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: Dance

Name of Assessment: TN - Grade 2 Dance Tasks

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: 5/2/12

Assessment Profile

Grade Level(s) suggested by this assessment: Grade 2

Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment:

DA09-GR.2-S.1-GLE.1; DA09-GR.2-S.1-GLE.2; DA09-GR.2-S.2-GLE.1; DA09-GR.2-S.2-GLE.2; DA09-GR.2-S.3-GLE.2; DA09-GR.2-S.4-GLE.1; DA09-GR.3-S.2-GLE.1; DA09-GR.3-S.3-GLE.2; DA09-GR.3-S.3-GLE.1; DA09-GR.3-S.4-GLE.2;

What is the DOK of the assessment? DOK 3

Indicate the DOK range of the CAS Grade Level Expectations: 1-3

Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed: movement & elements, choreographic principles, dance as communication, criticism & critical thinking, cultural/historical implications, healthful living

List the skills/performance assessed: non-locomotor movement, space and shape, pathways, tempo, group work, beg/mid/end, improvisation, audience development, understanding meaning, problem-solving, criticism, demonstrating folk dances, compare/contrast, identify body parts, connect to other disciplines

Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):

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.)

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:

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

Check All That Apply		
х		
х		
х		

Check All That Apply		
х		
exists, but no scoring		

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?	
Other:	

A high quality assessment should beAligned		
Alignment with Standards	Rating Column	Strengths & Suggestion
1a. To what extent do you see a strong content match between the set of		
tems reviewed or the task and the corresponding Colorado Academic		
Standard/s? Select one option below.		
Full match – task or most items address or exceed the relevant skills and		
knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.		
Partial match – task or most items partially address the 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:		
The assessment goes beyond the 2nd grade CAS to address standards in	Full=3; Partial =2; No	
other content areas, to include health and reading and writing. However,	Full=3; Partial =2; No Match= 1	
the assessment does not meet the CAS in synthesis and technique.	iviaten 1	
Alignment with Standards Score	2	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment	Rating Column	
1b . Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the	•	
grade level expectations? Select one option below.		
grade level expectations? Select one option below.		
grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.		
grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level		
More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK		
More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.		
More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. 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 grade level expectations and		
More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.		
More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. 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 grade level expectations and assessment to support your response:		
More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. 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 grade level expectations and	Similar Rigor=2; More	
More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. 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 grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: The complexity of the expected performance on the assessment is similar	Similar Rigor=2; More Rigor=1; Less Rigor= 1	

A high quality assessment should beScored us	ing Clear Guidelines a	and Criteria
Scoring Guidelines for this Assessment	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions
Scoring Guide Present:		
Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored		
Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)		
Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)	X	
Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)		
Feacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		
	Yes, several types=3, Yes,	
	at least one type=2,	
Searing Guide Dresent Search	None=1	
Scoring Guide Present Score	2	
2a. Give evidence that the rubric/scoring criteria aligns to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment.		
Provide an explanation of your response: Task specific rubric aligns with language of CO standard evidence outcomes for 2nd grade level.	Completely aligned=3, Somewhat aligned=2, Not aligned=1	
Rubric Aligned with Standards Score	2	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across		
performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response:		
There are absolutely no score categories or guidelines, but the rubric does show a differentiation between levels of understanding and knowledge.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Score	2	
2c. To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the		
demands within the task or item?		
Explain: The rubric is strong in terms of setting up guidelines for	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
understanding and knowledge.	No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	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? Why or why not? The guidelines are very clear, but the language used in the scoring criteria		
can lead to rater subjectivity. For example, the degree to which a student		
can "Employ supportive and constructive language" can vary from rater to	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
rater.	No=1	
Inter-rater Reliability Score	2	
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?		
None provided. Video or recorded oral response would be helpful.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Student Work Samples Score	N/A	

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	Strengths/Suggestions
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 tasks are designed as teacher-directed prompts/scripts.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
"Clear & Uncluttered" Score 3b. To what extent are most of the items or the task presented in as	3	
straightforward a way as possible for a range of learners? Provide an explanation of your response: There is no presentation of student prompt. The instructions to the teacher are slightly unclear and	All-2 Compa2 Named	
must be read thoroughly. "Straight Forward" Score	All=3, Some=2, None=1 2	
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:		
Completely unbiased.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
Free of 'Cultural or Unintended Bias' Score 3d. Does the assessment require students to possess a high level of academic language* comprehension to demonstrate understanding? Provide an explanation of your response:	3	
Not from a written language perspective since the performance task is largely movement based and teacher-directed. However, an educator would need to check for understanding of the task expectations to ensure that instructions are clearly communicated and understood.	No=3, Somewhat=2, Yes=1	
"Academic Language" Score *Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's	3	
3e. If applicable, what type of accommodations should be considered to ensure that students with special needs can fully access the content represented by the task or set of items reviewed? It would be easy and allowable to incorporate all accommodations, but they are not included.		
Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling: • 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. • 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. • Setting Accommodations — Change the location in which a test or assignment is given or the conditions of the assessment setting. • 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. • 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. 3f: Identify and write down the accommodations permitted for this assessment:		

	Yes, Several allowed=3;
None listed	Yes, Some allowed=2;
	None allowed =1
"Adequate Accommodations Allowed" Score	N/A

A high quality assessment shouldincrease OPPORTUNITIES TO LEARN			
The areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions	
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:	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;		
The tasks specifically represent problem-solving.	No=1		
"Engages Students" Score	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:			
The learning expectations are more thorough than the test prompt, and the prompt rarely asks for more than demonstration.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1		
Classroom Learning Score	2		
4c. To what degree do the results from this assessment (scores and			
student work analysis) foster meaningful dialogue about learning			
expectations and outcomes with students and parents? Provide an			
explanation of your response:			
Information gleaned from this assessment would be somewhat limited to	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;		
a student's ability to demonstrate. Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score	No=1		
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: Creativity and connecting to other disciplines are each dedicated			
	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;		
performance tasks in this series; learning expectations are very clearly defined and well-worded.	No=1		
Communicates Academic Excellence Score	2		
	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 (scores			
and student work analysis) to understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your response:			
The rubric is clearly defined, well-written and connected to the standards. However, there are no anchor papers or student performance examples to	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;		
support teacher decisions.	No=1		
Standards Competency Score	2		
•			
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 series of assessments is more of a year-long assessment process as it			
includes 7 performance tasks to build upon one another. This assessment	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;		
series could support a well-structured dance curriculum and evaluation	No=1		
process.			
Locate evidence Score	3		



	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	2	3
Rigor Rating	2	3
Subtotal	4	6
Standards Alignment Percentage		66.7%
Scoring Guide Present	2	3
Rubric Aligned w/standards	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	3	3
Inter-rater reliability	2	3
Student work present	N/A	3
Subtotal	11	18
Scoring Percentage		61.1%
Clear & Uncluttered Presentation	3	3
Straight Forward Presentation	2	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias	3	3
Academic Language Load	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed	N/A	3
Subtotal	11	15
Fair & Unbiased Percentage		73.3%
Engagement	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence	3	3
Competency on Standards Score	2	3
Locate evidence Score	3	3
Subtotal	15	18
Opportunities to Learn Percentage		83.3%
Grand Total	41	57
Overall Percentage		71.9%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	Х
Not Recommended	