

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 standard setting might look like:

Section 5: Standard-Setting

In order to meet the standard-setting criterion on the BOE Peer Review Scoring Guide, the submitted plan must include evidence of the following:

- The district plan describes a **rationale** and a **defensible method** of standard-setting. It explains how the determination is made regarding proficiency levels in each content area.
- The plan identifies **cut scores** for each level of performance and the method used to determine these cut scores. It shows that they are clearly tied to performance standards.
- The district plan presents a timeline showing **adequate notification** to students on progress toward proficiency in each content area.
- There is evidence that the district has included **key stakeholders** (e.g., parents, community members, teachers) in the standard-setting process.

Evidence in plan to support required criteria for standard setting:

- The rationale and the standard-setting method used for determining proficiency at the content level is described.
- The cut scores used for each level of proficiency in the representative content area are included in the plan.
- The levels at which the cut scores have been set are clearly tied to the performance descriptors for the representative content areas.
- How and when individual scores are aggregated to make “graduate/not graduate” decisions are explained.
- The plan includes the timeline the district uses for their student notification process.
- The plan describes how key stakeholders are involved in the standard-setting process.

Section 5. Standard Setting

Method

Sublette County School District #1 uses a “**Contrasting Groups**” method to determine cut scores for their Body of Evidence system. **Teacher ratings** of overall student performance at the

content area are compared with the **actual student performance** on Body of Evidence assessment tasks to form the contrasting groups.

Teacher ratings were based on agreed upon performance descriptors derived from the Wyoming Content Area Standards and Benchmarks. The actual data from students' Body of Evidence assessments were aggregated for each content area.

The aggregated scores were compared with teacher ratings to determine a range for cut scores for each content area. Cut scores are determined by a standard-setting committee described in **Step 6** of this section. Cut scores were set at the content level which supports the district's compensatory, course-based model.

The district plan describes a **rationale and defensible method** of standard setting. It explains how the **determination** is made regarding **proficiency levels** in each content area.

Rationale for Selection of Standard Setting Method

The process of **Contrasting Groups** compares teacher ratings based on content standard performance definitions with student's standard-based scores. Content area proficiency definitions are based on the performance descriptors taken from the Wyoming Content Standard and Benchmarks with minor modifications.

The **Contrasting Groups** method was selected because:

1. Teacher judgment of overall student proficiency is solidly based on the agreed upon definitions of content area proficiency.
2. Utilizing the actual scores from Body of Evidence assessments for the content area helps to balance any error in teacher judgment in the overall decision.
3. This process ties the scores to the content area performance definitions.
4. The calculations and graphs provide a solid starting point for the discussions involved in establishing the final cut scores for content area proficiency.

Aggregation and Determination of Proficiency Levels

Content area proficiency is based on identifying the exact assessments utilized for providing evidence of proficiency. Each assessment is evaluated using a 4 point scale that represents an Advanced performance as 4, a Proficient performance as 3, a Basic performance as 2 and Below Basic performance as 1. All identified assessments from the required/gatekeeper courses are added together to provide a total number of points. All Body of Evidence assessments are weighted equally in the content area.

Evidence of **key stakeholder involvement** is described.

Determining Cut Scores

Key stakeholders are involved through a **standard-setting committee** which determines the final cut score for each content area. Committee members are provided training in the standard-setting process; they discuss impacts of possible cut scores and affirm the cut point decision.

Steps and Description of Standard Setting Process

Step 1. Learning about Standard Setting

Sublette County School District #1 staff were involved in several trainings regarding the purpose and the method of standard setting selected for the Body of Evidence plan. Staff received an overview of the requirements for standard setting as well as very specific training for completion

of standard setting tasks. Additionally, new staff members receive training on the Body of Evidence system during the fall Professional Development Institute. Performance descriptors used for cut score comparisons have been included in Appendix J.

Step 2. Planning for Standard Setting

A core group of administrators met and developed a plan to accomplish the work of standard setting.

Step 3. Training

The core group provided information to the high school staff to give a general overview of the standard setting method being used, the process that would be followed and the implications of setting cut scores for BOE. Specific training was given to teachers regarding the task of developing a clear, concise and agreed upon definitions of content area proficiencies. These proficiencies are utilized for the process of rating students.

