

## 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: Reading, Writing and Communicating

Name of Assessment: [Teachers College Reading & Writing Project Common Core-Aligned Performance Assessments, Grade 6 - http://readingandwritingproject.com/resources/assessments/performance-assessments.html](http://readingandwritingproject.com/resources/assessments/performance-assessments.html)

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: April 18, 2012

PLEASE NOTE: Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Considerations for Reading, Writing and Communicating Assessments In August 2012, Colorado became a Governing State in the [Partnership for Assessment of College and Career Readiness \(PARCC\)](#) multi-state assessment consortium. At this time, PARCC has not released DOK indicators for the Common Core State Standards which the consortium is set to assess in 2014-2015. In order to move forward with the alignment portion of the assessment review process, the Colorado Reading, Writing and Communicating Content Collaborative utilized DOK indicators that were previously published by the [Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium's](#) Content Specifications for the Summative Assessment of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects. As additional information becomes available from PARCC, adaptations and revisions will be made to the assessment reviews in this Resource Bank, as necessary.

[PARCC http://www.parcconline.org/](http://www.parcconline.org/)

[SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium \(Content Specifications for the Summative Assessment of the Common Core State Standards\) http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/ELA-Literacy-Content-Specifications.pdf](http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/ELA-Literacy-Content-Specifications.pdf)

### Assessment Profile

Grade Level(s) suggested by this assessment: 6

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

RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.ai; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.aj; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.ak; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.al; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.am; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.an; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.ao; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.ap; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.aq; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.ar; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.as; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.at; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.au; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.av; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.aw; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.ax; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.ay; RWC10-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2-EO.az; RWC10-GR.6-S.3-GLE.2-EO.a; ; RWC10-GR.6-S.3-GLE.2-EO.b; RWC10-GR.6-S.3-GLE.2-EO.c; RWC10-GR.6-S.3-GLE.2-EO.d; RWC10-GR.6-S.3-GLE.2-EO.e; RWC10-GR.6-S.3-GLE.2-EO.f; RWC10-GR.6-S.3-GLE.2-EO.g; RWC10-GR.6-S.3-GLE.2-EO.h

What is the DOK of the assessment? 2-4

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

Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed:

Reasoning, Judgment, Persuasion, Comprehension

List the skills/performance assessed:

Determine central idea; summarize; cite textual evidence; introduce claim; support claims; provide concluding statement; maintain formal style; vary word choice and sentence structure

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

Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)

Check All That Apply

**Short Answer** (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)

X

**Extended Response** (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)

X

**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:**

**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?

**Other:**

**Check All That Apply**

X

X

x

x

x

performance  
assessment behavior  
checklist,  
performance  
assessment record  
sheet, protocol sheet,  
explanation of  
standards alignment

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

Alignment with Standards	Rating Column	Strengths & Suggestions
<p><b>1a.</b> 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? <b>Select one option below.</b></p> <p><b>Full match</b> – task or most items address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><b>Partial match</b> – task or most items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><b>No match</b> – task or most items are not related to the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p>		<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The DOKs of the assessment also align very strongly with the intended DOK of the standards. The rigor of the assessment is high, and it equates to the rigor of the standards.</p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <p>Consider adding a conventions component to align with CAS 3.3</p>
<p><b>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response:</b></p>		
<p>One-to-one correspondence between the wording of the standards addressed and the task requirements.</p>	<p>Full=3; Partial =2; No Match= 1</p>	
<b>Alignment with Standards Score</b>		<b>3</b>
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment	Rating Column	
<p><b>1b.</b> Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? <b>Select one option below.</b></p> <p><b>More rigorous</b> – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.</p> <p><b>Similar rigor</b> – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.</p> <p><b>Less rigor</b> – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.</p>		
<p><b>Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response:</b></p>		
<p>Scaffolded DOKs: on the high end of the range of DOK listed for our GLEs: the tasks in this assessment have the following DOKs: Task1: DOK 1, Remember; Tasks 2 and 3: DOK 2, Understand; Task 4: DOK 4, Analyze, Evaluate and Create. The rigor is scored on a 2 due to similarities in CAS and CCSS, however, both are of high DOK.</p>	<p>Similar Rigor=2; More Rigor=1; Less Rigor= 1</p>	
<b>Depth of Knowledge (Rigor) Score</b>		<b>2</b>



