High Quality Assessment Content Validity Review Tool

To understand the review process and the use of the review tool, go to: How to use the Assessment Review Tool

Content Area: Comprehensive Health Education	
Name of Assessment: HEAP Module 321: http://heaphealthliteracy.com	
Reviewer: Content Collaborative	
Date of Review: 11/14/12	

Assessment Profile	
Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):	**Check All That Apply**
Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)	x
Short Answer (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)	x
Extended Response (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)	x
Product (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)	
Performance (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)	
Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)	
The assessment includes:	**Check All That Apply**
Teacher directions (may include prerequisites/description of instruction before giving the assessment e.g., this assessment should be given after students have learned …)	
Scoring Guide/Rubric	x
Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like	x
Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)	
Estimated time for administration	
Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?	
Other:	

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		
Grade Level(s): 7th Grade		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: CH09-GR.7-S.2-GLE.2		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-3		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1-3		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: decision-making process, healthy eating choices,		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): Reasoning, analysis, extended, descriptive writing		
1d.To what extent do you see a strong content match between the set of items reviewed or the task and the corresponding Colorado Academic Standard/s? Use the definitions below to select your rating. □ **Full match – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standards** □ Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/ x Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standards		

□ Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. □ No match – task or most items are not related to the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.		
Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response: The evaluation committee decided that 50% of the assessment specific to the short answer and extended response is aligned to the GLEs and evidence outcomes. The multiple choice portion of the test does not provide any link to the current standards and GLEs.		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	**3**	
	Rating Column	**Comments**
1e. Are the set of items or tasks reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating. □ More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. x Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectation □ Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.		
Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: The coverage of GLEs, based on the short answer and extended response portions of the assessment, promotes a similar rigor of cognitive challenge.		
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	
Rigor Level Rating	**2**	

A high quality assessment should be…Scored using Clear Guidelines and Criteria

Scoring Guide Present	**Check all that apply:**	**Comments**
□ Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored	x	
□ Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)	x	
□ Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)		
□ Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)		
□ Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		
	Rating Column	
2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: The rubrics are general in nature vs. specific to the wording found within the standards (i.e. rubric mentions "core concepts" but doesn't specifically mention or align to the wording within the standards) However, the scoring criteria does in fact partially align to the state standards (i.e. vocabulary, word choice, etc.).	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	**2**	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: Yes - the rubric does provide a breakdown of each performance level (4,3,2,1).	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	**3**	
2c. To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the demands within the task or item? Provide an explanation of your response. Due to the holistic nature of the rubric (based on its defined purpose to be general so it can be applied to multiple things) there is a slight loss in meeting each of the demands of the assessment.	**High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1**	

Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	**3**	
2d. Based on your review of the rubric/scoring criteria, do you think the scoring rubric would most likely lead different raters to arrive at the same score for a given response. Provide an explanation of your response. Scorers would be advised to add their specific "analytic rubric" verbiage to the holistic rubric to improve this score. In other words, teachers would add to the rubric to make the rubric more demanding and reflective of classroom instruction.	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	**2**	
2e. Is there student work (e.g., anchor papers, video, portfolio) which illustrates student mastery? If so, describe. If not, what student work would be needed? 1 exemplar was provided for the assessment.	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Student Work Samples Rating	**2**	

A high quality assessment should be...FAIR and UNBIASED

FAIR and UNBIASED (the areas below should be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)	Rating Column	Comments
3a. To what extent are most of the items or the tasks designed and formatted to be visually clear and uncluttered (e.g., use of white space, graphics, and illustrations)? Provide an explanation of your response: Assessment is clear and formatted in an easily understandable form.	**High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1**	
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	**3**	
3b. To what extent are most of the items or the task presented in as straightforward a way as possible for a range of learners? Provide an explanation of your response: The questions are long and might promote confusion.	**High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1**	
Straight Forward Rating	**2**	
3c. To what degree is the vocabulary and context(s) presented by most of the items or task free from cultural or other unintended bias? There are no issues with vocab. or context creating bias within the assessment.	**High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1**	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	**3**	
3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. Assessment does a good job of being appropriate for both the grade level and content area.	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Academic Language Rating	**3**	
3e. Does the assessment limit the usage of words that can be confused with one another (homonyms)? (Examples: ate/eight; sell/cell; allowed/aloud; beet/beat; by/buy). Provide an explanation of your response. Vocabulary or word choice is well written and would not be confused with other terms.	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Confusing Language Rating	**3**	
Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's Standards" (http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwcy&cof=FORID:10&q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language)		
3f. If applicable, what type of accommodations are provided to ensure that English Learners and/or Students with Disabilities can fully access the content represented by the task or set of items reviewed? Provide an explanation of your response.		
Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling: o Presentation Accommodations—Allow students to access information in ways that do not require them to visually read standard print. These alternate modes of access are auditory, multi-sensory, tactile, and visual. o Response Accommodations—Allow students to complete activities, assignments, and assessments in different ways or to solve or organize problems using some type of assistive device or organizer.		

