

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](#)

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.

Content Area: Science

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

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: October 24, 2012

Assessment Profile

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, etc.)

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.)

Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)

Check All That Apply

X

X

X

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

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
<p>1a.</p> <p>Grade Level(s): 6-8</p> <p>Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: SC09-GR.8-S.2-GLE.2; SC09-GR.7-S.2-GLE.2; SC09-GR.6-S.2-GLE.1; SC09-GR.6-S.2-GLE.2</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-3</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1-3</p> <p>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</p>		<p>On this set of released items only the life science items were evaluated for the purpose of this review. There were physical science items as well.</p>

<p>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</p>		
<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Full match – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <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>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)</p>		
	<p>Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1</p>	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	3	
	Rating Column	Comments
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. <input type="checkbox"/> Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. <input type="checkbox"/> Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. <p>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.</p>		
	<p>Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1</p>	
Rigor Level Rating	2	

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

<p>Scoring Guide Present</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored <input type="checkbox"/> Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs) <input type="checkbox"/> Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task) <input type="checkbox"/> Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part) <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist 	<p>Check all that apply:</p> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/> <hr/>	Comments
	Rating Column	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	1	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	

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...Increases Opportunities to Learn

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>	Rating Column	Comments
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 tasks in this assessment ask students to synthesize information and/or apply it to a new situation.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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 beyond the proficiency level and would only be useful as a summative evaluation and not a formative one.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	2	
4c. To what degree do the results from this assessment (<i>scores and student work analysis</i>) foster meaningful dialogue about learning expectations and outcomes with students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response: Based on the results of these tasks a teacher could really probe further as to the students level of understanding.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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 Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: As these tasks lean more to synthesis and application it definitely supports that students need to move beyond memorization to application.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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 understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your response: As there is no proctor or scoring guide the assessment of competency on the standards is left up to individual teacher evaluation.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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. diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation of 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.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	3	5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	5	7
		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	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	X
Not Recommended	