## **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: Social Studies

Name of Assessment: China and the Environment (Michigan)

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: 4/19/12

## **Assessment Profile**

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

**High School** 

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

SS09-GR.HS-S.4-GLE.1-EO.a; SS09-GR.HS-S.4-GLE.3-EO.c; SS09-GR.HS-S.4-

GLE.3-EO.e

What is the DOK of the assessment?

**DOK level 2-3** 

Indicate the DOK range of the CAS Grade Level Expectations:

**DOK level 2-3** 

Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed:

Standards of ethics, responsibility and interactions among nations, global collaboration.

List the skills/performance assessed:

Cooperative learning, research, discussion, group participation, collaboration, synthesizing information, problem-solving skills, writing a report (optional)

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,

**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.)

	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: Glossary of terms, teacher observation forms

Check All That Apply				

x - optional

X

Check All That Apply
х
Х
x

A high quality assessment shou	ld beAligned	
Alignment with Standards	Rating Column	Strengths & Suggestion
<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? 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.		
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:		
Partial match to some standards High School Civics GLE 1.a, GLE 3.c and	Full=3; Partial =2; No	
e.	Match= 1	
Alignment with Standards Score	2	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment	Rating Column	
<b>1b</b> . Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the		
grade level expectations? Select one option below.		
The DOK level of the assessment is the same rigor as 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		
Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.		
range indicated for the grade level expectations.		
range indicated for the grade level expectations.  Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range		
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.		
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	
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:	Similar Rigor=2; More Rigor=1; Less Rigor= 1	

A high quality assessment should beScored usi	ng Clear Guidelines	and Criteria
Scoring Guidelines for this Assessment	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions
Scoring Guide Present:	Х	
Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored		
Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)	Х	
Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)		
Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)		
Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist	Х	
	Yes, several types=3, Yes,	
	at least one type=2,	
	None=1	
Scoring Guide Present Score	3	
<b>2a.</b> Give evidence that the rubric/scoring criteria aligns to Colorado		
Academic Standards in this assessment.		
Provide an explanation of your response: Some alignment to content	Completely aligned=3,	
standards, but there is alignment to the 21st century skills.	Somewhat aligned=2,	
	Not aligned=1	
Rubric Aligned with Standards Score	2	
<b>2b.</b> Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across		
performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response:		
Yes, the categories are clear and consistent.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Score	3	
<b>2c</b> . To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the		
demands within the task or item? <b>Explain:</b>		
The scoring guide is general, and specific to skills, not content.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
	No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	3	
<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? Why or why not?		
The scoring guide assesses process and procedures but not specifically	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
content	No=1	
Inter-rater Reliability Score	2	
<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?		
No. if this assessment is small group discussion than work samples are		
difficult (video capture is an option.) If the teacher revises it to an essay		
format, it would be possible to analyze student work.		
normat, it would be possible to allaryze student work.		
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
	No=1	
Student Work Samples Score	1	

A high quality assessment should be.	FAIR and UNBIASE	)
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
<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)?		
Provide an explanation of your response:		
The teacher needs to prepare by reading the directions and become familiar with the rubric in the front of the document. The assessment	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
"Clear & Uncluttered" Score	2	
<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?		
Provide an explanation of your response:		
Clear instructions and tasks.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
"Straight Forward" Score	3	
<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</b>		
explanation of your response:		
No obvious bias concerns.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
Free of 'Cultural or Unintended Bias' Score	3	
<b>3d.</b> Does the assessment require students to possess a high level of		
academic language* comprehension to demonstrate understanding?		
Provide an explanation of your response: There would need to be some pre-teaching of vocabulary, but nothing	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
that is inappropriate for the level and standards.	No=1	
"Academic Language" Score	3	
*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's		
<b>3e.</b> 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:		
<ul> <li>Presentation Accommodations — Allow students to access information in ways</li> </ul>		
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.		
<ul> <li>Timing and Scheduling Accommodations — Increase the allowable length of time to complete an assessment or assignment and perhaps change the way the</li> </ul>		
time is organized.		
Linguistic Accommodations — Allow English language learners (ELLs) to access academic construct magging by reducing the linguistic load of an accessment.		
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:		

There are instructions for creating your own scenarios, cooperative learning allows for varied complexity and small group scoring. Methods of grouping would allow some accommodations as well.

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

"Adequate Accommodations Allowed" Score

3

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
<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</b>		
explanation of your response:		
Yes, this is a real-world situation - environmental concerns - as well as a	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
real-world skill - developing a speech "Engages Students" Score		
<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>		
it provides information on critical thinking and oral communication (and	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
writing.) Content is not explicitly assessed.	No=1	
Classroom Learning Score	2	
<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</b>		
explanation of your response:		
	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
Unless parents saw the dialogues, it would be most useful with students	No=1	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score	2	
<b>4d.</b> To what extent do you believe the assessment can clearly		
communicate expectations for academic excellence to students? <b>Provide</b>		
an explanation of your response:		
The whole process is built around meaningful dialogue and that is clearly	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
communicated. Rubric is "process" based, not standards-based.	No=1	
Communicates Academic Excellence Score	2	
<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? Provide an explanation of your response:		
	Voc-2: Comowhat-2:	
It is not directly connected to CAS and is "skills/process" based.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
Standards Competency Score		
4f: Based on the content evaluated by the task or the set of items		
reviewed, to what extent do you think teachers can locate where the		
assessment evidence is represented within the curriculum, student		
learning objectives, or lesson? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b>		
Not all curriculums expect a "scored discussion" but most expect	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
argumentation and analysis of multiple perspectives.	No=1	
Locate evidence Score	2	

Summary	<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	3	3
Rubric Aligned w/standards	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	3	3
Inter-rater reliability	2	3
Student work present	1	3
Subtotal	14	18
Scoring Percentage		77.8%
Clear & Uncluttered Presentation	2	3
Straight Forward Presentation	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias	3	3
Academic Language Load	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed	3	3
Subtotal	14	15
Fair & Unbiased Percentage		93.3%
<b>Engagement</b>	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence	2	3
Competency on Standards Score	2	3
Locate evidence Score	2	3
Subtotal	13	18
Opportunities to Learn Percentage		72.2%
Grand Total	45	57
Overall Percentage		78.9%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	x - rubric needs to be explicitly aligned to CAS and take out the Michigan reference
Not Recommended	