

<p>X Full match – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><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> <p>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.</p>		
	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
<p>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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the range level expectations.</p> <p>X Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the range level expectations.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the range level expectations.</p> <p>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.</p>		
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	
Rigor Level Rating	2	

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

<p>Scoring Guide Present</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored</p> <p>X Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist</p>	<p>Check all that apply:</p> <p>X</p>	Comments
	Rating Column	
<p>2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: While written in student-friendly language, the range levels listed match our Colorado Standards in definition and application.</p>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	3	
<p>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-friendly language focusing on the student's learning. Score categories are very clearly defined.</p>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	
<p>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 student to see areas of strength and weakness. The rubric addresses all items of the assessment by being general but adaptable.</p>	High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1	
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	

<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p>Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p>Student Work Samples Rating</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
3a. To what extent do 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 do 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:bjkids4gwcyc&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.		
<i>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</i> <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. 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, lessening task, scheduling accommodations.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	

A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn

Opportunities to Learn (the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)	Rating Column	Comments
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 real-world in that students describe their school subjects and teachers. It does allow for creativity and transference into real-life situations.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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: It provides the necessary steps from Novice Low to Novice High. Demonstrates that students are learning to discuss school subjects and teachers.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	3	
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 lesson could be taught based upon the expected outcomes of this assessment.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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 areas or 21st Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: It allows for creativity and transference of knowledge to daily life.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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 understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your response: Teachers can look at specific areas on the rubric to see specific strengths and weaknesses. Matching the task & rubrics should provide a clear example of an Novice-Low to Novice-High.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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 your response: Could be used for a variety of assessment purposes Does not specify on assessments.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	

Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	5	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	1	3
Subtotal	12	15
		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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Partially Recommended	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not Recommended	<input type="checkbox"/>