<b>Rubric/Scoring Alignment</b>		<b>3</b>
<p><b>2d.</b> 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? <b>Why or why not?</b></p> <p>Because there are no anchors/exemplars for the rubric, inter-rater reliability may be inconsistent, however, language used in the rubric would allow for greater objective scoring. For example, possible responses are provided to clarify proficiency levels, i.e.: "The dangers of having a classroom pet are greater than the benefits."</p>		<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>A strong, well-developed rubric is provided that defines each proficiency level.</p>
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Inter-rater Reliability Score</b>		<b>2</b>
<p><b>2e.</b> 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?</p> <p>Anchor/Exemplar papers are needed for each level of proficiency.</p>		<p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <p>Anchor/Exemplar Papers would be helpful.</p>
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Student Work Samples Score</b>		<b>1</b>

**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
<p><b>3a.</b> 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)?</p>		<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>There is an update on the website of the Teacher's College Reading and Writing Project that clarifies instructions for the assessment. This indicates that test writers are continually revising and updating the assessment.</p>
<p><b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>Video is used in the task. Although reading passages are age-appropriate and interesting, no visuals are provided and font-size seems small. The response page has adequate white-space and room for writing task.</p>	<p>All=3, Some=2, None=1</p>	<p><b>Suggestions:</b></p>
<p align="center"><b>"Clear &amp; Uncluttered" Score</b></p>		<p align="center"><b>2</b></p>
<p><b>3b.</b> To what extent are most of the items or the task presented in as straightforward a way as possible for a range of learners?</p>		<p>High-level vocabulary in both articles may make comprehension challenging for ELL or SPED students but would be appropriate for grade-level learners. Definitions and pictures would be helpful, especially for ELL students. Opportunity for small-group discussion may also help differentiate.</p>
<p><b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>The items are presented in easy-to-understand language for most students. Normal accommodations to address specific student needs could easily be utilized. It is unknown if enhanced versions of the video are available for blind and deaf students.</p>	<p>All=3, Some=2, None=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>"Straight Forward" Score</b></p>		<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>
<p><b>3c.</b> To what degree is the vocabulary and context(s) presented by most of the items or task free from cultural or other unintended bias? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>The two articles about classroom pets, provides real-world connections for students. Most students have either had a classroom pet, or can identify with the situation.</p>	<p>All=3, Some=2, None=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Free of 'Cultural or Unintended Bias' Score</b></p>		<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>
<p><b>3d.</b> Does the assessment require students to possess a high level of academic language* comprehension to demonstrate understanding? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>Both scientific and high-academic language are included in the articles which are appropriate for grade-level learners. Ex: justification, mismanagement, empathy, therapeutic, inundated, nocturnal, Salmonella</p>	<p>No=3, Somewhat=2, Yes=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>"Academic Language" Score</b></p>		<p align="center"><b>1</b></p>

[\\*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's Standards" \(http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4q wcy&cof=FORID:10&q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language\)](http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4q wcy&cof=FORID:10&q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language)

Level 4 WIDA standards are referenced, requiring students to function at the "Expanding" level. Students below Level 4 would need scaffolding and/or support.

**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:*

- **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.

Presentation Accommodations  
Response Accommodations  
Timing accommodations  
Linguistic Accommodations

**3f:** Identify and write down the accommodations permitted for this assessment:

The Protocol Sheet indicates that current classroom accommodations should be allowed. "Students who receive scribing or directions read aloud should receive the same modification for this assessment. Students who receive time and a half or double time should receive the same modification. During the assessment, teachers should take the opportunity to observe students' test-taking behaviors, recording observations that may lead to small group instruction during test prep."