Step 4. Rating of Students and Collection of Data (Appendix B, Math and Health Standard Setting, Proficiency Definitions, Procedures and information)

1. The first step in this phase was to have content area teachers develop clear definitions describing the performance levels for student work and achievement at the advanced, proficient, basic and below basic levels in each content area. The framework for these definitions came directly from the Wyoming State Standards and Benchmarks. These definitions were affirmed and agreed upon by the content area department.
1. The students enrolled during the year of 2007-2008 and taking the most advanced course required in any given content area were selected for the rating process. Fine and Performing Arts and Foreign language do not have a required course. The entry-level courses in these content areas were used for the rating group. This method of selecting students provided the most consistency and greatest number of students for the standard setting process.
2. A step-by-step process was utilized by teachers to rate their students based on the established performance descriptors. They rated their students as advanced, proficient, basic, or below basic. The information was given to the data administrator. Body of Evidence assessments for each student were retrieved and aggregated by the data administrator, thus forming the two contrasting groups.

The steps described provide evidence that the **cut scores are clearly tied to the performance standards.**

The district describes how the different levels of performance are **tied to the performance descriptors.**

Step 5. Expression of Data (Appendix B, Math and Health Standard Setting)

The data administrator prepared spreadsheets that listed all of the identified students and their teacher's rating of their performance based on the standards-based definitions. Next, the scores from the Body of Evidence assessments were compiled with teacher ratings. This information was displayed in charts and graphs for use by standard-setting groups and for summarizing

findings. Because of the limited sample size and because standard setting is not a precise process, the district regularly reviews the cut scores every four years.

Step 6. Standard Setting Groups/Members (Appendix B, Math and Health Standard Setting)

The purpose of a standard setting group is to assure that the cut scores between proficiency levels are community friendly and reflect local norms for the Body of Evidence system.

Stakeholder involvement in the standard setting process is outlined.

The composition of each content area standard-setting group includes:

- Teacher(s) from the content area
- Parent(s)/Community member(s)
- Administrator(s)
- Non-content area teacher(s)
- Student(s)

Acceptable dates, times and location are set with the group members for the standard setting work. Training is provided to all members and includes:

- A consensus based decision making process
- Background on Body of Evidence
- How and why specific data/activities have been identified as proof of proficiency on the Wyoming State Content Standards and Benchmarks
- BOE content area performance level definitions with examples of student work that illustrate these definitions
- Implications of setting a cut score too high or too low
- The data and the charts that summarize and display the ranges of cut scores.

The group approves the definitions of proficiency established by the teachers, examines, discusses and affirms the cut scores for the content area.

Step 7. Board Approval

The core administrative team presents the Board with information regarding the cut score process and explains the recommendations formulated by the nine content area committees.

Timeline for **adequate notification** to students on progress towards proficiency in each content area is described.

Step 8. Student Notification Timeline (Appendix A)

Body of Evidence assessments are recorded in the district's student data management system. Students and parents are notified immediately when assessments are assigned and scored through the online student data management system. During the spring, counselors inform students and parents of the student's progress toward graduation. The notification includes the potential for earning the various Body of Evidence transcript endorsements and the number and type of credits earned to date (Appendix A).

(Excerpt from Body of Evidence Plan Overview on Notification)

Notification of Progress towards Body of Evidence and Graduation

During the spring the high school counselor meets with each 8th grade student and his/her parents prior to entry into high school. Part of this conference is devoted to explaining the grade, credit and Body of Evidence requirements for high school.

During the spring high school students and their parents are informed of the student’s progress toward graduation. The information (Appendix A) includes the potential for earning the various Body of Evidence transcript endorsements and the number and type of credits earned to date.

The guidance counselor meets with students who are off track for graduation. One-on-one or small group sessions are provided to develop appropriate schedules and a plan for graduation including demonstrating Body of Evidence standard’s proficiencies.

Cut Scores for Math and Health Content Areas

Body of Evidence Cut Scores for Math Content Area Proficiency	
24 points possible in Content Area	
Advanced	24 - 22
Proficient	21 - 16
Basic	15 - 11
Below Basic	10 and below

Body of Evidence Cut Scores for Health Content Area Proficiency	
36 points possible in Content Area	
Advanced	36 - 32
Proficient	31 - 23
Basic	22 - 15
Below Basic	14 and below

Cut-scores for the two representative content areas are presented and documentation that they are clearly tied to the performance descriptors is evident in the appendix.

Full documentation on the standard setting process for Math and Health are available in Appendix B.