High Quality Assessment Content Validity Review Tool

To understand the review process and how to use the review tool, go to:	Assessment Review Tool
Content Area: Music	
Name of Assessment: Defined STEM - music performance task:	
www.definedstem.com	
Reviewer: Content Collaborative	
Date of Review: 7/9/2012	

Assessment Profile

Grade Level(s) suggested by this assessment:

Upper elementary, MS and HS indicated in product learning outcomes

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

MU09-HSGP-S.1-GLE.1; MU09-HSGP-S.1-GLE.2; MU09-HSGP-S.2-GLE.2; MU09-HSGP-S.3-GLE.2; MU09-HSGP-S.4-GLE.1; MU09-HSGP-S.4-GLE.2; MU09-HSGP

GLE.3; MU09-HSGP-S.4-GLE.4

What is the DOK of the assessment?

DOK ranges from 2-4

Indicate the DOK range of the CAS Grade Level Expectations:

Range is 1-4

Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed:

Focused on Creation of Music GLE 2 but with connections to other GLEs listed above

List the skills/performance assessed:

Creating and performing music using technology: composition, eportfolio and "press release"

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, etc.)

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.)

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

Check All That Apply		
Х		
х		
Х		

Check All That Apply	
х	
х	
x	
Х	

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

A high quality assessment should	beAligned	
Alignment with Standards	Rating Column	Strengths & Suggestions
1a.To what extent do you see a strong content match between the set of items		The strength of this
reviewed or the task and the corresponding Colorado Academic Standard/s?		assessment is that it
Select one option below.		measures creativity, aesthetic
		valuation and expression.
Full match – task or most items address or exceed the relevant skills and		The teacher may want to add
knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.		connections to Theory of
		, Music.
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 support]	
your response:		
The assessment aligns with the creation standard more than expression standard.	Full=2. Dortiol =2. No	
- ·	Match= 1	
It is a full match for use with HS Generalist pathway.	IVIACCII- I	
Alignment with Standards Score		2
Alignment with Standards Store		
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below.		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below.		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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.		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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.		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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.		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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 assessment	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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 assessment to support your response:	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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 assessment	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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 assessment to support your response:	Rating Column More Rigor=1; Same Rigor=2; Less Rigor= 1	

A high quality assessment should beScored using	Clear Guidelines and	d Criteria
Scoring Guidelines for this Assessment	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions
Scoring Guide Present:	Х	Has rubrics for most tasks but
Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored		not for composition task.
Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)	Х	
Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)	Х]
Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)		
Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		
	Yes, several types=3,	1
	Yes, at least one type=2,	[
	None=1	Į.
Scoring Guide Present Score	3	
2a. Give evidence that the rubric/scoring criteria aligns to Colorado Academic		
Standards in this assessment.		[
Needs rubric for composition task.	Completely aligned=3,	
	Somewhat aligned=2,	[
	Not aligned=1	[
Rubric Aligned with Standards Score	3	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance		[
levels? Provide an explanation of your response:	Voc-2 Comp. 1	Į.
Very well defined clear and concise.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Score	3	
2c . To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the demands		[
within the task or item? Explain:	Vac 2 2	[
Rubric covers all of the demands of the task except composition.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	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	1	[
given response? Why or why not?		[
The scoring criteria is very specific and will lead to similar results from different	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
raters.	No=1	[
Inter-rater Reliability Score	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?		
This assessment includes multiple examples of student work for each of the tasks	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
except for the composition.	No=1	
Student Work Samples Score	2	1

A high quality assessment should beFAIR 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:		
Clear and uncluttered.	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: Very Straightforward.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
"Straight Forward" Score		
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: Strong for the Generalist Pathway but may need adapting for lower grades. The academic vocabulary is advanced for younger students and therefore may present a cultural bias.		
Free of 'Cultural or Unintended Bias' Score		
3d. Does the assessment require students to possess a high level of academic language* comprehension to demonstrate understanding? Provide an explanation of your response: Students must have an understanding of music and technology vocabulary.	3 Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
"Academic Language" Score	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)		
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.		
3f: Identify and write down the accommodations permitted for this assessment: presentation, response, setting, timing and scheduling, and linguistic.		
Accommodations not addressed including availability of technology. Accommodations can be added by the teacher. Student availability to technology is key to completing this assessment.	Yes, Several allowed=3; Yes, Some allowed=2; None allowed =1	
"Adequate Accommodations Allowed" Score	1	

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:		These performance tasks are high quality, real-life applications of music knowledge that can readily be assessed and evaluated.
The assessment presents a real-life scenario for students to engage in and respond to.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
"Engages Students" Score	3	However, the composition
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:		task lacks a rubric.
It tests their knowledge of composition that is then performed and evaluated.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1]
Classroom Learning Score	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:		
It clearly shows if a student understands the concepts of expression and aesthetic valuation by using technology.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score	2	
4d. To what extent do you believe the assessment can clearly communicate expectations for academic excellence to students? Provide an explanation of		
your response: It shows whether or not a student can use technology to express and evaluate music as highlighted in the Generalist Pathway. The addition of a composition rubric is needed.	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: Yes. If a student receives a 4 on this assessment that indicates that a student is	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
demonstrating a depth of understanding regarding expression using technology and evaluation	No=1	
Standards Competency Score	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:		
The rubrics provide evidence for all tasks but the composition task.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
Locate evidence Score	2	

Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	3	3
Rigor Rating	2	3
Subtotal	5	6
Standards Alignment Percentage		83.3%
Scoring Guide Present	3	3
Rubric Aligned w/standards	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	2	3
Inter-rater reliability	3	3
Student work present	2	3
Subtotal	16	18
Scoring Percentage		88.9%
Clear & Uncluttered Presentation	3	3
Straight Forward Presentation	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias	2	3
Academic Language Load	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed	1	3
Subtotal	12	15
Fair & Unbiased Percentage		80.0%
Engagement	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes		3
Communicates Academic Excellence	2	3
Competency on Standards Score	2	3
Locate evidence Score	2	3
Subtotal	14	18
Opportunities to Learn Percentage		77.8%
Grand Total	47	57
Overall Percentage		82.5%

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

Fully Recommended	Х
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	