

## 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](#)

<b>Content Area:</b> Reading, Writing and Communicating
<b>Name of Assessment:</b> <a href="http://readingandwritingproject.com/resources/assessments/performance-assessments.html">Teacher College Reading &amp; Writing GR 3 CCSS Performance Assessment - http://readingandwritingproject.com/resources/assessments/performance-assessments.html</a>
<b>Reviewer:</b> Content Collaborative
<b>Date of Review:</b> April 19, 2012

**PLEASE NOTE: Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Considerations for Reading, Writing and Communicating Assessments** In August 2012, Colorado became a Governing State in the [Partnership for Assessment of College and Career Readiness \(PARCC\)](#) multi-state assessment consortium. At this time, PARCC has not released DOK indicators for the Common Core State Standards which the consortium is set to assess in 2014-2015. In order to move forward with the alignment portion of the assessment review process, the Colorado Reading, Writing and Communicating Content Collaborative utilized DOK indicators that were previously published by the [Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium's](#) Content Specifications for the Summative Assessment of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects. As additional information becomes available from PARCC, adaptations and revisions will be made to the assessment reviews in this Resource Bank, as necessary.

[PARCC http://www.parcconline.org/](http://www.parcconline.org/)

[SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium \(Content Specifications for the Summative Assessment of the Common Core State Standards\) http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/ELA-Literacy-Content-Specifications.pdf](http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/ELA-Literacy-Content-Specifications.pdf)

### Assessment Profile

**Grade Level(s) suggested by this assessment:** Grade 3

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

RWC10-GR.3-S.2-GLE.2-EO.a.i; RWC10-GR.3-S.2-GLE.2-EO.a.ii; RWC10-GR.3-S.2-GRL.2-EO.d.i; RWC10-GR.3-S.3-GRL.1.EO.a;

**What is the DOK of the assessment?** RI.3.1: Understand - 2; RI.3.2: Apply - 2 RI.3.10: Apply - 3 W.3.1: Evaluate - 3

**Indicate the DOK range of the CAS Grade Level Expectations:** 2.2.a: 1-3; 2.2.d: 1-2; 3.1.a: 3-4

**Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed:**

Using informational text, students make judgments and use reasoning. Summarizing nonfiction text. Taking a position and defending an opinion essay with evidence.

**List the skills/performance assessed:**

Determine the main idea of the text. Summarize main idea. Support with key details. Write an opinion essay.

**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)

<b>Check All That Apply</b>
X

**Product** (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)

X

**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:**

Data sheet that charts individual student score; Teacher oral script (expressive and interesting to students)

X

Check All That Apply
X
X
X
X
X

**A high quality assessment should be...Aligned**

Alignment with Standards	Rating Column	Strengths & Suggestions
<p><b>1a.</b>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? <b>Select one option below.</b></p> <p><b>Full match</b> – task or most items address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><b>Partial match</b> – task or most items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><b>No match</b> – task or most items are not related to the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p>		<p>Text complexity exceeds grade level expectations and although text structures is not mentioned specifically in GR3, GR2 cites many text structures that students are already expected to know and be able to read. Word structure and readability is of a high level.</p>
<p><b>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response:</b></p>		
<p>Direct alignment with GR3 Standards: main idea, using details, summarizing, opinion writing.</p>	<p>Full=3; Partial =2; No Match= 1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Alignment with Standards Score</b></p>		<p align="center"><b>2</b></p>
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment	Rating Column	
<p><b>1b.</b> Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? <b>Select one option below.</b></p> <p><b>More rigorous</b> – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.</p> <p><b>Similar rigor</b> – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.</p> <p><b>Less rigor</b> – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.</p>		
<p><b>Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response:</b></p>		
<p>There is a direct match between the DOK in the assessment and the standards.</p>	<p>Similar Rigor=2; More Rigor=1; Less Rigor= 1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Depth of Knowledge (Rigor) Score</b></p>		<p align="center"><b>2</b></p>

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

Scoring Guidelines for this Assessment	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions
<p><b>Scoring Guide Present:</b></p> <p><b>Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored</b></p> <p><b>Generalized Rubric</b> (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)</p> <p><b>Task-Specific Rubric</b> (only used for the particular task)</p> <p><b>Checklist</b> (e.g., with score points for each part)</p> <p><b>Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist</b></p>	<p align="center">X</p> <p align="center">X</p> <p align="center">X</p> <p align="center">X</p> <p align="center">X</p> <p>Yes, several types=3, Yes, at least one type=2, None=1</p>	<p>Individual Data task sheet teachers can document scores on individual task objectives.</p>
<b>Scoring Guide Present Score</b>	<b>3</b>	
<p><b>2a.</b> Give evidence that the rubric/scoring criteria aligns to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment.</p> <p><b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The CCSS standards that are referenced in the rubric are in the CAS. Levels of proficiency are articulated. Proficient levels are bolded so teachers are aware of the targets for all students. The proficient levels matched the wording in the Evidence Outcomes. Explicit directions are provided for the teacher to accurately use the rubric.</p>	<p>Completely aligned=3, Somewhat aligned=2, Not aligned=1</p>	
<b>Rubric Aligned with Standards Score</b>	<b>3</b>	
<p><b>2b.</b> Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p><b>Explain:</b> Each category is given a point value which corresponds to a specific standard and performance level.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	<p>Standard is listed, concept and skills are identified.</p>
<b>Rubric/Scoring Coherent Score</b>	<b>3</b>	
<p><b>2c.</b> To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the demands within the task or item?</p> <p><b>Explain:</b></p> <p>Two rubrics are used: One is for the first task for reading comprehension and summarizing and the other is specifically for writing. Within the rubric, attributes are explained to match each task.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<b>Rubric/Scoring Alignment</b>	<b>3</b>	
<p><b>2d.</b> 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? <b>Why or why not?</b></p> <p>There would be a high level of interrater reliability. Each standard is broken down into different attributes; there are multiple indicators under each level of proficiency to narrow the evaluator's choices. Knowledge of the rubric and student data analysis could be used fairly to evaluate the effectiveness of the teacher's instruction on identified standards.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<b>Inter-rater Reliability Score</b>	<b>3</b>	
<p><b>2e.</b> 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?</p> <p>Need: Samples from each task, from each proficiency level used as exemplars.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<b>Student Work Samples Score</b>	<b>1</b>	