	Rating Column	Comments
o Setting Accommodations—Change the location in which a test or assignment is given or the conditions of the assessment setting. o Timing and Scheduling Accommodations—Increase the allowable length of time to complete an assessment or assignment and perhaps change the way the time is organized. **o Linguistic Accommodations—Allow English language learners (ELLs) to access academic construct measured by reducing the linguistic load of an assessment. The accommodation is based on an ELL's limited English language proficiency, which is different than an accommodation based on a student's disability or a cognitive need.**		
3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response. Provide an explanation of your response. It does not provide any accommodations but there could be easy modifications added by teacher.	**Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1**	
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	**1**	

A high quality assessment…Increases Opportunities to Learn

Opportunities to Learn *(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)*	Rating Column	Comments
4a. Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new context, situation, problem or challenge? Provide an explanation of your response: We felt the final questions of the assessment (questions #9, #10, #11) do a good job of meeting real-world settings (i.e. fast food restaurants, soccer teams, holiday seasons, etc.).	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Engagement Rating	**3**	
4b. To what extent do you think the knowledge and skills tested by the assessment can provide good information about what students have learned in the classroom? Provide an explanation of your response: The final questions of the assessment does an average jog of addressing skills such as decision-making. The depth of how far students must push the process of decision making and defend that thinking is minimal (but meets to similar rigor the GLEs themselves).	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	**2**	
4c. To what degree do the results from this assessment (scores and student work analysis) foster meaningful dialogue about learning expectations and outcomes with students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response: With the quality of the "real world" situations within this assessment we believe meaningful dialogue between students, parents, teachers, etc. would be of a high quality.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	**3**	
4d. To what extent do you believe the assessment can clearly communicate expectations for academic excellence (e.g., creativity, transference to other content areas or 21st Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: The assessment is a mid-grade DOK that does not necessarily promote a high level of academic excellence. Also, the wording of the questions are slightly long which could promote some confusion on the overall product or answer to the question.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	**2**	
4e. Based on the content evaluated by the task or the set of items reviewed, to what extent do you think teachers can use the results (scores and student work analysis) to understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your response: Being we're only using 3 of the questions from the assessment the assessment does not meet the fullness of the GLE.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Competency on Standards Rating	**2**	

4f: Based on the content evaluated by the task or the set of items reviewed, to what extent do you think teachers can identify what purpose the assessment serves (e.g. diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation of your response: This assessment would allow for teachers to understand whether or not students understand the general process of decision-making. Based upon that data a teacher could adjust instruction to deepen understanding of the skill of decision making.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	

Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	3	5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	5	7
		71.4%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	2	3
Student Work Samples Rating	2	3
Subtotal	12	15
		80.0%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	3
Straight Forward Rating	2	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	3
Academic Language Rating	3	3
Confusing Language Rating	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	2
Subtotal	15	17
		88.2%
Engagement Rating	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	2	3
Competency on Standards Rating	2	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	15	18
		83.3%
Grand Total	47	57
		82.5%

This assessment is: Place an 'X' in the appropriate box

Fully Recommended	

Partially Recommended	x	We only can partially recommend this assessment because the first 8 multiple choice questions did not address the GLE whatsoever. However, the final 3 questions (short answer and extended response) create coverage of the GLE and a similar rigor standard for assessing student learning.
Not Recommended		