

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: Exchanging Notes, Interpersonal Writing
Reviewer: Content Collaborative
Date of Review: October 25, 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.)	
Short Answer (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)	x
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.)	x
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 ...)	x
Scoring Guide/Rubric	x
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?	x
Other:	

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		
Range Level(s): Novice High		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: WL09-NH-S.1-GLE.1 -- (interpersonal writing)		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-3		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Food specific vocabulary, likes and dislikes, telling time.		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): Telling who, what, when, where, why.		
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.		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Full match – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> No match – task or most items are not related to the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. 		
<p>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response: The task meets the standards for interpersonal writing because students are responding to written prompts.</p>		
	<p>Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1</p>	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	5	
	Rating Column	Comments
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. <input type="checkbox"/> Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. <input type="checkbox"/> Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. 		
<p>Please provide evidence from both the range level expectations and assessment to support your response: It is less rigor because at times DOK level 1 is appropriate; however, for this assessment there seems to be too much focus on the lower level DOK, and students should be expected to perform at a higher DOK range to meet the standard.</p>		
	<p>Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1</p>	
Rigor Level Rating	1	

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

<p>Scoring Guide Present</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored <input type="checkbox"/> Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs) <input type="checkbox"/> Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task) <input type="checkbox"/> Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part) <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist 	<p>Check all that apply:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">x</p> <p style="text-align: center;">x</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Rating Column</p>	Comments
<p>2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: The rubric is vague and does not include language that is aligned to the standards.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	1	
<p>2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: The score categories are coherent across performance levels because the vocabulary in the rubric is mostly consistent; however, the categories are not clearly defined because they are not specific enough when addressing vocabulary use and language control. For example, what does recently and previously acquired vocabulary mean to the rater?</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	

Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	2	
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. The task is interpersonal writing, however the rubric includes no consideration for grammar usage, mechanics, organization or comprehensibility.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1	
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	1	
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 rubric is too vague and the impact is subjective, therefore causing different raters to arrive at different scores.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	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? Sample notes would be helpful to indicate the desired outcome.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Student Work Samples Rating	1	

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
<p>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 assessment is user-friendly with clearly defined sections indicating all the necessary parts of the assessment: learner targets, proficiency goal, scenario, teacher directions, and rubric.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	
<p>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: There are lines to divide each section making it easy to focus on one aspect of the assessment at a time. Also, the font is clear and easy to read. In addition, there is a visual to represent what is going on in the scenario for this assessment.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
Straight Forward Rating	3	
<p>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: Mostly free of bias, however one cannot assume that all students eat at fast-food restaurants.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	
<p>3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. The assessment uses student friendly language and vocabulary that would be very easy for the students to understand. It is appropriately written for the range level.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
Academic Language Rating	3	
<p>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. Meet/meat?</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
Confusing Language Rating	2	
<p>*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's Standards" (http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwc&cof=FORID:10&q=D efining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language)</p>		
<p>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.</p>		
<p><i>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		

<p>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.</p>	
<p>3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response. There are no accommodations, however it would be very easy for teachers to make them for this assessment based upon the needs of their students.</p>	<p>Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1</p>
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1

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
<p>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: Because this task requires students to "pass notes" about their likes/dislikes/recommendations about foods and drinks, this is very much a task that connects to a real world situation since students talk about likes and dislikes on a daily basis.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
Engagement Rating	3	
<p>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: It will help to indicate comprehension of basic skills.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
Classroom Learning Rating	3	
<p>4c. 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? Provide an explanation of your response: The rubric is not conducive to a meaningful dialog beyond the basics.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	
<p>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 your response: Although the scenario for this assessment requires basic skills in the language, students could have an opportunity to elaborate and give more detail. If the student decided to go "above and beyond" the task, they could write some very creative notes for this task.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	2	
<p>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 understand what competency on standard's look like? Provide an explanation of your response: If it had a better rubric the assessment would be more relevant.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
Competency on Standards Rating	1	
<p>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 could be a formative assessment used to adjust instruction.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary		
	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	5	5
Rigor Rating	1	2
Subtotal	6	7

		85.7%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	1	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	1	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	1	3
Student Work Samples Rating	1	3
Subtotal	6	15
		40.0%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	3
Straight Forward Rating	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	3
Academic Language Rating	3	3
Confusing Language Rating	2	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	2
Subtotal	14	17
		82.4%
Engagement Rating	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	2	3
Competency on Standards Rating	1	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	14	18
		77.8%
Grand Total	40	57
		70.2%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	X
Not Recommended	

In order to recommend this assessment it would need a more detailed and task-specific rubric. Also, to meet the novice-high range level expectation, the task and expectations should be more difficult or at a higher DOK.