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

ABSTRACT: Partially Recommend. This assessment is part of a suite of activities offered via the NeoK12 website. These tasks can be completed individually by the student on-line or can be printed in several formats for whole class presentation. Even though there is no rubric or scoring criteria, we feel this task was an invaluable tool for evaluating each students grasp of core content knowledge prior to more in-depth study and application.

Content Area: Middle School Science
Name of Assessment: NeoK12 Photosynthesis: http://www.neok12.com/Photosynthesis.htm
Reviewer: Content Collaborative
Date of Review: October 25, 2012

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		
Grade Level(s): 7		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the		
Assessment: SC09-GR.7-S.2-GLE.4-EO.a		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-2		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): 1 (2 if fill in blank)		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: understand basic concepts of photosynthesis and plant metabolism		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): Gather, analyze, and interpret data		

 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/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: This assessment is a good measure of students knowledge of the sequence of events in photosynthesis or the associated processes. This matches the GR 7-2.2 a very well but none of the other EO's for this GLE.		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	5	
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.	Rating Column	Comments
 □ More rigorous – most items or the tasks 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: The DOK for this EO is at 1-2, so this assessment matches the 1. It has the ability to be a 2 if you move to the fill in the blank version.		
	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		
☐ Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)		
 Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task) 		
□ 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: There is no scoring rubric so that aligning to standards is teacher dependent.	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: There are no scoring categories, again it is teacher dependent.	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 an explanation of your response. There are no scoring categories, again it is teacher dependent.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1	
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	1	

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. As there is no rubric provided, scoring is teacher dependent so that different teachers could potentially have different evaluation results.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	1
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?	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: Task is well written both in web format and paper format. The questions are clearly laid out as well as answers.	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: As this is a DOK level 1 the items are very straightforward in a matching format.	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: Vocabulary does not present any bias. It sticks strictly to the content and content related vocabulary.	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 only difficult vocabulary was that being specifically assessed.	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. No confusing language was found.	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=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? Provide an explanation of your response.		
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 specifically identified. The online version is more graphic based and less dependant on reading text. However teachers could easily provide students unlimited time, linguistic/reading support.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	

Opportunities to Learn	Rating Column	Comments
(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and	ŭ	Even though this assessment
talented students, and students with disabilities)		does not have real world context
4a. Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new		or present an opportunity for
context, situation, problem or challenge? Provide an explanation of your response: This	High=3; Moderate=2;	new learning or application, we
assessment does not go beyond understanding a basic process isolated from all others.	Low or None=1	felt there was validity in this
assessment does not go beyond understanding a basic process isolated from all others.		assessment, especially the on-line
Engagement Rating	1	version. This assessment is a
4b. To what extent do you think the knowledge and skills tested by the assessment can		great quick check for both
provide good information about what students have learned in the classroom? Provide	High=3; Moderate=2;	teacher and student on basic
an explanation of your response: This task is an excellent measure of the	Low or None=1	concept understanding before
understanding of the basic process of photosynthesis.		proceeding to a more in-depth
Classroom Learning Rating	3	analysis.
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: On the basis of	High=3; Moderate=2;	
understanding very basic science concepts this task provides good data to foster	Low or None=1	
conferences regarding what is occurring in the classroom vs. the student understanding	LOW OF HORE-I	
basic knowledge.		
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: This assessment	High=3; Moderate=2;	
does not go beyond a simple evaluation of conceptual knowledge. However it does	Low or None=1	
reinforce the need for students to be active in their learning.		
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	High=3; Moderate=2;	
understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your	Low or None=1	
response:		
Competency on Standards Rating		
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.	High=3; Moderate=2;	
diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation of	Low or None=1	
your response: This task is a great pre-assessment or a quick formative check for	LOW OF NOTICE	
student understanding to inform further instruction.		
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
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	1	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	1	3 3 3 15
Student Work Samples Rating	1	
Subtotal	6	
Subtotal		40.0%
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
Subtotal		

	•	94.1%
Engagement Rating	1	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	1	3
Competency on Standards Rating	0	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	10	18
		55.6%
Grand Total	39	57
		68.4%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	Х
Not Recommended	