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: World Languages

Name of Assessment: The Environment: Advice for Keeping a City Clean

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: 10/24/2012

Assessment Profile	
Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):	Check All That Apply
Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)	Х
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)	х
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	
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.		
Range Level(s): Intermediate Low		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by		
the Assessment: WL09-IL-S.1-GLE.2		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: DOK 3		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): 3		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the		
performance task: Students read, discuss and present about how to keep their school		
and their city garbage-free		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?):		
understand key vocabulary, understand main ideas, determine why the article is		
appropriate for its readership.		
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 task is thorough and covers all the main points of interpretive reading.		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	5 Rating Column	Comments
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: Most tasks are in simply comprehending the article and only one goes beyond comprehension to drawing conclusions.		
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	
Rigor Level Rating		

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)	X	
 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: The "meets expectations" column of the rubric closely matches expectations for Intermediate Low Interpretive communication from the CAS.	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: Yes, it is internally coherent.	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. There are three types of interpretive tasks and three categories in the 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 interpretive rubric (p. 7) is generally very clear but the criterion "Can I identify the main idea?" is problematic in that the descriptor "I identify the main ideas of the text." is listed as both exceeding and meeting expectations.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	2
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? It would be nice to have student work for the open-ended question.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Student Work Samples Rating	

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: Yes, it has graphics and is clearly laid out.	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: Many responses are in English, testing only interpretative ability. The prompt sets up a scene in a way that requires students to empathize with the "you" in the prompt.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Straight Forward Rating	2	
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: Because t he prompt is written as an internal monologue with a student as protagonist, some students might not understand or identify with the student portrayed in the prompt.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	
3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. Although the main prompt for the interpretive activity is written in a "student"-centered informal register, the interpretive task instructions themselves are written with an appropriate level of academic language.	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 homonyms	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. One accommodation is mentioned: reading the text aloud.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	2	

Auequate Accommodations Anowed Nating		
A high quality assessmentIncreases Opportunities to I	<u>Learn</u>	
Opportunities to Learn	Rating Column	Comments
(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and		
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	High=3; Moderate=2;	
response: Yes, because it's about garbage and also about what's interesting for young	Low or None=1	
readers		
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: This task will accurately assess the interpretive skills	High=3; Moderate=2;	
of students who have been previously exposed to a variety of interpretive texts/tasks.	Low or None=1	
The subject matter of this task may be new, but if students have strong interpretive		
skills they should be able to demonstrate proficiency through this assessment.		
Classroom Learning Rating	2	
4c. To what degree do the results from this assessment (<i>scores and student work</i>		
analysis) foster meaningful dialogue about learning expectations and outcomes with		
students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response : This assessment	High=3; Moderate=2;	
would allow for conversations both about interpretive proficiency and content	Low or None=1	
knowledge about the environment.		
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	
4d. To what extent do you believe the assessment can clearly communicate		
expectations for academic excellence (e.g., creativity, transference to other content	High=3; Moderate=2;	
areas or 21st Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: The	Low or None=1	
true/false activity requiring justification of responses hold students accountable and	LOW OF HOME-1	
requires citation of textual evidence.		
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 (<i>scores and student work analysis</i>) to	High=3; Moderate=2;	
understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your	Low or None=1	
response: The rubric covers all of the aspects of interpretive communication at the	LOW OF NOTIE-1	
Intermediate Low level and does show what competency on this standard looks like.		
Competency on Standards Rating	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.	High=3; Moderate=2;	
diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation of	Low or None=1	
your response: Could help adjust instruction in interpretive strategies.		
Clarity of Purpose Rating	2	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	2	
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	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3 2	3

Student Work Samples Rating	1	3
Subtotal	12	15
		80.0%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	3
Straight Forward Rating	2	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	3
Academic Language Rating	3	3
Confusing Language Rating	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	2	2
Subtotal	15	17
		88.2%
Engagement Rating	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	3	3
Competency on Standards Rating	3	3
Locate Evidence Rating	2	3
Subtotal	16	18
		88.9%
Grand Total	50	57
		87.7%

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

Fully Recommended	X
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	