## 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: Music
Name of Assessment: Auralia -- http://www.risingsoftware.com/auralia/
Reviewer(s): Content Collaborative
Date of Review: 4/18/12

## Assessment Profile

Grade Level(s) suggested by this assessment: K-16

Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards (CAS) and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: MU09-GR.4-S.3-GLE.1; MU09-GR.4-S.3-GLE.3; MU09-GR.4.S.3-GLE.4; MU09-
GR.5-S.3-GLE.2; MU09-GR.5-S.3-GLE.3; MU09-GR.5-S.3-GLE.4; MU09-GR.6-
S.1-GLE.3; MU09-GR.6-S.3-GLE.1; MU09-GR.6-S.3-GLE.3; MU09-GR.7-S.1-

GLE.3; MU09-GR.7-S.3-GLE.1; MU09-GR.7-S.3-GLE.3; MU09-GR.8-S.3-GLE.1;
MU09-GR.HSGP-S.3-GLE.1; MU09-GR.HSPP-S.3-GLE-3; MU09-GR.HSPP-S.3-
GLE. 1
What is the DOK of the assessment? 1-4

Indicate the DOK range of the CAS Grade Level Expectations: 1-4

Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed: Intervals and Scales, Chords, Rhythm, Harmony and Form, Pitch and Melody.

List the skills/performance assessed: Sing, compare, recognize, imitate, sight-sing, rhythm and melodic dictation, identify, differentiate

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
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?

| Check All That Apply |
| :---: |
| X |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |


| Check All That Apply |
| :---: |
| $x$ |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Other:


## A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment with Standards
Strengths \& Suggestions:

1a. 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? 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:
This assessment is a full match to the standards because the Auralia program has many different components that address standards one (expression) and three (theory) in grades 4-12.

Alignment with Standards Score

Full=3; Partial =2; No Match= 1

| (expression) and three (theory) in grades 4-12. |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Alignment with Standards Score |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| 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.

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 assessment covers skills in the 4th - 8th grade standards, and also the
high school Generalist and Performance pathways, but it also assesses skills
at the college level.

Similar Rigor=3; More Rigor=2; Less Rigor= 1

Auralia includes many wellaligned components of standards one and three at similar or more rigor than the CAS.

| A high quality assessment should be...Scored using Clear Guidelines and Criteria |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Scoring Guidelines for this Assessment | Check all that apply: | Strengths/Suggestions |
| Scoring Guide Present: <br> 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) Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part) Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist | X <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Yes, several types=3, Yes, <br> at least one type=2, <br> None=1 | Strengths/Suggestions: The Auralia program is a high quality assessment with very clear guidelines and criteria. |
| Scoring Guide Present Score | $\square 2$ |  |
| 2a.Give evidence that the rubric/scoring criteria aligns to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. <br> Provide an explanation of your response: The scoring guide assesses skills that are in the standards. | Completely aligned=3, Somewhat aligned=2, Not aligned=1 |  |
| Rubric Aligned with Standards Score | - 3 |  |
| 2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: The score categories are clearly defined. Within each skill area, there are levels, some of which begin in elementary, and continue to high school level and beyond. | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, <br> No=1 |  |
| Rubric/Scoring Coherent Score | $\square 3$ |  |
| $\mathbf{2 c}$. To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the demands within the task or item? <br> Explain: <br> Each item has a response of right or wrong answer, so the scoring guide addresses each item as it is completed. | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, 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? <br> The assessment is computer-based and each answer is either correct or incorrect. | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 |  |
| Inter-rater Reliability Score | $\square 3$ |  |
| 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? <br> All the tasks are clearly defined in the assessment. | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 |  |
| Student Work Samples Score | - 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 | 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: This is a well-designed and organized computer program with clear formatting and uncluttered appearance. | All=3, Some=2, None=1 | Auralia is a clear, straight forward and unbiased assessment. |
| "Clear \& Uncluttered" Score | - 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: Each task is clearly defined and presented in straightforward manner. | All=3, Some=2, None=1 |  |
| "Straight Forward" Score | $\square 3$ |  |
| 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: There is no inherent bias. | All=3, Some=2, None=1 |  |
| Free of 'Cultural or Unintended Bias' Score | - 3 |  |
| 3d.Does the assessment require students to possess a high level of academic language* comprehension to demonstrate understanding? Provide an explanation of your response: There are multiple levels for each concept, some requiring a high level of academic language comprehension and some requiring a lower level. | No=3, Somewhat=2, Yes=1 |  |
| "Academic Language" Score | 2 |  |
| *Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's |  |  |
| 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? |  |  |
| Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling: <br> - 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> - 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> - Setting Accommodations -Change the location in which a test or assignment is given or the conditions of the assessment setting. <br> - 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> - 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: |  |  |
| None identified. Accommodations suggested by the reviewers but not explicitly specified by the assessment: Presentation, setting, timing and scheduling, and linguistic accommodations may be used. | Yes, Several allowed=3; <br> Yes, Some allowed=2; <br> None allowed =1 |  |


