

## 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](#)

<b>Content Area: World Languages</b>
<b>Name of Assessment: FLENJ To Bargain or Not to Bargain A Day at the Market</b>
<b>Reviewer: Content Collaborative</b>
<b>Date of Review: 9-20-12</b>

Assessment Profile	
<b>Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):</b>	<b>Check All That Apply</b>
<b>Selected Response</b> (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)	X
<b>Short Answer</b> (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)	X
<b>Extended Response</b> (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)	X
<b>Product</b> (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)	
<b>Performance</b> (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)	
<b>Process</b> (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)	
<b>The assessment includes:</b>	<b>Check All That Apply</b>
<b>Teacher directions</b> (may include prerequisites/description of instruction before giving the assessment e.g., this assessment should be given after students have learned ...)	X
<b>Scoring Guide/Rubric</b>	X
<b>Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like</b>	
<b>Materials</b> (if needed to complete the assessment)	X
<b>Estimated time for administration</b>	X
<b>Student Directions &amp; Assessment Task/Prompt</b> – what does the student see/use?	X
<b>Other:</b>	

### A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
<b>1a.</b>		
<b>Range Level(s):</b> Intermediate-mid		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and range Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: WL09-IM-S.1-GLE.1; WL09-IM-S.1-GLE.2; WL09-IM-S.1-GLE.3; WL09-IM-S.2-GLE.1; WL09-IM-S.2-GLE.2;		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the range Level Expectations: 3-4		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1-2		
<b>1b.</b> Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Vocabulary identification, cultural comparison		
<b>1c.</b> List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): repeat commonly used phrases, indicate understanding of the song text, speaking interpretive roll play with the teacher		

<p><b>1d.</b> 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? <b>Use the definitions below to select your rating.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Full match</b> – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Close match</b> – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partial match</b> – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Minimal match</b> – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>No match</b> – task or most items are not related to the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> </ul> <p><b>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response:</b> Although the assessment has merit, the lack of required response in the target language in the interpretive mode, is problematic for the range level the assessment claims for itself.</p>		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
<b>Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<p><b>1e.</b> Are the set of items or tasks reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? <b>Use the definitions below to select your rating.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>More rigorous</b> – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Similar rigor</b> – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Less rigor</b> – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response:</b> Due to the responses in English for the interpretive standards, as well as a lack of demonstrating an ability to use the skill being assessed, lowers the rigor rating of this assessment.</p>		
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	
<b>Rigor Level Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	

### A high quality assessment should be...Scored using Clear Guidelines and Criteria

Scoring Guide Present	Check all that apply:	Comments
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored</b>	x	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Generalized Rubric</b> (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)	X	
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Task-Specific Rubric</b> (only used for the particular task)		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Checklist</b> (e.g., with score points for each part)		
<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist</b>		
	<b>Rating Column</b>	
<p><b>2a.</b> Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The assessment aligns to the standards, and so by default the rubric does also. But the rubric is vague and could be written better.</p>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	Exemplars of the interpretive, and presentational portions of the assessments. Would be helpful to give sample
<b>Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	

<p><b>2b.</b> Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: Rubric categories of "meets", "exceeds", and "doesn't meet" are vague and subjective.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	<p>responses for the interpersonal interview.</p>
<p><b>Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating</b></p>	<p>1</p>	
<p><b>2c.</b> To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the demands within the task or item? Provide an explanation of your response. The rubric addresses all of the demands, but not well.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1</p>	
<p><b>Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating</b></p>	<p>2</p>	
<p><b>2d.</b> 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. Rubric categories of "meets", "exceeds", and "doesn't meet" are vague and subjective.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p><b>Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating</b></p>	<p>1</p>	
<p><b>2e.</b> 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? A sample transcript or video of a "bargaining" conversation.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p><b>Student Work Samples Rating</b></p>	<p>1</p>	

## 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
<b>3a.</b> 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)? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: There are no illustrations or graphics. While the assessment is by no means visually interesting or stimulating, it is fairly straight-forward.</b>	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	Lacks graphic illustrations. It allows for various types of artifacts to express responses. i.e. video or essay
<b>Clear &amp; Uncluttered Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>3b.</b> To what extent are most of the items or the task presented in as straightforward a way as possible for a range of learners? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: All instructions and most of the assignment are in English, so the assessment is very easy to read and understand.</b>	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
<b>Straight Forward Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>3c.</b> To what degree is the vocabulary and context(s) presented by most of the items or task free from cultural or other unintended bias? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: The vocabulary an task are simple and straight-forward.</b>	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
<b>Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>3d.</b> Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? <b>Provide an explanation of your response. The vocabulary is simple and easy to understand.</b>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Academic Language Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<b>3e.</b> 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). <b>Provide an explanation of your response. The language is simple and easy to understand with few or no opportunities for confusion.</b>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Confusing Language Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<a href="http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bikids4qwcy&amp;cof=FORID:10&amp;q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language">*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's Standards" (http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bikids4qwcy&amp;cof=FORID:10&amp;q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language)</a>		
<b>3f.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b>		<b>2</b>
<p><i>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Presentation Accommodations</b> —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.</li> <li>o <b>Response Accommodations</b> —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.</li> <li>o <b>Setting Accommodations</b> —Change the location in which a test or assignment is given or the conditions of the assessment setting.</li> <li>o <b>Timing and Scheduling Accommodations</b> —Increase the allowable length of time to complete an assessment or assignment and perhaps change the way the time is organized.</li> <li>o <b>Linguistic Accommodations</b>— 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.</li> </ul>		

<b>3g:</b> Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? <b>Provide an explanation of your response. Students are given the option of writing letter or presenting a dialog.</b>	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
<b>Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	

### A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn

Opportunities to Learn <i>(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)</i>	Rating Column	Comments
<b>4a.</b> Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new context, situation, problem or challenge? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: The assessment does require students to think about culturally relevant situations, but the limited expectations in the target language seem low for the level.</b>	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	It discusses bargaining culturally, but never gives the students the opportunity to bargain. The use of English responses impedes the assessment of the target language.
<b>Engagement Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>4b.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: The assessment might be good to test culture, but it doesn't focus on language.</b>	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
<b>Classroom Learning Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>4c.</b> To what degree do the results from this assessment ( <i>scores and student work analysis</i> ) foster meaningful dialogue about learning expectations and outcomes with students and parents? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: The culture and connections pieces are strained at best, and there is little evaluation of the target language.</b>	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
<b>Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>4d.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: The culture and connections pieces are strained at best, and there is little evaluation of the target language.</b>	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
<b>Communicate Academic Excellence Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>4e.</b> 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 understand what competency on standard/s look like? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: The culture and connections pieces are strained at best, and there is little evaluation of the target language.</b>	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
<b>Competency on Standards Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>4f:</b> 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.)? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: We have no idea what purpose this assessment is meant to serve.</b>	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
<b>Clarity of Purpose Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	

Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	3	5
Rigor Rating	1	2
Subtotal	4	7
		57.1%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	1	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	2	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	1	3
Student Work Samples Rating	1	3

<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>15</b>
		<b>46.7%</b>
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	2	2
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>17</b>
		<b>94.1%</b>
Engagement Rating	2	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	1	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	1	3
Competency on Standards Rating	1	3
Locate Evidence Rating	1	3
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>18</b>
		<b>44.4%</b>
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>57</b>
		<b>61.4%</b>

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

<b>Fully Recommended</b>	
<b>Partially Recommended</b>	X
<b>Not Recommended</b>	

The interpretive piece of the test could be used for a lower range level, i.e. novice high, intermediate low. The document would need to be changed to be a fully useful assessment.