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

Content Area: Elementary Social Studies		1
Name of Assessment: Making a Difference	http://www.aac.ab.ca/assessment-materials/	
Reviewer: Content Collaborative	making-a-difference/	
Date of Review: April 18, 2012		

Assessment Profile

Grade Level(s) suggested by this assessment: 3

<u>Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment:</u> SS09-GR.3-S.1-GLE.2-EO.c; SS09-GR.3-S.4-GLE.1-EO.a;

What is the DOK of the assessment? 1-4

Indicate the DOK range of the CAS Grade Level Expectations: 1-3

Rights and responsibilities, cooperation, perspective-taking, and problem solving

List the skills/performance assessed: 1.2c,4.1a

cause/effect relationships, learning to ask powerful questions, choose and justify a course of action

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.)

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: Student Learning Goals (Reflection), Ongoing evaluation tools

Check All That Apply		
x		
х		

Check All That Apply		
х		
Х		
Х		
х		
х		

Alignment with Standards 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 knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. Practice in critical thinking and decision making and discourse about rights and discours	A high quality assessment shou	ıld beAligned	
the evidence outcomes in civic's and geography standards/? Select one option below. Full match — task or most items address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. Practice in critical thinking and discourse about pith in the corresponding state standard/s. Practice in critical thinking and discourse about pith in the corresponding state standard/s. Practice in critical thinking and discourse about rights would net to take place prior to the assessment. 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: Strong alignment for evidence outcomes stated but potential for alignment with 4.1 b & c as well. Alignment with Standards Score 2 Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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 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 assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More			Strengths & Suggestions
students to further their thinking beyond CAS DOK Practice in critical thinking and discourse about rights an responsibilities would net to take place prior to the assessment. 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. 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: Strong alignment for evidence outcomes stated but potential for alignment with 4.1 b & c as well. Full=3; Partial =2; No Match= 1 Alignment with Standards Score Alignment with Standards Score Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment Alignment with Standards Score Rating Column 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the 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. 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 assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More	items reviewed or the task and the corresponding Colorado Academic		
and decision making and discourse about rights an responsibilities would net to take place prior to the assessment. 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: Strong alignment for evidence outcomes stated but potential for alignment with 4.1 b & c as well. Full=3; Partial =2; No Match= 1 Alignment with Standards Score 2 Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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 assessment to support your response: Similar Rigor=3; More			
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: Strong alignment for evidence outcomes stated but potential for alignment with 4.1 b & c as well. Alignment with Standards Score Alignment with Standards Score Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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 assessment to support your response: Similar Rigor=3; More			discourse about rights and responsibilities would need to take place prior to the
Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response: Strong alignment for evidence outcomes stated but potential for alignment with 4.1 b & c as well. Full=3; Partial=2; No Match=1			
support your response: Strong alignment for evidence outcomes stated but potential for alignment with 4.1 b & c as well. Alignment with Standards Score Alignment with Standards Score 2 Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 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 assessment to support your response: The assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More	_		
support your response: Strong alignment for evidence outcomes stated but potential for alignment with 4.1 b & c as well. Full=3; Partial =2; No Match= 1 Alignment with Standards Score 2	Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to	1	
Alignment with Standards Score 2 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: The assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More	support your response: Strong alignment for evidence outcomes stated		
Alignment with Standards Score 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: The assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More	but potential for alignment with 4.1 b & c as well.		
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: The assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More	Alignment with Standards Score		
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: The assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More	· ·		
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: The assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More		Rating Column	
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 assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More			
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 assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More			
Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: The assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More	-		
The assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More			
The assessment exceeds rigor of CAS by asking student to evaluate Similar Rigor=3; More	Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and]	
		_	
Depth of Knowledge (Rigor) Score 2	Depth of Knowledge (Rigor) Score	2	

