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

Name of Assessment: HEAP Module 345: http://heaphealthliteracy.com

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: 9/19/12

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.		DOK is a lower "skill" level for this GLE. Assessment does a good job of matching the DOK through the selected response, short answer, and extended response. Hits only 2 of the 3 evidence outcomes for the GLE
Grade Level(s): 8th Grade		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: CH09-GR.8-S.2-GLE.3		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-2		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1-2 (prompts from extended response are low on bloom's taxonomy)		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Signs, symptoms and transmission of HIV/AIDS and other STDs		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): Create a written plan, identify and recall information, provide written dialogue		
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 standard/		

x Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. □ Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. □ 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 skills expected are a direct match. i.e. GLE states that student should be able to summarize how to prevent and the assessment has a question that directly reflects that very statement).		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	4	

	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 expectations. □ 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: Direct DOK alignment. Level 1-2 (i.e. Identify, Describe, Summarize).		
	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	The only unique discussion the cohort discovered was general vs. specific rubrics. The suggestion of the group was that teachers would have to add their specific language from classroom instruction to improve the consistency of grading practices on the assessment itself. A general rubric would provide input yet would be improved in the level of feedback you could give by providing specific language from the assessment in the rubric.
□ Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)	x	
□ Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)	x	
□ 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 scoring criteria is very good yet is general in nature compared to the specifics of the assessment.	**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: Criteria tended to not only be general/holistic rubric that does a poor job of defining progression between levels.	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	2	
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	2	
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? Only 1 of the constructed responses supply student work. It would be helpful to have examples for all 3 responses.		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: Font is slightly small on the online version of the HEAP work.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	Important to note that teacher needs to be aware that some of the vocabulary may be difficult for lower level learners.
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	
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: Selected responses, short answers, and constructed response are all very clear.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Straight Forward Rating	3	
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? Provide an explanation of your response: The vocabulary within the questions could cause a struggle for ELL or SPED (For example..."substantial evidence", "accumulated", "associated risks", etc.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	
3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. Assessment uses same language as represented within the specific standard. It is appropriate for middle school students. However, getting LEXILE reading data for the assessment would be helpful.	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. Assessment is very content specific with little room for confusion.	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:bjkids4gwcy&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? *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. 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 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: This is an appropriate 8th grade "real world" connections due to internal and external influences around their sexuality.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	The assessment does a good job of providing a base of understanding towards standards and the level of DOK.
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 assessment uses a variety of avenues to allow students to show learning - i.e. selected response, short answer, extended response are all in the same assessment. The coverage of the evidence outcomes are comprehensive.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	**3**	
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: This is only a DOK of level 1-2 so providing meaningful feedback about critical thinking skills at a higher level is not evident (which for issues around sexuality would provide for more meaningful conversations).	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	**2**	
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: DOK is only level 1-2 so the opportunity for true 21st century skills is limited. The assessment only asked for lower level skills that did not promote things such as cross-content connections, creativity, etc.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	**1**	

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: DOK is specific to content understanding. With the descriptors of describe, identify, summarize, etc. it would be easy to analyze student performance.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Competency on Standards Rating	**3**	
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: DOK being a level 1-2 we would see this as a summative piece to provide an idea of the overall student performance on basic content. Teachers could use this as part of the final assessment in a unit. Additional assessment would be required to address the more complex components of the GLE.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	**3**	

Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	4	5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	6	7
		85.7%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	2	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	2	3
Student Work Samples Rating	2	3
Subtotal	10	15
		66.7%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	3
Straight Forward Rating	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	3
Academic Language Rating	3	3
Confusing Language Rating	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	2
Subtotal	14	17
		82.4%
Engagement Rating	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	1	3
Competency on Standards Rating	3	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	15	18
		83.3%
Grand Total	45	57
		78.9%

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

Fully Recommended	x
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	