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: JCPS,KY - Unit 4 My School Life SPA1A_4 Presentational Speaking

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): Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)	Check All That Apply
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)	Х
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)	
Scoring Guide/Rubric Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like Materials (if needed to complete the assessment) 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
1a.	
Grade Level(s): Novice-mid	<u>-</u>
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Range Level Expectations evaluated by	
the Assessment: WL09NM-S.1-GLE.3	<u>- </u>
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Range Level Expectations: DOK 1	
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): DOK 1	
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the	
performance task: Vocabulary: School subjects, objects and schedule. Concepts:	
Presentational communication.	
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?):	
Communicate orally in presentational mode to communicate information about school.	
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.	

X 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: 1.3 Standards is addressed in that students need to communicate orally to present information about school.		
	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 range level expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating.		
 ☐ More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the range level expectations. X Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the range level expectations. ☐ Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the range level expectations. 		
Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to		
support your response: The DOK for the Range Level expectations and the assessments are a match.		
	Similar Rigor=2, More	
	Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	

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 		
X 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		
	Rating Column	
2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this		
assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: While written in student-	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
friendly language, the range levels listed match our Colorado Standards in definition and	No=1	
application.		
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	3	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels?		
Provide an explanation of your response: The categories are clearly defined in student-	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
friendly language focusing on the student's learning. Score categories are very clearly	No=1	
defined.		
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. The rubric allows the	High=3, Moderate=2,	
student to see areas of strength and weakness. The rubric addresses all items of the	Low or None=1	
assessment by being general but adaptable.	FOM OL MOLIG-T	
assessment by being general but adaptable.		
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. Another rater could arrive at a similar score, but only if they were both trained on the definitions of "few", "limited", and "mostly". Students should be given the rubric provided in advance of assessment.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	2
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating 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 products at the range levels would be helpful.	

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: It's well organized with bullet points and picture.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	3f no accommodations listed.
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: Learning targets and proficiency goals help to keep students on track.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Straight Forward Rating	3	
3c. To what degree is the vocabulary and contexts) presented by most of the items or task free from cultural or other unintended bias? Provide an explanation of your response: The vocabulary is mostly simple and straight forward.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	
3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. Very basic levels of academic language is used.	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. The assessment doesn't use any confusing words.	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. The assessment doesn't provide any specific accommodations, but there is a differentiated rubric. The teacher could easily incorporate some: extra time, lessoning task, scheduling accommodations.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	

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 response: It's	High=3; Moderate=2;	
real-world in that students describe their school subjects and teachers. It does allow for	Low or None=1	
creativity and transference into real-life situations.		
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?	High=3; Moderate=2;	
Provide an explanation of your response: It provides the necessary steps from Novice Low to Novice High. Demonstrates that students are learning to discuss school subjects	Low or None=1	
and teachers.		
Classroom Learning Rating	3	
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	High=3; Moderate=2;	
students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response: The lesson could be	Low or None=1	
taught based upon the expected outcomes of this assessment.		
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: It	Low or None=1	
allows for creativity and transference of knowledge to daily life.	LOW OF HOME-1	
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	3	
	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 understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your	High=3; Moderate=2;	
response: Teachers can look at specific areas on the rubric to see specific strengths and	Low or None=1	
weaknesses. Matching the task & rubrics should provide a clear example of an Novice-	LOW OF NOTICE	
Low to Novice-High.		
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.		
diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation of	High=3; Moderate=2;	
your response: Could be used for a variety of assessment purposes Does not specify on	Low or None=1	
assessments.		
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	Earned	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	<u>carned</u> 5	<u>Possible</u> 5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	7	7
		100.0%
Rubric Aligned we/Standards Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	2	3
Student Work Samples Rating Subtotal	1 12	15
Subtotal	16	80.0%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	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	1	2
Subtotal	16	17
		94.1%
Engagement Rating	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	3	3
Competency on Standards Rating	3	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	18	18
		100.0%
Grand Total	53	57
		93.0%

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

Fully Recommended	Х
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	