

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 Language
Name of Assessment: JCPS, KY Unit 3 What do you like to do? FR1A_3_Presentational Speaking1
Reviewer: Content Collaborative
Date of Review: Sept. 19, 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.)	
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.)	X
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 ...)	
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.	5	
Range Level(s): Novice-mid		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Range Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: WL09-NM-S.1-GLE.1		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Range Level Expectations: Level 1		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : Level 1		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Likes, Dislikes, Activities.		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): Speaking		
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.		
<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. Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response: Meets the Communication Standard (Interpersonal) at the appropriate range level (Novice-mid)		
	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. <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. Please provide evidence from both the range level expectations and assessment to support your response: Participates in basic conversations on a variety of familiar and predictable topics; talk about what you like and don't like to do		
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=3, Less Rigor=1	
Rigor Level Rating	2	

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

Scoring Guide Present <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	Check all that apply: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rating Column	Comments 2a,2b,2c The scoring is based on a very detailed rubric based on speaking tasks, including major and minor emphases
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.	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: As the student moves across the rubric, the language remains consistent. Use of the Grading Guidelines sheet makes grade conversion understandable.	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. The rubric addresses all the communication skills needed for presentational speaking at the Novice-Mid Range Level.	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. There is an element of subjectiveness that can occur, because the wording in the scenario and rubric allow for differences for the grader and student.</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? An exemplar of mastery would be needed</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 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 very well organized with different sections for the different parts.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	3a,3b Clear explanations of expectations, graphic organizers
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: It's in English, so there can't be problems understanding the direction. The bulleted points make the different tasks clear.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Straight Forward Rating	3	
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: Does not display any cultural, economic or gender bias.	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. The language in the prompt directly aligns with the DOK in the rubric.	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	1	
<p><u>*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)</u></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.	2	
<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. 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>3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response. Graphic organizers are helpful for accommodations. A student could easily have the exam read to them. The assessment doesn't provide any specific accommodations, but the teacher could easily incorporate some: extra time, lessening task, scheduling accommodations.</p>	<p>Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1</p>	
<p>Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating</p>		<p>1</p>

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: This is an every day situation for teenager.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	<p>Focus and depth of the rubric and how it intersects with state performance standards enable the assessment to meet all of the expectations of a high quality assessment.</p>
<p>Engagement Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<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: This assessment provides information about how well students can speak in a public forum in a real-world context.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Classroom Learning Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<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: Student performance can indicate their ability speak in a public forum and directly aligns with given learner targets. Also, because this is a real world situation, it becomes obvious to students and parents which skills have been developed or not developed yet.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<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: It allows for creativity, self-direction, and initiative plus it depends upon transfer knowledge of the language.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Communicate Academic Excellence Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<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 a teacher looks at the entire unit/scenario package (unit plan, learner targets, rubric, scenario/prompt), they can get a good picture of student progress and performance. Teachers can also look at specific areas on the rubric to see areas of strength and weakness.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Competency on Standards Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<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: The Learner targets and proficiency goal are directly stated on the assessment indicating the purpose of the assessment.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Clarity of Purpose Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
Summary	Earned	Possible
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	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	1	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	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	51	57
		89.5%

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

Fully Recommended	X
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	