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

FAIR and UNBIASED <i>(the areas below should be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)</i>	Rating Column	Strengths/Suggestions
<b>3a.</b> 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)?		
<b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b>  Items in the task are void of color, but meet the needs of the task. Students need to be familiar with text features such as sub-headings and side bar graphics, in this case a menu.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
<b>"Clear &amp; Uncluttered" Score</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>3b.</b> To what extent are most of the items or the task presented in as straightforward a way as possible for a range of learners?		
<b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b>  Presentation includes a teacher script, written directions and a rubric students can have before the task begins. Presented visually and auditorily. Students hear oral directions and get print directions that mirror what the teacher says. Print is clear and concise. There is flexibility given to teachers to front load pronunciation of proper nouns and change the script based on teaching style of nonfiction text.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
<b>"Straight Forward" Score</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>3c.</b> To what degree is the vocabulary and context(s) presented by most of the items or task free from cultural or other unintended bias? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> There are no indications of cultural or unintended biases. This task relates to choosing a restaurant and making an opinion about which restaurant they would be prefer. Students are told to establish an opinion regarding the restaurant and establish an opinion about which one you would go to and are asked to support their opinion with evidence from the text. This is meaningful for students because students have knowledge of restaurants. However, they may be unfamiliar with high dining compared to casual eating.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
<b>Free of 'Cultural or Unintended Bias' Score</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>3d.</b> Does the assessment require students to possess a high level of academic language* comprehension to demonstrate understanding?		
<b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> Academic language is appropriate for the task and grade level. No surprising terms exist. Summarize, main idea, write to explain, support your idea, write a persuasive essay, use information, connect opinion with reason...are all key terms used in the tasks. This language is not unfamiliar to 3rd grade students.	No=3, Somewhat=2, Yes=1	
<b>"Academic Language" Score</b>	<b>2</b>	
*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's		
<b>3e.</b> 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?		
<i>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>Presentation Accommodations</b> —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.</li> <li>○ <b>Response Accommodations</b> —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.</li> </ul>		

- **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:

This assessment allows for scribing, extra time and visual supports for students that have a documented plan. In addition, the presentation accommodations allow for teachers to rephrase the script according to their instructional practices.

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

**"Adequate Accommodations Allowed" Score**

**3**

A high quality assessment should ...increase 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
<p><b>4a.</b> Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new context, situation, problem or challenge? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>The topic of the content students are reading is relevant to their everyday life. Debate creates a metacognitive opportunity to express opinion. Students read and summarize nonfiction text about two separate restaurants and form an opinion to suggest the restaurant they would prefer. One restaurant is familiar to them (Wendy's) and one is not.</p>	<p>Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1</p>	
<b>"Engages Students" Score</b>		<b>3</b>
<p><b>4b.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>For those four standards, teachers can easily draw conclusion about student proficiency and skill level. Because the standards which this assessment are aligned to, the method of assessment is appropriately matched. A M/C or CR would not provide the most accurate information to teachers.</p>	<p>Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1</p>	
<b>Classroom Learning Score</b>		<b>3</b>
<p><b>4c.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>Part of the assessment is a plan for responsive teaching. Teachers can plan for support for upcoming units of study. This could also be transferred to communication to parents about student proficiency. Teachers can look for less than proficiency on standards as outlined in the rubric. If students demonstrate deficits, teachers can pinpoint areas for growth.</p>	<p>Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1</p>	
<b>Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score</b>		<b>2</b>
<p><b>4d.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>If students can review the rubric prior to the assessment, teachers can provide the completed rubric and students can see their strengths and areas for growth. The clearly defined student rubric sets the bar for students to achieve excellence in this task. If students use this rubric, the indicators clearly explain to students what they need to do to achieve at the highest level.</p>	<p>Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1</p>	
<b>Communicates Academic Excellence Score</b>		<b>3</b>
<p><b>4e.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>The descriptions of the attributes in the rubric provides characteristics matching proficiency levels as well as identified attributes that can be applied to future lesson planning.</p>	<p>Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1</p>	
<b>Standards Competency Score</b>		<b>3</b>

<p><b>4f:</b> 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.)? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p>	
<p>There is an explanation of standards alignment in the assessment information sheet that supports where the assessment aligns to the standards. This performance assessment could be used in several ways: 1) progress monitoring, 2) instructional planning in accordance to the data task sheet if a strand of students do not understand a concept and 3) summative in conclusion of a unit of study.</p>	<p><b>Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1</b></p>
<p><b>Locate evidence Score</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>



Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	2	3
Rigor Rating	2	3
Subtotal	4	6
Standards Alignment Percentage		66.7%
Scoring Guide Present	3	3
Rubric Aligned w/standards	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	3	3
Inter-rater reliability	3	3
Student work present	1	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	2	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed	3	3
Subtotal	13	15
Fair & Unbiased Percentage		86.7%
Engagement	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence	3	3
Competency on Standards Score	3	3
Locate evidence Score	3	3
Subtotal	17	18
Opportunities to Learn Percentage		94.4%
Grand Total	50	57
Overall Percentage		87.7%

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

Fully Recommended	X
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	