A high quality assessment should beScored us	ing Clear Guidelines	and Criteria
Scoring Guidelines for this Assessment	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions
Scoring Guide Present:		
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)	х	
Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)	х	
		Student self-evaluation pieces
		are a strength. They provide opportunities for ongoing
		evaluation throughout the
		process. Teacher notes are
Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		thorough and are divided into
		Instructional Support and
		Learner Access. Resources are
		listed for support throughout
		the process.
		process.
	Yes, several types=3,	
	Yes, at least one type=2, None=1	
Scoring Guide Present Score	3	
2a. Give evidence that the rubric/scoring criteria aligns to Colorado		
Academic Standards in this assessment.		
Provide an explanation of your response: The rubric would need to be		
aligned to CAS . The rubric goes to a higher DOK than is expected on the		
CAS. The scenario should use an American network rather than the		
Canadian Broadcast Company.	Completely aligned=3,	
	Somewhat aligned=2,	
	Not aligned=1	
Rubric Aligned with Standards Score	2	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across		
performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response:		
Subjective areas of rubric need to be clearly defined. The student peer		
coaching feedback tool could be used to provide more specificity to		
teacher.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
	No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Score		
2c . To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the		
demands within the task or item?		
Explain:		
All parts of the task are evaluated with multiple opportunities including	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
provision for student self evaluation.	No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	3	
		Student exemplars would
2d. Based on your review of the rubric/scoring criteria, do you think the		enhance scoring consistency
scoring rubric would most likely lead different raters to arrive at the same		and understanding of
score for a given response? Why or why not?		expectations.
		,
Having exemplars and specific clarification of terms on the rubric would		
allow for greater consistency in scoring. Words such as insightful,		
reasonable, superficial on the rubric can be ambiguous.		
_		
I	I	I

	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,
	No=1
Inter-rater Reliability Scor	е
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 work would clarify expectations for the tasks and increase	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,
consistency in scoring.	No=1
Student Work Samples Scor	e

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:		In the task, Colorado relevant terms need to be
Everything is broken into chunks for easy processing and is simplified. Bullets are used without confusing language.	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: Even student reflection tool is very user friendly and straight forward.		
	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
"Straight Forward" Score	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:		
If rubric vocabulary was developed and defined and if exemplars were provided, there would be a very low degree of bias. Activity is free of bias, but the rubric is confusing.	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: Academic language is appropriate for the expectations at this grade level.	No=3, Somewhat=2, Yes=1	
"Academic Language" Score	145-1	
*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's	1	
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		

While presentation choice are not explicitly stated, all accommodations are permissible.

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

"Adequate Accommodations Allowed" Score

3

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		Colorado relevant terms and
real world, new context, situation, problem or challenge? Provide an		situations need to be
explanation of your response:		exchanged for Canadian
Students chose an individual who has made a difference to interview and	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	experiences and terms.
go through a nomination process.	No=1	
"Engages Students" Score		
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 have to self-evaluate every piece of the process. The rubric	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
addresses each task required of students.	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:		
When the terms are clarified on the rubric, this will foster more	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
meaningful dialogue. In what way?	No=1	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score	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 vour response: When the terms are clarified on the rubric, this will foster more		
meaningful dialogue. Samples of student work at various proficiency		
levels would clarify the expectations.		
	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
	No=1	
Communicates Academic Excellence Score	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:		
Anchor papers and rubric clarification would allow for further		
understanding of competency. These things would help the teacher		
accurately assess the learner. The task itself is set up to show whether		
students successfully master the content.		
•	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	1
	No=1	
Standards Competency Score	2	
	2	
4f : Based on the content evaluated by the task or the set of items		
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		
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		
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:		
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:		

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	3	3
Rubric Aligned w/standards	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	3	3
Inter-rater reliability	2	3
Student work present	1	3
Subtotal	13	18
Scoring Percentage		72.2%
Clear & Uncluttered Presentation	3	3
Straight Forward Presentation	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias	2	3
Academic Language Load	1	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed	3	3
Subtotal	12	15
Fair & Unbiased Percentage		80.0%
Engagement	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence	3	3
Competency on Standards Score	2	3
Locate evidence Score	3	3
Subtotal	16	18
Opportunities to Learn Percentage		88.9%
Grand Total	45	57
Overall Percentage		78.9%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	x - the rubric needs to
raitially Recommended	be revised
Not Recommended	