

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 Languages
Name of Assessment: FLENJ - Overtime, A Pro or A Con IPA
Reviewer: Content Collaborative
Date of Review: 10/25/2012

Assessment Profile	
Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):	Check All That Apply
Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)	X Interpretive only
Short Answer (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)	X Interpretive only
Extended Response (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)	X presentational only
Product (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)	X Presentational only
Performance (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)	X Interpersonal only
Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)	
The assessment includes:	Check All That Apply
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	x for all
Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like	
Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)	x for all
Estimated time for administration	x for all
Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?	x for all
Other: Separate rubrics for each task.	x for all

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a. Grade Level(s): Intermediate-mid -- Focus age group 15-18 Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Range Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: WL09-IM-S.1-GLE.1; WL09-IM-S.1-GLE.2; WL09-IM-S.1-GLE.3; WL09-IM-S.3-GLE.2 Indicate the intended DOK range of the Range Level Expectations: DOK 1-4 Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : DOK 3-4		Interpersonal DOK 1-3, Interpretive DOK1- 3, Presentational DOK 2-4.
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Vocabulary: employment, salary government policies and laws; Concepts: students comprehend an article about a new topic, discuss it and write a letter expressing their opinion about it.		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): write, describe, inform, identify, analyze, react, communicate orally and express opinions.		

<p>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.</p> <p>X Full match – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p>X Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No match – task or most items are not related to the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p>		
<p>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response: Each one of our Standards is addressed and assessed individually in the rubrics. Interpersonal- full match because it is a true interpersonal task. Interpretive-full match because students are asked to demonstrate comprehension, analyze and react to article. Presentational-Full match because they have to write a letter to the editor.</p>	<p>Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1</p>	
<p>Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating</p>	<p>5</p>	
<p>1e. Are the set of items or tasks reviewed as cognitively challenging as the range level expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the range level expectations.</p> <p>X Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the range level expectations.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the range level expectations.</p> <p>Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: The DOK for the Range Level expectations and the assessments are a match.</p>		
	<p>Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1</p>	
<p>Rigor Level Rating</p>	<p>2</p>	

A high quality assessment should be...Scored using Clear Guidelines and Criteria

Scoring Guide Present	Check all that apply:	Comments
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored</p> <p>x Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)</p> <p>X Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">x</p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p>	<p><i>Separate task-specific rubrics are provided for each component. Rubrics are written from the student perspective.</i></p>
<p>2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: While written in student-friendly language, the range levels listed match our Colorado Standards in definition and application.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p>Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p>2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: The categories are clearly defined in student-friendly language focusing on the student's learning.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	

Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	
<p>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. There is a separate rubric for each task. The rubric allows the student to see areas of strength and weakness.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1</p>	
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	
<p>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 descriptions in the rubrics are explicit enough that different raters will arrive at the same scores.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	3	
<p>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? Student products at the range levels would be helpful.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
Student Work Samples Rating	1	

A high quality assessment should be...FAIR and UNBIASED

FAIR and UNBIASED <i>(the areas below should be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)</i>	Rating Column	Comments
3a. To what extent do 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: It's well organized with different sections for the different tasks in the order they might happen.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	
3b. To what extent do 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: It's written in English using student-friendly language so there shouldn't be problem understanding the directions.	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: The article is about a political/economic issue and while there may be disagreements among students about the topic, the task itself is free of cultural bias.	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. The academic language is straightforward and unambiguous and seems appropriate for the level.	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. <i>The assessment doesn't use any confusing words.</i>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Confusing Language Rating	3	
<p><i>*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's Standards"</i> http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwcy&cof=FORID:10&q=D efining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language</p>		
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.		
<p><i>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 		

<p>3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response. The assessment doesn't provide any specific accommodations, but there is a differentiated rubric. The teacher could easily incorporate some: extra time, adjusting task, scheduling accommodations.</p>	<p>Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating</p>		

A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn

<p style="text-align: center;">Opportunities to Learn <i>(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Rating Column</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Comments</p>
<p>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: It's real-world in that students need to think about the pros and cons of a proposal to change the laws about overtime pay. However, the article is outdated. It does allow for creativity and transference into real-life situations. This could serve as model for another IPA centered around an up to date article.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Engagement Rating</p>		
<p>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: The Interpretive assessment gives a clear picture of students understanding and ability to analyze and react to an article about a very specific and perhaps an unfamiliar topic. The interpersonal tasks assesses students ability to participate in a debate. The presentational task requires students to assimilate the points of the article and express an opinion about the topic.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Classroom Learning Rating</p>		
<p>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: Rubrics are explicit and will give a clear idea about the strengths and weakness of a student.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating</p>		
<p>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 Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: It requires high level of DOK, and allows for creativity.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Communicate Academic Excellence Rating</p>		
<p>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: If a teacher looks at the entire unit, then they can get good picture of student progress and performance as well as the targeted range level. Teachers can also look at specific areas on the rubric to see specific strengths and weakness. Matching the task, rubrics, and product should provide a clear example of an Intermediate-Mid level. Specifies strengths and weakness of each communication mode.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Competency on Standards Rating</p>		
<p>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: Could be used for any of these purposes.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Clarity of Purpose Rating</p>		
<p style="text-align: center;">Summary</p>		<p style="text-align: center;">Earned Possible</p>

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	1	3
Subtotal	13	15
		86.7%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	3
Straight Forward Rating	3	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	16	17
		94.1%
Engagement Rating	2	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	17	18
		94.4%
Grand Total	53	57
		93.0%

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

Fully Recommended	x
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	