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: Pandemics: http://otis.coe.uky.edu/ccsso/cssapn	nodules/pandemics/overview.html#assess
Reviewer: Content Collaborative	
Date of Review: 4/19/12	
Assessment Profi	le

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.2-GLE.1-EO.a; SS09-GR.HS-S.2-GLE.1-EO.b; SS09-GR.HS-S.2-GLE.3-EO.b; SS09-GR.HS-S.2-GLE.3-EO.e; SS09-GR.HS-S.2-GLE.3-EO.f

What is the DOK of the assessment?

DOK 3

Indicate the DOK range of the CAS Grade Level Expectations:

Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed:

Interconnected nature of the world, population change, diffusion List the skills/performance assessed:

researching, summarizing data, presenting, compare/contrast, predicting, proposing solutions

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.)

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	

Check All That Apply	
	Х
	Х
	х
	Х

A high quality assessment should beAligned		
Alignment with Standards	Rating Column	Strengths & Suggestions
1a. 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.	х	
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:		
Definite alignment to Geography Standard 2.1 and 2.3	Full=3; Partial =2; No Match= 1	
Alignment with Standards Score		
Aligiment with standards score	3	
	-	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment		
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below.	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below.	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. More rigorous – most items or the task reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. 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	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. 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 range indicated for the grade level expectations.	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. 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 range indicated for the grade level expectations. Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. 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 range indicated for the grade level expectations.	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. 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 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.	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. 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 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.	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. 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 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:	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. 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 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: The assessment is at a level 3, and this corresponds to the DOK of the	Rating Column	
Depth of Knowledge as Measured by this Assessment 1b. Are the set of items or task reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? Select one option below. 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 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:	Rating Column X Similar Rigor=2; More Rigor=1; Less Rigor= 1	

A high quality assessment should beScored usi	ing Clear Guidelines a	and Criteria
Scoring Guidelines for this Assessment	Check all that apply:	Strengths/Suggestions
Scoring Guide Present:		
Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored		
Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)	X	
Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)		
Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part)		
Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		
reacher Observation Sheety Observation Checklist	Yes, several types=3, Yes,	
	at least one type=2,	
	None=1	
Scoring Guide Present Score	2	
2a. Give evidence that the rubric/scoring criteria aligns to Colorado		
Academic Standards in this assessment.		
Scoring guide needs to be refined to align to Geography CAS and GLEs	Completely aligned=3,	
	Somewhat aligned=2,	
	Not aligned=1	
Rubric Aligned with Standards Score	2	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across		
performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response :		
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
The categories are clear but need more specificity related to GLE	No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Score	2	
2c . To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the		
demands within the task or item?		
Explain:		
The rubric needs to be more specific for standards and GLEs	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
·	No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	2	
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? Why or why not?		
The rubric needs to be more specific for CAS; since it is a generic rubric, it		
is possible that there may be multiple interpretations of the expectations		
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
	No=1	
Inter-rater Reliability Score	2	
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 student work is provided.		
	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
	No=1	
Student Work Samples Score	1	

A high quality assessment should beFAIR 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	Strengths/Suggestions
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 clear and easy to read. The visuals do not present any	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
issues. "Clear & Uncluttered" Score		
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:		
The student assessment is clear and clearly formatted.	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
"Straight Forward" Score	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:		
There does not seem to be any bias in the questions	All=3, Some=2, None=1	
Free of 'Cultural or Unintended Bias' Score	3	
3d. Does the assessment require students to possess a high level of		
academic language* comprehension to demonstrate understanding?		
Provide an explanation of your response:	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	1
There is "content-specific" and "process" language that could be	Yes=3, Somewnat=2, No=1	
problematic for struggling readers "Academic Language" Score		
*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's_		
3e. 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:		
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. • Setting Accommodations — Change the location in which a test or assignment		
is given or the conditions of the assessment setting.		
 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.		
3f: Identify and write down the accommodations permitted for this assessment:]	

Any accommodations that are legally specified are allowable on the assessment: specifically, presentation accommodations may be needed as Yes, Some allowed=2; well as response accommodations

Yes, Several allowed=3; None allowed =1

"Adequate Accommodations Allowed" Score

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
4a. Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a	опостан описиры д	
real world, new context, situation, problem or challenge? Provide an		
explanation of your response:		
Students are engaged in a real-world issue.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1	
"Engages Students" Score	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:		
Refers to standards, tests both content and skills. The product		
expectations need to be more explicit. The students need a specific set	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
of resources for the assessment and a clear set of student expectations	No=1	
that are separate from the teacher instructions.		
Classroom Learning Score	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:		
It allows the conversation to revolve around real world applicability.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Score	No=1	
4d. To what extent do you believe the assessment can clearly	_	
communicate expectations for academic excellence to students? Provide		
an explanation of your response:		
There is a transfer of problem-solving ability, understanding the		
geographic (and possibly historical) context, the necessity of using		
technology and research.		
<i>5,</i>	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
	No=1	
Communicates Academic Excellence Score	2	
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:	Year 2 Course had 2	
look like? Provide an explanation of your response: With a tweaking of the rubric, this would be an exemplary tool to	Yes=3; Somewhat=2;	
look like? Provide an explanation of your response: With a tweaking of the rubric, this would be an exemplary tool to communicate competency.	Yes=3; Somewhat=2; No=1 2	
look like? Provide an explanation of your response: With a tweaking of the rubric, this would be an exemplary tool to communicate competency. Standards Competency Score		
look like? Provide an explanation of your response: With a tweaking of the rubric, this would be an exemplary tool to communicate competency. Standards Competency Score 4f: Based on the content evaluated by the task or the set of items		
With a tweaking of the rubric, this would be an exemplary tool to communicate competency. 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		
look like? Provide an explanation of your response: With a tweaking of the rubric, this would be an exemplary tool to communicate competency. 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		
look like? Provide an explanation of your response: With a tweaking of the rubric, this would be an exemplary tool to communicate competency. 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? Provide an explanation of your response:	No=1 2	
look like? Provide an explanation of your response: With a tweaking of the rubric, this would be an exemplary tool to communicate competency. 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		

Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	3	3
Rigor Rating	2	3
Subtotal	5	6
Standards Alignment Percentage		83.3%
Scoring Guide Present	2	3
Rubric Aligned w/standards	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Alignment	2	3
Inter-rater reliability	2	3
Student work present	1	3
Subtotal	11	18
Scoring Percentage		61.1%
Clear & Uncluttered Presentation	3	3
Straight Forward Presentation	2	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%
Engagement	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	43	57
Overall Percentage		75.4%

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

Fully Recommended	
	X - the rubric needs to
Partially Recommended	align with the
	Geography CAS.
Not Recommended	

Highly Recommended with a revision of the rubric, a clarified Student Expectation sheet, and time requirements.