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: Partial Recommendation was chosen because this assessment is one piece of a large GLE. The assessment task is focused on how seasonal changes affect a non-human population.

Assessment Profile	
Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types): Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)	Check All That Apply
Short Answer (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)	Х
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:	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)	х
Scoring Guide/Rubric	х
Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like	Х
Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)	Х
Estimated time for administration	Х
Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?	Х
Other:	

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		
Grade Level(s): High School		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the		
Assessment: SC09-GR.HS-S.2-GLE.2		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-3		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): 2-3		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the		
performance task: ecosystems, populations, abiotic factors		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): The		
questions within the assessment ask students to predict, analyze, interpret data, and		
justify their responses which increases the overall DOK.		
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: Looking deeper into GLE 2, the statements become highly specific. This assessment would fit into GLE 2.d easily if the term "human" was removed.		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating		
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 match is excellent and requires higher level thinking, which the standards require as well.		
	Similar Rigor=2, More	
Rigor Level Rating	Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1 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 	Х	
 Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs) 		
 Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task) 	Х	
□ Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)	Х	
□ 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 scoring criteria provides for the level of rigor and DOK necessary to meet the high school GLE.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	3	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: The scoring criteria are clearly defined and easy to utilize in the scoring process.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	
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. Each demand of the task is clearly addressed within the scoring rubric.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1	
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	
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. The scoring rubric is clearly written and there is little room for personal interpretation of the responses required.	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? Student samples are provided for each level of the scoring criteria.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Student Work Samples Rating	3

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: The overall task is neatly designed but there are slight formatting issues within the task. See Comments as well.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	The review team noticed that different internet browsers pulled up different symbols which should be identified prior to using the assessment. We also
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	felt that substituting different
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: The questions are very specific and most learners will be able to read and respond to the assessment without much difficulty.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	symbols may be beneficial for different learners. There is a Technical Quality Information page associated with assessment
Straight Forward Rating	3	task which indicates that 500-
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: Some bias could be unintentional based on the plants referred to within the task, but this could be easily fixed by substituting local plants for an area.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	1000 students have used this task, including different subgroups of learners. This assessment specifically requires complete sentence responses
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	from students which should be
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 is appropriate for high school students. The directions are clear and the life science content is easily accessible.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	accommodated for exceptional learners.
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 homonyms were 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. No specific accommodations are recommended.		
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 specific accommodations are recommended in the Administration Procedures.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	

	D. 11	•
Opportunities to Learn (the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and	Rating Column	Comments
talented students, and students with disabilities)		
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: Students are asked to interpret data collected by others and respond to questions pertaining to this data. Plant growth data is commonly researched by scientists to find patterns of change, both seasonally and due to other abiotic factors. This task is a close mirror of real-world applications.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Engagement Rating	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: Students are asked to interpret data previously gathered and then apply this new data to classroom learning about abiotic factors.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	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: This assessment has constructed response items so the teacher can easily have meaningful dialogue with students and parents about scientific writing and explanations using this assessment. This assessment gives students an opportunity to authentically communicate their understanding of this topic.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	
4d. To what extent do you believe the assessment allows students to demonstrate academic excellence (e.g., creativity, transference to other content areas or 21st Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: Students are interpreting data in a different context allowing for creativity and 21st Century skill applications.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	3	
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: There is a close match to standards, but not exact as the EOs in the standard are more specific than this particular task. Using only one task to fully assess a standard is not appropriate.	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 identify what purpose the assessment serves (e.g. diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation of your response: Teachers would be able to determine that this assessment can be used in formative, interim and summative purposes. With the short answer questions, teachers can also adjust instruction based on student responses as student thinking is more easily accessible.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating		5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	6	7
		85.7%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating		3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating		3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating		3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3	3
Student Work Samples Rating	3	3
Subtotal	15	15

		100.0%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	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	15	17
		88.2%
Engagement Rating	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	3	3
Competency on Standards Rating	2	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	17	18
		94.4%
Grand Total	53	57
		93.0%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	х
Not Recommended	