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: World Language

Name of Assessment: JCPS EXPANDING SPANISH (B)UNIT 4 Assessment: Interpersonal Speaking 1

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: 09/20/12

Assessment Profile Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item Check All That Apply 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 Х for tasks) Product (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art Х products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.) Performance (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, Х athletic performance, debate, etc.) Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, Χ 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 ...) 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:

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		Good assessment of
Range Level(s): Intermediate mid		vocabulary and the usage
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the		of the past tense and
Assessment: WL09-IM-S.1-GLE.1		present tense control.
Indicate the intended DOK range of the range Level Expectations: 3		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): 3		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the		
performance task: Preterit, Imperfect, Talking about relationships, likes and dislikes,		
childhood experiences.		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to		
do?):Interpersonal mode, ask and answer questions, conduct an interview. Expand on		
what it said		
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.		3 (3) (3) (3) (3) (4) (3)

 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: Interpersonal mode involves discussion and interview style communication,		
exactly what this assessment requires.		
	Full Match=5; Close	
	Match=4; Partial	
	Match=3; Minimal	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	Match=2; No Match= 1	
Alighed to Colorado Academic Standards Rating		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.	Rating Column	Comments
1e . Are the set of items or tasks reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level		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 		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: Rigor is appropriate for range level. It can easily be used with	Rating Column Similar Rigor=2, More	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: Rigor is appropriate for range level. It can easily be used with	Rating Column Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	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		Like most of JCPS
☐ Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)	х	assessments, exemplars
□ Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)		are missing, this could be
□ Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)	Х	solved by adding.
□ 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: The rubric aligns to the standards very well.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	3	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: Score categories are very clearly defined.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
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. The rubric addresses all items of the assessment by being general but adaptable.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	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. Provide an explanation of your response. The rubric is very user-friendly and objective.	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? There are no exemplars, but the proficiency goals and learning targets are great guidelines for students to be sure they are on task with the assignment.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Student Work Samples Rating	3

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: The assessment is visually pleasing and user friendly.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	The assessment is straight forward and easy to understand with a universal vocabulary and
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	content. Might
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: Learning targets and proficiency goals help to keep students on track.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	reconsider the word embellish.
Straight Forward Rating	2	
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: The vocabulary is mostly simple and straight forward.	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. Language is simple and direct.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Academic Language Rating	3	
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 not present.	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:bjkids4qwcy&cof=FORID:10&q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language)		
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. Although the assessment does not specifically address accommodations, it can easily be modified. The assessment itself does not directly provide accommodations, but they could be easily made to meet the needs of students and teachers.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	

A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn

A flight quality assessmentincreases opportunities to Ed		
Opportunities to Learn	Rating Column	Comments
(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and		This is an excellent
talented students, and students with disabilities)		assessment that enables
An Doos this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, now		both student and teacher
4a. Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new	High=3; Moderate=2;	to evaluate performance
context, situation, problem or challenge? Provide an explanation of your response: The	Low or None=1	and reflect on needed
assessment forces a conversation that could very easily happen in the real world.		areas of improvement.
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	High=3; Moderate=2;	
an explanation of your response: The assessment is asking the student to use	Low or None=1	
vocabulary and grammar learned in class in a real world scenario.		
Classroom Learning Rating	3	
Classiconii Learning Rating	3	
4c. To what degree do the results from this assessment (<i>scores and student work</i>		
analysis) foster meaningful dialogue about learning expectations and outcomes with	High=3; Moderate=2;	
students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response: The lesson could be	Low or None=1	
taught based upon the expected outcomes of this assessment.		
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: The lesson could	Low or None=1	
	LOW OF NOTICE	
be taught based upon the expected outcomes of this assessment.		
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 (scores and student work analysis) to	High=3; Moderate=2;	
understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your	Low or None=1	
	rom of Molle-1	
response: The assessment and rubric are both in line with the standards.		
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.		
	High=3; Moderate=2;	
diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation of	Low or None=1	
your response: This assessment could serve many uses based upon teacher discretion.		
It is simple and aligns to the standards.		
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
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	3	3
		•

		_
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3	3
Student Work Samples Rating	3	3
Subtotal	15	15
		100.0%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	3
Straight Forward Rating	2	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	3
Academic Language Rating	3	3
Confusing Language Rating	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	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	3	3
Competency on Standards Rating	3	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	18	18
		100.0%
Grand Total	55	57
		96.5%

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

Fully Recommended	X
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	