that decisions made regarding Body of Evidence transcript endorsements for students is fair and equitable over time.

Measures to Ensure Comparability

Sublette County School District #1 has achieved comparability in its assessment system by requiring teachers teaching the same course or grade level, regardless of location, to use the same set of assessments to evaluate student achievement for Body of Evidence purposes. For example, all algebra 1 teachers use the same set of assessments.

Additionally, all staff members are trained in the terminology and administration procedures of common assessments. Each assessment has administrative guidelines, teacher directions, and student directions. Each staff member was trained in the process of developing these assessments as well as in implementing them. Additional training is provided when staff examines student work and when staff score assessments using a common rubric. This training is ongoing and continued with annual training.

The district provides evidence of specific procedures for ensuring comparability of assessments **in a given year** regardless of classroom, program or school.

Within a given Year and Year-to-Year Consistency

The Pinedale High School Body of Evidence system ensures assessments are administered in a manner comparable from year to year and that the assessments are scored the same way as in previous years by following these procedures:

1. Each assessment has standard assessment directions which ensure that the assessments are administered the same way in a given year, from teacher to teacher, school to school, and from year to year. (Appendix B and C)
2. Scoring rubrics are designed and utilized for each assessment ensuring that the assessments are scored using the same criteria regardless of which teacher scores the assessment. (Appendix B and C)
3. Anchor papers or anchor projects are provided as guides after the piloting phase of the assessment. (Appendix B, Health)
4. Scorers are provided with training and practice on scoring specific performance assessments. **On going training** is provided to teachers on scoring open ended assessments. New staff receive additional training on the process during their required new teacher training workshops. (Appendix B, Math – Inter rater agreement process)

The district describes a process to ensure that assessments are administered similarly from year to year.

The district describes a process to ensure that assessments are scored the same as in previous years.

5. Multiple scoring on required Body of Evidence assessments is accomplished through training conducted by content area chairs and then collaboratively scoring assessments utilizing a **common rubric** with all of content area staff members.

1. Each year, Content Area Chairs have 10 % of the required Body of Evidence assessments for each course roster re-scored by a knowledgeable, independent scorer to check for inter-rater agreement (Appendix B, Math).

2. For courses with a single teacher the district has established procedures that require the teacher to calibrate their scoring from cohort of students to cohort. This is accomplished by having the teacher:

- a. Review the performance descriptors for the content area,
- b. Review the **rubrics** for the specific task,
- c. Review the scoring of past cohort samples and
- d. **Seeding** the current set of tasks with samples from previous administrations to ensure consistent evaluation of the tasks (Appendix B, Health).

District has processes to ensure comparability with issues unique as a result of their size.

Procedures for Replacing Assessment Tasks/items

Standards and benchmarks are not static. They continue to be revised and changed over time. In Wyoming the standards and benchmarks are on a five-year cycle of review. Therefore, the required Body of Evidence assessments will need to be reviewed and revised to maintain alignment. The effectiveness of the assessments, the resulting data, and the control of the assessments are monitored at the district level. Annual reviews of assessments by teachers and administrators allow refinement and improvement of the assessments and the assessment system. The following procedures guide the process of revising and replacing assessment tasks or items.

1. Review of body of Evidence Assessments

Content area specialists and department committees review assessments annually.

2. Determining the Tasks or Items for Replacement

Memorable tasks, poorly aligned tasks and outdated tasks must be replaced. Tasks that are biased are replaced. Task that are a better match for the cognitive complexity implied in the standard are utilized as available for replacement.

3. The Number of Items or Tasks to be Replaced and Maintaining Comparability from Year to Year

Content area departments must apply to revise or replace Body of Evidence assessments on an annual basis. (Appendix I)

On closed ended tasks no more that 33% of the items can be replaced and still be said to maintain year-to-year comparability.

The district outlines specific **procedures for replacing assessment tasks/items** with comparable tasks/items in Steps 1-7.

For performance tasks generally the entire task will need to be replaced. No more than 33% of the performance tasks may be replaced in a content area and still be said to provide for year-to-year comparability in the content area.

4. Use of Test Blueprints

Each assessment blueprint will be used as a guide for the development of comparable items or tasks (**cognitive level, content, focus**) to cover the same standards and benchmarks (Appendix B).

5. Pilot and Re-pilot Revised Assessments

It will be necessary to monitor the new assessment items on a closed ended test. Piloting will be necessary on new performance assessments including rubric development, revision and cut score process.

6. Scoring Rubrics for Revised Assessments

It will be necessary to develop new rubrics for new performance assessments.

7. Reviewing New or Revised Assessments for Bias

The district bias committee will review all new or revised assessments for bias.