# High Quality Assessment Content Validity Review Tool

**Content Area: Drama and Theatre Arts**

**Name of Assessment: New York Open Script: Developing Characterizations by Creating Stereotypes (Pg. 57-86)**

**Reviewer: Content Collaborative**

**Date of Review: March 1, 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.) | |
| **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 …) | X |
| **Scoring Guide/Rubric** | X |
| **Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like** | |
| **Materials** (if needed to complete the assessment) | X |
| **Estimated time for administration** | X |
| **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.** Grade Level(s): Middle and High School<br><br>Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: DT09-GR.8-S.1; DT09-GR.8-S.2; DT09-GR.8-S.3; DT09-GR.HS-S.1; DT09-GR.HS-S.2; DT09-GR.HS-S.3<br><br>Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-3<br>Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1-3<br><br>**1b.** Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: • Create, perform, respond and connect<br><br>**1c.** List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): • Presentation skills<br>• Writing skills<br>• Critical thinking<br>• Creativity, collaboration and innovation | | Strengths?<br>• They align with our three standards, but they have separated critically respond and cultural relevance<br><br>Suggestions?<br>• DOK 4 needs to be developed and made apparent, it is possible to have a DOK 4, but not evident currently<br>• Could remove the title word of stereotype and reference only "develop a character" |

| | Rating Column | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| **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.**<br>□ **Full match –** all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.<br>□ **Close match –** most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.<br>□ **Partial match –** many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.<br>□ **Minimal match –** some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.<br>□ **No match –** task or most items are not related to the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.<br>**Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response: Students are creating, performing, and critically responding to a performance and other peoples performance** | | |
| | 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.**<br>□ **More rigorous –** most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.<br>□ **Similar rigor –** most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.<br>□ **Less rigor –** most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.<br><br>**Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: • The assessment is asking the student to be engaged in the depth of knowledge and create through the depth of knowledge.**<br>**• Create, perform and critically respond through their depth of knowledge, analyze meaning, articulate blips issues, write and perform monologue scenes.**<br>**• Enact through a set of requirements, apply concepts in a new context, justify a critique.** | | |
| | 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

| Scoring Guide Present | Check all that apply: | Comments |
|---|---|---|
| □ **Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored** | | Strengths? |
| □ **Generalized Rubric** (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs) | X | • Easy to read, user friendly. |
| □ **Task-Specific Rubric** (only used for the particular task) | X | • There are rubric points and |
| □ **Checklist** (e.g., with score points for each part) | X | percentages, which allows for |
| □ **Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist** | | standards based grading. • We |
| | **Rating Column** | believe that you would get very |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| **2a.** Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. **Provide an explanation of your response: • Open script on pg. 59, follows the performance standard, it includes voice, movement and performance criteria • Pg. 60 Create, reflection rubric for a rehearsal performance, talks about create • Pg. 61 Performance scoring rubric for weighing the production, definition of terms.** | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 | consistent responses from using this rubric. |
| **Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating** | **3** | |
| **2b.** Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? **Provide an explanation of your response: • In the category of voice, they talk about characteristics of voice. (pg. 59) It defines the elements for each area of the rubric, which allows for growth markers** | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 | Suggestions? • Terms need to be defined in their glossary, such as "sophisticated" performance? • Vocabulary needs to be defined, to increase reliability • Provide some simple clips of exemplary student performances |
| **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. • High degree, but this form does not give us a scale. However, all of the objectives are scored in the rubric** | High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1 | |
| **Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating** | **2** | |
| **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. • We believe that this rubric would provide some consistent responses for different evaluators working with this assessment.** | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 | |
| **Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating** | **3** | |
| **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? • No student work displayed** | 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 |
|---|---|---|
| **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: Layout is fine, rubrics excellent, checklists, numerical order, easy to find things in bold font** | High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1 | Strengths?<br>• The glossary is the strength<br>• The assessment has a general reminder about how to provide accommodations |
| **Clear & Uncluttered Rating** | **3** | • Fair as it is open ended that allows for it to be viewed through various lenses. |
| **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: Accommodations for ELL students and for students that have difficulty in writing. Also GT accommodations are included.** | High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1 | |
| **Straight Forward Rating** | **3** | Suggestions?<br>• Difficulty in locating the student prompt |
| **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: Called "stereotypes" which brings up several issues and open the doors for several racial stereotypes, can easily be fixed by changing the title to "Portrait of a Character".** | High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1 | • Items not listed clearly<br>• Need for accommodations in numerous areas.<br>• Include other activities at the beginning and end to help students when they enroll in the course. |
| **Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating** | **2** | • Reframe as "character development" rather than "stereotypes". |
| **3d.** Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? **Provide an explanation of your response. Glossary terms included. If this type of unit is new, then the vocabulary would be new to the students.** | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 | |
| **Academic Language Rating** | **2** | |
| **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. Confusing language is limited.** | 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:bjkids4gwcy&cof=FORID:1 | | |
| **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. • As titled, this could encourage negative stereotypical behavior in the classroom.** | | |
| *Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:*<br>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.*<br>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.*<br>o **Setting Accommodations** *—Change the location in which a test or assignment is given or the conditions of the assessment setting.*<br>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.*<br>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. • Numerous suggested as discussed above. No specific accommodations identified, however, simply a general overview.** | Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1 | |
|---|---|---|
| **Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating** | 2 | |

## 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: • Includes numerous problem solving techniques, where they can re-do the assessment.** **• Process is mimicking the professional real world** **• Discusses real world themes which are student based.** **• Product based** | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | Strengths? • Includes numerous problem solving techniques, where they can re-do the assessment. • Process is mimicking the professional real world • Discusses real world themes which are student based. • Product based |
| **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: • Students self-reflect, and others students observing get to reflect on the experience, thus providing many opportunities to discover what the students are learning from the activity.** | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | |
| **Classroom Learning Rating** | 3 | Suggestions? • Included in a portfolio |
| **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: • There is dialogue intrinsically included in the assessment, but the parent could interact with the assessment as a path for dialogue on growth with the teacher.** | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | • Content is missing in the area of technical theatre • Definitions of venues • Costumes or no costumes? |
| **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: The lack of exemplars makes it difficult to clearly see what the true potential of the assessment can be.** | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | |
| **Communicate Academic Excellence Rating** | 1 | |
| **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: • Contains the basic building blocks to help understand what the standards are and could look like.** | 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: • Assuming that the instructor is competent and well versed in the standards, yes.** | 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 w/Standards Rating** | 3 | 3 |
| **Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating** | 3 | 3 |

| | | |
|---|:---:|:---:|
| Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating | 2 | 3 |
| Inter-rater Reliability Rating | 3 | 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 | 2 | 3 |
| Academic Language Rating | 2 | 3 |
| Confusing Language Rating | 3 | 3 |
| Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating | 2 | 2 |
| Subtotal | 15 | 17 |
| | | 88.2% |
| Engagement Rating | 3 | 3 |
| Reflects Classroom Learning Rating | 3 | 3 |
| Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating | 3 | 3 |
| Communicates Academic Excellence Rating | 1 | 3 |
| Competency on Standards Rating | 3 | 3 |
| Locate Evidence Rating | 3 | 3 |
| Subtotal | 16 | 18 |
| | | 88.9% |
| Grand Total | 50 | 57 |
| | | 87.7% |

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

| | |
|---|---|
| **Fully Recommended** | |
| **Partially Recommended** | X |
| **Not Recommended** | |