## **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: E-Pals\_InterpersonalWriting\_Novice\_Mid

**Reviewer: Content Collaborative** 

10/25/2012

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.)	Check All That Apply
<b>Short Answer</b> (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)	х
<b>Extended Response</b> (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)	х
<b>Product</b> (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)	х
Performance (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)  Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)	х
The assessment includes:	Check All That Apply
<b>Teacher directions</b> (may include prerequisites/description of instruction before giving the assessment e.g., this assessment should be given after students have learned)	х
Scoring Guide/Rubric Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like Materials (if needed to complete the assessment) Estimated time for administration	Х
Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?	х
Other: Learner targets, proficiency goals, reflective and goals setting	

## A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		Geared to Novice-Mid however
Range Level(s): Novice-Low to Novice-High		accommodates for Novice-Low
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: WL09-NM-S.1-GLE.1 Interpersonal writing		or Novice-High.
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: DOK 1-2		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): DOK 1-2		
<b>1b.</b> Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the		
performance task: What you like and don't like to do, ask and answer questions about		
when, why, and with whom		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): reading and writing		
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.		

X 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.		
<ul> <li>Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> </ul>		
□ <b>No match</b> – 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: Expects spontaneous responses, does not prescribe what students needs to say, room to negotiate meaning.		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	5	
	Rating Column	Comments
<b>1e</b> . Are the set of items or tasks reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade level expectations? <b>Use the definitions below to select your rating.</b>		
□ More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.  X Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated		
for the grade level expectations.		
□ <b>Less rigor</b> – 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		
<b>support your response:</b> Students are being asked to share information about personal interests.		
mitor coto.		
	Similar Rigor=2, More	
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	

## 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		2a, 2b - Rubric uses the language
☐ <b>Generalized Rubric</b> (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)		of the essential outcomes.
<ul> <li>Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)</li> </ul>	Х	
□ <b>Checklist</b> (e.g., with score points for each part)		
□ Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		
	Rating Column	
<b>2a.</b> Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The scoring is based on a detailed rubric aligned with CAS and performance levels.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	3	
<b>2b.</b> Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The scoring is based on a detailed rubric aligned with CAS and performance levels.	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	High=3, Moderate=2,	
task or item? <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> Does not address the responses to partner.	Low or None=1	

<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. <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> Rubric uses clear criteria.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	3
<b>2e.</b> Is there student work (e.g., anchor papers, video, portfolio) which illustrates student mastery? <b>If so, describe. If not, what student work would be needed?</b> Student exemplar	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Student Work Samples Rating	1

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

Opportunities to Learn

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
<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)? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> Very pleasing to the eye.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	
<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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> Student friendly language.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Straight Forward Rating	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 explanation of your response:</b> Culture is appropriate to task	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	
<b>3d.</b> Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> Student friendly language. Task is real world for teenager.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Academic Language Rating	3	
<b>3e.</b> 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). <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> No confusing language 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.		
<b>o</b> 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.		
<b>3g:</b> Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> None identified however assessment could easily be adopted to meet accommodations.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	n <u>u</u>	
	<u>-earn</u>	

**Rating Column** 

Comments

(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)		
<b>4a.</b> Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new	High=3; Moderate=2;	
context, situation, problem or challenge? Provide an explanation of your response:	Low or None=1	
Emailing friends is an everyday situation for students.		
Engagement Rating	3	
<b>4b.</b> To what extent do you think the knowledge and skills tested by the assessment can	High-2. Madayata-2.	
provide good information about what students have learned in the classroom? <b>Provide</b>	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
an explanation of your response: Demonstrate what student knows and is able to do.	tow or none=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	3	
<b>4c.</b> To what degree do the results from this assessment ( <i>scores and student work</i>	High-2: Madayata-2:	
analysis) foster meaningful dialogue about learning expectations and outcomes with students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response: Demonstrate what	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
student knows and is able to do.	row or none=1	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	
<b>4d.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response</b> : The theme of	Low or None=1	
writing an email is a 21st century skill with transference to other subject areas.	LOW OF NOTICE-1	
writing an email is a 21st century skill with transference to other subject areas.		
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	3	
<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	High=3; Moderate=2;	
response: Clearly show where the student's interpersonal writing skills are on the	Low or None=1	
proficiency scale.		
Competency on Standards Rating	3	
	<u> </u>	
<b>4f:</b> 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.)? <b>Provide an explanation of</b>	Low or None=1	
your response: Teacher could use the results for a variety of purposes depending on		
need.		
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating		5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	7	7
		100.0%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating		3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating		3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating		3
Student Work Samples Rating		3
Subtotal		15
Junitotal		80.0%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	3
Straight Forward Rating	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	3
	2	3
Academic Language Rating	3	
Academic Language Rating Confusing Language Rating		3
	3	3 2
Confusing Language Rating	3 1	

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	53	57
		93.0%

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

Fully Recommended	Х
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	