High Quality Assessment Content Validity Review Tool

To understand the review process and the use of the review tool, go to:

Name of Assessment: New England Common Assessment Program-Released Items 2011

Content Area: Science

Scoring Guide/Rubric

Other:

Estimated time for administration

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

How to use the Assessment Review Tool

ABSTRACT: Partially Recommend. This assessment is a set of released standardized test items from the New England Common Assessment Program from 2011. While this 8th Grade test covers Earth and Physical Science only the Life Science Items were reviewed here. This assessment is good for the evaluation of student mastery and synthesis of concepts and application to real world situations. The items are vocabulary heavy and as no rubric is included the evaluation of student results is left to the proctor. Although the overall percentage is low we felt that the tasks presented were good ones that encouraged students to apply their knowledge in new ways.

Date of Review: October 24, 2012 **Assessment Profile** Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item **Check All That Apply** types): Χ **Selected Response** (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.) **Short Answer** (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain Χ your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.) Extended Response (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required Χ 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) **Check All That Apply** 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 ...)

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?

Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like

Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		On this set of released items only
Grade Level(s): 6-8		the life science items were
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by		evaluated for the purpose of this
the Assessment: SC09-GR.8-S.2-GLE.2; SC09-GR.7-S.2-GLE.2; SC09-GR.6-S.2-GLE.1; SC09-		review. There were physical
GR.6-S.2-GLE.2		science items as well.
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-3		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): 1-3		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the		
performance task: Model ecosystem and energy flow including effects of changes in the		
system, predicting genetic inheritance of traits, explain the functions and interactions of		
the human body systems		

Х

1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): evaluate affects of a substance on human body system, draw a food web, predict genetic outcomes, predict results of manipulating ecosystem components		
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	1	
below to select your rating. Full match – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and		
knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge		
described in the corresponding state standard/s. Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.		
☐ Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant 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: for each of the GLE's covered within this assessment only one EO is		
assessed. For those EO's covered it does a good job however many other EO's are not covered which resulted in the lower score. EO's covered (Life Science GR 8 2.2c, GR 7		
2.2 b/c, GR 6 2.1 c, GR 6 2.2 b)		
	Full Match=5; Close	,
	Match=4; Partial	
	Match=3; Minimal	
	Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	3 3	
	Rating Column	Comments
	Rating Column	Comments
expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating. More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the	Rating Column	Comments
expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating. More rigorous – most items or the tasks 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		Comments
expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating. More rigorous – most items or the tasks 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		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. More rigorous – most items or the tasks 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: These items are very well matched to the depth of knowledge within the EO's. They do a good job at moving to level 2-3, which is listed in standards.		Comments
expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating. More rigorous – most items or the tasks 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: These items are very well matched to the depth of knowledge		Comments

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 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	Rating Column	
2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: No rubrics or scoring guide is provided with this set of released items.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	1	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: No rubrics or scoring guide is provided with this set of released items.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	

Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	1
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. No rubrics or scoring guide is provided with this set of released items.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	1
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. No rubrics or scoring guide is provided with this set of released items. Scoring results would depend on the evaluator.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	1
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 rubrics or scoring guide is provided with this set of released items.	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: This assessment is in a traditional standardized test format. Questions, diagrams, and answer choices are clearly laid out.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
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: All tasks are very straight forward, in a very linear format.	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: No cultural biases noted.	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. These tasks lean very heavy on content specific vocabulary. Those with a weaker grasp of the content vocabulary AND associated vocabulary would need modification or vocabulary support.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Academic Language Rating	1.5	
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. Within this sample there was one homonym which could affect student performance.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Confusing Language Rating	2	
(http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwcy&cof=FORID:10&q=		
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.		
Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling: 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. 3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response. As there is not a proctors guide no accommodations are	Yes, Some identified=2;	
specifically listed and therefore left to the discretion of the proctor. ELL and struggling students would most likely need language support and extended response time. Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	None identified =1	
Auequate Accommodations Anowed Rating	1	

A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn

A high quality assessmentIncreases Opportunities to L		
Opportunities to Learn (the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and	Rating Column	Comments
talented students, and students with disabilities)		
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: The	High=3; Moderate=2;	
tasks in this assessment ask students to synthesize information and/or apply it to a	Low or None=1	
new situation.		
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: This test would be excellent for assessing mastery of content however as it does go beyond assessing rote memorization of content it goes	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
beyond the proficiency level and would only be useful as a summative evaluation and	LOW OF NOTICE-1	
not a formative one.		
Classroom Learning Rating	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: Based on the results	High=3; Moderate=2;	
of these tasks a teacher could really probe further as to the students level of	Low or None=1	
understanding.		
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	High=3; Moderate=2;	
Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: As these tasks	Low or None=1	
lean more to synthesis and application it definitely supports that students need to		
move beyond memorization to application.		
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	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 (<i>scores and student work analysis</i>) to	High=3; Moderate=2;	
understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your	Low or None=1	
response: As there is no proctor or scoring guide the assessment of competency on the		
standards is left up to individual teacher evaluation.		
Competency on Standards Rating	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.	High=3; Moderate=2;	
diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation of	Low or None=1	
your response: As previously mentioned this is clearly an assessment of mastery		
and/or final unit evaluation rather than one that can be used to inform instruction.		
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	3	5
Rigor Rating Subtotal	2 5	2 7
Subtotal		71.4%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	1	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	1	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	1	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	1	3
Student Work Samples Rating	1	3
Subtotal	5	15 33.3%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	33.3%
Straight Forward Rating	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	3

		_
Academic Language Rating	1.5	3
Confusing Language Rating	2	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	2
Subtotal	13.5	17
		79.4%
Engagement Rating	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	3	3
Competency on Standards Rating	2	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	16	18
		88.9%
Grand Total	39.5	57
		69.3%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	Х
Not Recommended	