

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 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

A. Method of Standard Setting

The district describes a **rationale and defensible method** of standard setting.

Sweetwater School District #1 selected the Body of Work Method (Kahl, et al. 1995; Sweeney, Kahl, Kingston & Bay, 2000) for standard setting. The Body of Work Method was presented by Dr. Rich Hill (Wyoming Assessment Activities Consortium, Cody, 2003) as a defensible process to determine standards. One of the advantages of the process is to compare student authentic class work to performance on assessments. Another advantage is that the process considers the performance of sub-groups in standard setting. Finally, the method requires consistent involvement of classroom teachers in the standard-setting process.

B. Cut Scores

The district describes the process used to ensure **cut-scores are clearly tied to the performance descriptors**. Supporting evidence is provided in appendices.

The Body of Work method resulted in cut scores through the following process:

1. Collaborative development of performance descriptors by content teachers. Teachers were asked to define how proficient performance by students on state standards would be described (Appendix 2C). In addition, advanced proficient performance was described.
2. The assessments were piloted and scored. Agreement on rubric scores was reached through professional development followed by double-scoring workshops. Inter-rater reliability was established.
3. Teachers compared performance on assessments to student performance in the classroom for congruity of measurement.
4. Adjustments were made to assessments and rubrics based on actual student work and teacher input.
5. Revised Passport assessments were administered and scored. The data were disaggregated by sub-groups and content areas to determine the performance of each of the sub-groups including students in advanced placement courses.
6. The impact of the range of cut scores was reviewed to determine the effect that specific scores would have on providing a fair assessment process.

7. Proficiency cut scores were established to provide fairness to even the lowest performing subgroup. Advanced proficiency cut scores were set using the prior performance in indicator courses of students who were later enrolled in one or more advanced placement courses (Appendix 5A; Appendix 5B) The standard-setting process will be revisited in the 2009/2010 Passport review cycle. The process will be consistent with the Wyoming's Pathway to 2014 standards review schedule (Appendix 2H).

The district describes the timeline showing **adequate notification** for students on progress toward proficiency in each content area.

C. Adequate Notification

During the registration of 8th grade students for 9th grade, high school staff provide parents and students with Passport information. This information includes multiple opportunities, cut scores representing proficient and advanced performance and information regarding the online access to student Passport results (Appendix 5C; Appendix 4F). During a student's 9th grade year, district office staff present SSD#1 body of evidence information to all 9th grade students during the school day (See Appendix 5B) and students create a S.M.A.R.T. goal and action plan to meet their graduation goal. Parents and students access and monitor progress towards content area proficiencies using the on-line reporting system (Appendix 4F). High school counselors meet regularly with students to monitor progress towards content area proficiencies. Letters are sent home annually to all juniors indicating their status in relation to content area proficiencies and graduation (Appendix 5E). Informational materials related to Body of Evidence are translated into Spanish.

The district describes the procedures by which **key stakeholders** are involved in the standard setting process. Additional evidence is provided in the appendices.

D. Key Stakeholders

As previously described, primary stakeholders were involved in all aspects of the Body of Work process. Stakeholders included administrators, teachers, department chairs, and special programs staff. In addition, other stakeholders including parents and community members met to review the draft performance level descriptors and provide input prior to adoption by the Board of Trustees (Appendix 5D; Appendix 5F).