High Quality Assessment Content Validity Review Tool

Content Area: Mathematics

Name of Assessment: Acuity Common Core Diagnostic Assessment, Grade 6, Diagnostic Form 4

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: 9/20/12

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	
Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)	X
Estimated time for administration	
Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?	X
Other:	

Did not finish this Assessment did not seem to show much promise in terms of alignment or quality of items

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a. Grade Level(s): 6th grade. Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: MA10-GR.6-S.1-GLE.2; MA10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.1; MA10-GR.6-S.4-GLE.1; MA10-GR.6-S.3-GLE.1. Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1-2		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: algebraic expressions, inequalities, integers, volume, data displays, measure of central tendency		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed: Mathematical Practices 2, 4		
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.**		

X Full match – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. □ **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: Full alignment to the assessed GLEs and evidence outcomes, as stated in the CAS.**		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	**5**	
	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: The items appear to have the same rigor and expectation as stated in the GLEs and evidence outcomes assessed. No items appear to be lesser in rigor.**		
	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

	Check all that apply:	Comments
Scoring Guide Present □ **Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored**	**X**	
□ **Generalized Rubric** (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)		
□ **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 short answer/extended response items scoring criteria does align to the CAS and learner expectations of the CAS at a basic level. Multiple-choice is only scored as right or wrong, although the items themselves are aligned to the standards.**	**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: Performance levels not defined by the scoring guide. Cannot be determined by the materials given how performance levels are determined based on student responses.**	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	**1**	

2c. To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the demands within the task or item? Provide and explanation of your response. The scoring guide for the short answer/extended response address the demands of the tasks. Since student work is not accounted for in the multiple-choice items, that information is not included with the answer key for those items.	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. **Very clear scoring guidelines for the short answer/extended response, more likely to lead to consistency.**	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	3	
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? **Exemplars and anchor papers for the short answer/extended response items to show varied solution methods that are grade-level appropriate.**	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Student Work Samples Rating	1	

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: Appropriate space provided, and all illustrations and graphics help clarify the problem and do not create distractions. Given this is meant to be an online assessment, problem spacing is not an issue.**	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: Items are presented very straightforward with no unnecessary or confusing language.**	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: No bias or vocabulary issues identified with the items. The contexts do not confuse the mathematics being assessed.**	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. The academic language presented in the items reflects the academic language stated in the GLEs and assessed evidence outcomes.	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). These instances are very limited; no recommendations to rewrite or modify items to reduce any occurrences that may confuse students.	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=		
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: No accommodations are listed or explained. Accommodations could be granted, given the assessment is intended to be administered online.	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: An attempt was made the pose the items in a relevant context in order to assess the mathematical concepts and skills. Some of the contexts are limiting, and the items do not offer opportunities to engage in non-routine problems or contexts.**	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Engagement Rating	2	
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: This assessment provides strong information about mastery of specific evidence outcomes at the skill and basic application level. The assessment items do not allow for the assessment of mathematical practices and problem-solving perseverance in mathematics.**	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: A raw score would communicate overall "proficiency" with grade-level evidence outcomes, but is lacking with communicating learning expectations with respect to persevering in solving non-routine problems and using the mathematical practices.**	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: Limited opportunities for students to engage in 21st century skills and transfer to other content areas. An attempt was made to pose the items in contexts to show the application of the mathematics skills/concepts being assessed. More extended response and non-routine problems are needed to improve this quality.**	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: Provides evidence of competency at the skill level (right or wrong) and basic application level with the short answer and extended response. More extended response and non-routine problems are needed to fully show desired competency using the mathematical practices.**	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 locate where the assessment evidence is represented within the curriculum, student learning objectives, or lesson? **Provide an explanation of your response: Good summative assessment for 6th grade GLEs and selected evidence outcomes.**	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Locate Evidence Rating	3	

Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	5	5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	7	7
		100.0%

Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	1	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	2	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3	3
Student Work Samples Rating	1	3
Subtotal	9	15
		60.0%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	3
Straight Forward Rating	3	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	16	17
		94.1%
Engagement Rating	2	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	2	3
Competency on Standards Rating	2	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	13	18
		72.2%
Grand Total	45	57
		78.9%

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

Fully Recommended	X
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	