**Yes, Several allowed=3;  
Yes, Some allowed=2;  
None allowed =1**

**"Adequate Accommodations Allowed" Score 2**

**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
<p><b>4a.</b> Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new context, situation, problem or challenge? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>The content (animals) is of high interest to the majority of students at this age. The task is authentic by taking a real problem in school and allows students to take a stand and argue a claim.</p>	<p>Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b></p> <p>The real-world nature of these tasks make them interesting and engaging to students, as does the topic - animals. The prompt empowers students to think about the world around them and connect to their authentic voice.</p>
<b>"Engages Students" Score</b>		<b>3</b>
<p><b>4b.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>It provides good information about research and reasoning - using information from multiple sources and formats to inform a reasoned argument. Content-area knowledge is used for the topic, and a real-world scenario is engaging to middle-school students.</p>	<p>Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1</p>	
<b>Classroom Learning Score</b>		<b>3</b>
<p><b>4c.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>The use of the analytic rubric pin-points strengths and weaknesses, allowing for dialogue among all vested parties. Students will have the rubric before the assessment. Data can be shared with students and parents, and can be discussed by teachers in PLC. Student could be scored collaboratively. Because the skills and concepts assessed are "high leverage" skills and concepts in literacy, they can form the basis for good prior instruction without the teacher feeling that time spent preparing for the assessment is taken away from "real learning".</p>	<p>Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1</p>	
<b>Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score</b>		<b>3</b>
<p><b>4d.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>The use of the analytic rubric pin-points strengths and weaknesses, allowing for dialogue among all vested parties. Students will have the rubric before the assessment providing them with targeted goals for which to aim. Students are held accountable via the Student Behavior Checklist, so they know what the expectations are for their performance. The rubric outlines the performance expectations in student-friendly language, so they know what they are accountable for. The content is presented in multiple modalities (video, pictures with captions, text) because students are expected to learn and to express their learning in a variety of modalities. Additionally, by having students synthesize different points of view in text and video, the assessment communicates the 21st skill to develop and apply learned information to a new situation.</p>		



	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1
<b>Communicates Academic Excellence Score</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>4e.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>According to the assessment protocol, "after scoring, teachers get back their own students' work and meet to discuss next steps. Based on students' performance in reading nonfiction and writing information or opinion, teachers can plan for support during upcoming units of study in reading/writing, social studies, and science." The Performance Assessment Data Sheet acts as a student data flow collection that quickly gives the teacher accurate assessment information on the group as a whole and on individual students. Use of this data sheet makes this an assessment FOR learning as well as an assessment OF learning.</p>	
	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1
<b>Standards Competency Score</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>4f:</b> 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.)? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b></p> <p>An explanation of standards alignment in the assessment information sheet supports where the assessment falls in the curriculum. The Performance Assessment Data Sheet acts as a student data flow collection that quickly gives the teacher accurate assessment information on the group as a whole and on individual students. Use of this data sheet makes this an assessment FOR learning as well as an assessment OF learning, allowing for both diagnosis and reporting.</p>	
	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1
<b>Locate evidence Score</b>	<b>3</b>

Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	3	3
Rigor Rating	2	3
Subtotal	5	6
Standards Alignment Percentage		83.3%
Scoring Guide Present	3	3
Rubric Aligned w/standards	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	3	3
Inter-rater reliability	2	3
Student work present	1	3
Subtotal	15	18
Scoring Percentage		83.3%
Clear & Uncluttered Presentation	2	3
Straight Forward Presentation	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias	3	3
Academic Language Load	1	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed	2	3
Subtotal	11	15
Fair & Unbiased Percentage		73.3%
Engagement	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes	3	3
Communicates Academic Excellence	3	3
Competency on Standards Score	3	3
Locate evidence Score	3	3
Subtotal	18	18
Opportunities to Learn Percentage		100.0%
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	