| A high quality assessment should ...increase 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: <br> The assessment represents demonstration of the ability to function at a variety of difficulty levels. The skills required represent those that transfer to other contexts. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes=3; Somewhat=2; } \\ & \mathrm{No=1} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| "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: <br> Students who score well on this assessment will demonstrate what they have learned in the classroom. | Yes=3; Somewhat=2; <br> No=1 |  |
| Classroom Learning Score | 3 |  |
| 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: <br> The software allows for multiple students to be entered, and data on their results of tests compiled so they can be shared with students and parents. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes=3; Somewhat=2; } \\ & \mathrm{No=1} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score | 3 |  |
| 4d.o 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 software somewhat suggests a level of academic excellence in the multiple levels students can achieve; however, there is no inherent demand for excellence because students can start at any level without having to complete previous levels, and scores are given as a percentage. | Yes=3; Somewhat=2; <br> No=1 |  |
| Communicates Academic Excellence Score | 2 |  |
| 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: <br> The program tracks student progress and provides detailed reports to the teacher. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Yes=3; Somewhat=2; } \\ & \text { No=1 } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Standards Competency Score | 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: <br> It is very apparent to teachers that this assessment can be used for a variety of purposes including formative, summative, and interim evaluation. | Yes=3; Somewhat=2; <br> No=1 |  |
| Locate evidence Score | 3 |  |


| Summary | Earned | Possible |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Standards Rating | 3 | 3 |
| Rigor Rating | 2 | 3 |
| Subtotal | 5 | 6 |
| Standards Alignment Percentage |  | 83.3\% |
| Scoring Guide Present | 2 | 3 |
| Rubric Aligned w/standards | 3 | 3 |
| Rubric/Scoring Coherent | 3 | 3 |
| Rubric/Scoring Alignment | 3 | 3 |
| Inter-rater reliability | 3 | 3 |
| Student work present | 1 | 3 |
| Subtotal | 15 | 18 |
| Scoring Percentage |  | 83.3\% |
| Clear \& Uncluttered Presentation | 3 | 3 |
| Straight Forward Presentation | 3 | 3 |
| Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias | 3 | 3 |
| Academic Language Load | 2 | 3 |
| Adequate Accommodations Allowed | 1 | 3 |
| Subtotal | 12 | 15 |
| Fair \& Unbiased Percentage |  | 80.0\% |
| Engagement | 3 | 3 |
| Reflects Classroom Learning | 3 | 3 |
| Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes | 3 | 3 |
| Communicates Academic Excellence | 2 | 3 |
| Competency on Standards Score | 3 | 3 |
| Locate evidence Score | 3 | 3 |
| Subtotal | 17 | 18 |
| Opportunities to Learn Percentage |  | 94.4\% |
| Grand Total | 49 | 57 |
| Overall Percentage |  | 86.0\% |

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

| Fully Recommended | $X$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| Partially Recommended |  |
| Not Recommended |  |

