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: Social Studies	
Name of Assessment: Foundations of Early Civilizations	
Reviewer: Content Collaborative	
Date of Review: April 18, 2012	

Assessment Profile

Grade Level(s) suggested by this assessment: Grade 6

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

SS09-GR.6-S.1-GLE.1-EO.b; SS09-GR.6-S.2-GLE.1-EO.b; SS09-GR.6-S.2-GLE.1-EO.d; SS09-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2

What is the DOK of the assessment?

4

Indicate the DOK range of the CAS Grade Level Expectations:

DOK 1-4

Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed:

Characteristics of a region, foundation and development of a civilization, population distribution patterns.

List the skills/performance assessed:

Analyze and interpret maps, charts, documents, thinking spatially, ability to articulate findings in a written format, organization of writing.

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

	Check All That Apply
	х
	x
ļ	

Check All That Apply
Х
Х
X

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

A high quality assessment should	d beAligned	
Alignment with Standards	Rating Column	Strengths & Suggestion
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.		
It is a full match with the standards.		
Full match – task or most items address or exceed the relevant skills and		
knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.		
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:		
Students answer the geographic question of "why there." Students analyze	Full=3; Partial =2; No	
multiple sources of data to develop a hypothesis of why a city developed	Match= 1	
Alignment with Standards Score	3	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment	Rating Column	
1b . Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the	Ū	
grade level expectations? Select one option below.		
0 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
The DOK level is higher than the Evidence Outcomes in the Standards		
The DOK level is higher than the Evidence Outcomes in the Standards More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level		
More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.		
More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level		
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.		
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		
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		
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.		
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		
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	
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	Similar Rigor=3; More Rigor=2; Less Rigor= 1	

A high quality assessment should beScored usin		
Scoring Guidelines for this Assessment	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions
Scoring Guide Present:	Х	
Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored		
Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)	Х	
Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)		
Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)		
Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		
	Yes, several types=3, Yes,	
	at least one type=2,	
	None=1	
Scoring Guide Present Score	2	
2a. Give evidence that the rubric/scoring criteria aligns to Colorado Academic		
Standards in this assessment.		
Provide an explanation of your response: The scoring guide is too general	Completely aligned=3,	
and has a strong emphasis on the writing skills, but not the social studies	Somewhat aligned=2,	
standards.	Not aligned=1	
Rubric Aligned with Standards Score	1	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance	-	
levels? Provide an explanation of your response:		
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
As a writing rubric, it is clearly defined and coherent.	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:		
The rubric is vague about the content demands, but strong in the writing	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
components.	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 given response? Why or why not?		
=		
The rubric needs to be revised to align with CAS in geography and history. It		
is very vague on content and it is likely scorers could come up with different		
rating in content knowledge. Writing portion of the rubric is clear.		
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
	No=1	
Inter-rater Reliability Score	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?		
No student work is included.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
	No=1	
Student Work Samples Score	1	

All=3, Some=2, None=1 3 All=3, Some=2, None=1 3 All=3, Some=2, None=1	Strengths/Suggestions
All=3, Some=2, None=1	
All=3, Some=2, None=1	
All=3, Some=2, None=1	
All=3, Some=2, None=1 3	
3	
3	
3	
All-2 Some-2 None-1	
All-2 Some-2 None-1	
All-3, Julie-2, Nolle-1	
3	
No=3, Somewhat=2, Yes=1	
1	
	es=1

None are included, but none are excluded. The rubric requires them to write in order to score the 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/Suggestic
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:		
They are evaluating the foundations of civilization to modern day situations.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
"Engages Students" Score	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:		
The student product can give information about student learning, but it is not reflected in the rubric.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
Classroom Learning Score	2	
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:		
The student work analysis will create quality dialogue about learning. The scores will not.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score 4d. To what extent do you believe the assessment can clearly communicate	2	
expectations for academic excellence (e.g., creativity, transference to other content areas or 21st Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of vour response:		
This assessment demands academic excellence in writing in particular.	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:		
Students must justify why a city is situated, where it is located, from analyzing data and maps. The student work would show academic excellence on concepts in geography.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
Standards Competency Score	3	
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:		
This is a diagnostic assessment and is labeled as such. With revision of the rubric it could be used for grades.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	

Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	3	3
Rigor Rating	3	3
Subtotal	6	6
Standards Alignment Percentage		100.0%
Scoring Guide Present	2	3
Rubric Aligned w/standards	1	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	2	3
Inter-rater reliability	1	3
Student work present	1	3
Subtotal	10	18
Scoring Percentage		55.6%
Clear & Uncluttered Presentation	3	3
Straight Forward Presentation	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias	3	3
Academic Language Load	1	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed	1	3
Subtotal	11	15
Fair & Unbiased Percentage		73.3%
Engagement	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence	3	3
Competency on Standards Score	3	3
Locate evidence Score	3	3
Subtotal	16	18
Opportunities to Learn Percentage		88.9%
Grand Total	43	57
Overall Percentage		75.4%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	x - rubric needs to be
	aligned to CAS
Not Recommended	