High Quality Assessment Content Validity Review Tool

To understand the review process and how to use the review tool, go to:

How to use the Assessment Review Tool

Content Area: Music

Name of Assessment: WA Come to the Fair Gr. 5

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: April 18, 2012

Assessment Profile

Grade Level(s) suggested by this assessment: Grade 5

Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment:

MU09-GR.5-S.3-GLE.1

What is the DOK of the assessment? 1-2

Indicate the DOK range of the CAS Grade Level Expectations: 1-2

Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed: Analyze and apply dynamics, tempo, meter using appropriate vocabulary.

List the skills/performance assessed: Write a review; compare and contrast the two musical selections.

Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):

Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)

Short Answer (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, otc.)

Extended Response (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)

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:

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

Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like:

Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)

Estimated time for administration

Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?

Other:

(Check All That Apply
F	
L	
	X
ľ	
-	

Check All That Apply
х
Х
Х
Х
Glossary of terms

A high quality assessment shou	ıld beAligned	
Alignment with Standards	Rating Column	Strengths & Suggestions
1a. 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? Select one option below.		
Full match – task or most items address or exceed the relevant skills and		Terms need to be aligned with
knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.		CAS vocabulary.
Partial match – task or most items partially address the 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	1	
support your response:		-
Students are asked to identify tempo and dynamics as stated in the GLE, however, the vocabulary is different than that used in the Eos.	Full=3; Partial =2; No Match= 1	
Alignment with Standards Score		<u>,</u>
Allgiment with Standards Score	•	
Double of Manual adaption of Management has the formal and the		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment	Rating Column	
	Rating Column	1
1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below.	Rating Column	
1b . Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the	Rating Column	
1b . Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below.	Rating Column	
 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. 	Rating Column	
1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below.More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level	Rating Column	
1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK	Rating Column	
 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. 	Rating Column	
 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. 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 	Rating Column	
1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. 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.	Rating Column	
1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous — most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. 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		
1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. 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	Similar Rigor=3; More Rigor=1; Less Rigor= 1	

A high quality assessment should beScored usi	ng Clear Guidelines	and Criteria
Scoring Guidelines for this Assessment	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions
Scoring Guide Present:		The rubric needs quantitative
Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored		elements to be fairly
Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)		evaluated. Words from the
Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)	Х	glossary should be added or
Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)		used to clarify what is
Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		expected. The rubric only
Teacher Observation sheety Observation encetalst	Yes, several types=3, Yes,	requires the students to
	at least one type=2,	identify 2 elements of music
	None=1	using vocabulary and
Scoring Guide Present Score	2	clarification is needed to
2a. Give evidence that the rubric/scoring criteria aligns to Colorado		actually assess the GLE.
Academic Standards in this assessment.		
Provide an explanation of your response: The rubric asks for	Completely aligned=3,	1
demonstrating an understanding of the elements of music, but again, there		!
	Not aligned=1	
Rubric Aligned with Standards Score	2	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across		1
performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response:		
The rubric lacks specificity in regards to vocabulary.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Score	2	
2c . To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the		
demands within the task or item? Explain:		
All the rubric basically asks for is that students can "hear" a difference in		
music. It does leave room for the students to incorrectly label and element.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Alignment		
2d. Based on your review of the rubric/scoring criteria, do you think the		1
scoring rubric would most likely lead different raters to arrive at the same		
score for a given response? Why or why not?		
Yes, the rubric only requires the students to identify two elements of		
music, there is no quantitative or qualitative amount of vocabulary		
required. The rubric should be edited to included more reliability between		
raters.		
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	1
	No=1	
Inter-rater Reliability Score	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?		
No, a student exemplar is definitely needed.		1
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
	No=1	
Student Work Samples Score	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	Strengths/Suggestions
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: All items are easily read and understood.		
	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
"Clear & Uncluttered" Score	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: Definitions of terms would have to be in place for all students to fairly		
complete the assessment. Some explanation would be required (Timber is difficult for some students to understand). Clarification of the terms being assessed should be used in the teacher directions to provide		
straightforward instructions to all learners.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
"Straight Forward" Score	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? Provide an explanation of your response:		
For the most part free of bias, however, some terms may be confusing based on the region of the student or their prior education. This would need to be addressed by the teacher.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
Free of 'Cultural or Unintended Bias' Score	2	
3d. Does the assessment require students to possess a high level of		
academic language* comprehension to demonstrate understanding?		
Provide an explanation of your response:		
The teacher needs to use their judgment to ensure that no bias is implied.	No=3, Somewhat=2, Yes=1	
"Academic Language" Score	2	
*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's		
3e. If applicable, what type of accommodations should be considered to		
ensure that students with special needs 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:		
 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.		
 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. 		
 Setting Accommodations — Change the location in which a test or assignment is given or the conditions of the assessment setting. 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.		
 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. 		
different than an accommodation based on a student's disability or a cognitive need. 3f: Identify and write down the accommodations permitted for this assessment:		

Response Accommodations are included. Linguistic, Timing and Scheduling, and Presentation Accommodations should be considered.

Yes, Several allowed=3; Yes, Some allowed=2; None allowed =1

"Adequate Accommodations Allowed" Score

2

A high quality assessment shouldincrease OPPORTUNITIES	TO LEARN	
The areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented		
students, and students with disabilities	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions
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:		
The task asks for in-depth thinking about what they are hearing and apply	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
it to write a critique. Students will become critics of the music in their	No=1	
world.	NO-1	
"Engages Students" Score	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:		
nearned in the classiconi: Floride an explanation of your response.		
This assessment would tell you if the students could use element	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
vocabulary appropriately and distinguish between similarities and	No=1	
differences in music.	140-1	
Classroom Learning Score		
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:		
It would provide quality dialogue about similarities/differences the student		
heard, as well as the vocabulary they used. However, the rubric is slightly	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
	No=1	
vague as to how many terms need to be used, so that should be clarified.		
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score		
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:		
demonstrate true excellence at a 5th Grade level, more detailed		
information should be required in the student work, as well as the rubric.		
Specific vocabulary requirements should be identified by the teacher prior		
to assessment. This is a low-level DOK, to really achieve academic		
excellence students should have to analyze and defend their answers,		
which would link to CAS 4.		
	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
	No=1	
Communicates Academic Excellence Score	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:		
The results would be general, but not specific. Again, the teacher		
directions, rubric and student page would need to be changed to very clear		
about the quantitative and qualitative amount to vocabulary used. The		
choice of music could skew the results of the assessment. The choice of		
music is teacher-driven.		
	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
	No=1	
Standards Competency Score	1	

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:	
Due to the variables of this assessment, teachers would have difficulty locating which evidence is represented. Teachers could modify the assessment to achieve a specific assessment evidence outcome or a complete a specific objective or lesson.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1
Locate evidence Score	1

Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	2	3
Rigor Rating	2	3
Subtotal	4	6
Standards Alignment Percentage		66.7%
Scoring Guide Present	2	3
Rubric Aligned w/standards	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	2	3
Inter-rater reliability	2	3
Student work present	1	3
Subtotal	11	18
Scoring Percentage		61.1%
Clear & Uncluttered Presentation	3	3
Straight Forward Presentation	2	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias	2	3
Academic Language Load	2	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed	2	3
Subtotal	11	15
Fair & Unbiased Percentage		73.3%
Engagement	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence	2	3
Competency on Standards Score	1	3
Locate evidence Score	1	3
Subtotal	12	18
Opportunities to Learn Percentage		66.7%
Grand Total	38	57
Overall Percentage		66.7%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	Х
Not Recommended	