

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: Comprehensive Health Education
Name of Assessment: HEAP Module 252: http://heaphealthliteracy.com
Reviewer: Content Collaborative
Date of Review: 9/20/12

Assessment Profile								
<p>Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):</p> <p>Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)</p> <p>Short Answer (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)</p> <p>Extended Response (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)</p> <p>Product (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)</p> <p>Performance (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)</p> <p>Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"><th>Check All That Apply</th></tr> <tr><td>x</td></tr> <tr><td>x</td></tr> <tr><td>x</td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> </table>	Check All That Apply	x	x	x			
Check All That Apply								
x								
x								
x								
<p>The assessment includes:</p> <p>Teacher directions (may include prerequisites/description of instruction before giving the assessment e.g., this assessment should be given after students have learned ...)</p> <p>Scoring Guide/Rubric</p> <p>Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like</p> <p>Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)</p> <p>Estimated time for administration</p> <p>Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"><th>Check All That Apply</th></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td>x</td></tr> <tr><td>x</td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> </table>	Check All That Apply		x	x			
Check All That Apply								
x								
x								
<p>Other:</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; text-align: center;"> <tr><td> </td></tr> </table>							

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
<p>1a.</p> <p>Grade Level(s): 6</p> <p>Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: CH09-GR.6-S.4-GLE.1</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-4</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1-2 (The prompts only used lower level verbiage from Bloom's taxonomy)</p> <p>1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Consequences of tobacco use, media literacy, defining internal and external influences</p> <p>1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): Reasoning, analysis, extended, descriptive writing</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> <p><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.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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>		

<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. Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response: The assessment includes 3 of the 4 evidence outcomes from GLE. Also, it touches on tobacco but doesn't include alcohol (which is written into the GLE)		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	4	
	Rating Column	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. <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. Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: DOK on the assessment is actually below the DOK of the standards. Example - standard says DOK 1-4 (i.e. analyze) where the assessment falls into more of a DOK of 1-2.		Though the assessment tries to move to analytical level (i.e. requirement of standard to "analyze") it only provides a selected response for students to match that requirement. We felt that would not be a sufficient format to meet the rigor found within the GLE
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	
Rigor Level Rating	1	

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

Scoring Guide Present <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	Check all that apply: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Rating Column	Comments
2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: Important to note here that the assessment does not directly link to a specific grade level. In other words, the standard asks for "influences" but the assessment speaks to "consequences". The majority of the assessment meets the 6th grade requirements but there is also some content that can be found in 7th and 8th grade.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	1	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: The scoring criteria is clear and coherent, but performance levels are not identified.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	2	
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 scoring criteria address the task thoroughly.	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. Yes...if we're only talking about the consequence section of the standard (might be more difficult if we're speaking about analyzing influences).	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? The assessment includes anchor papers for 2 of the 3 questions (short answer, extended response).	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Student Work Samples Rating	2

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: Font is slightly small on the online version of the HEAP work.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	
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: Content is applicable for mixed classrooms - i.e. 6/7 combos or 7/8 combos. Language is straightforward.	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: "Smoking in a public place" might be irrelevant in today's time. However, the vocabulary is age appropriate and free of bias. Also, one of the questions asked about certain "places" you might go - we felt using the term "sources" might be a clearer term.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	
3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. The assessment does but language focuses on 6th grade vs. 7th and 8th grade.	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. No conflict of homonyms within the assessment	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:bjkids4qwc&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. <i>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</i> 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.		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. It does not provide any modifications but there could be easy modifications added by teacher.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1
Adequate Accommodations Allowed 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: Actual resources listed in the assessment are relevant to real scenarios in life for the average middle school student.	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: Selected responses are usually difficult to determine student understanding because students can guess correct information (one of the negatives of selected responses vs. knowing true student knowledge). However, ensuring use of the scoring criteria or rubric for student use will provide a much clearer picture of student growth on short answer and extended response.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	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: This is only a DOK of level 1-2 so provide meaningful feedback about critical thinking skills at a higher level is not evident. If assessment was a DOK of 3-4 we might suggest a higher level of effectiveness for feedback conversations with students and parents.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	
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: DOK is only level 1-2 so the opportunity for true 21st century skills is limited. This assessment misses providing opportunity for cross-content connection, creativity, etc.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	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: 3 of the 4 GLEs are only being met along with 6th grade being about "influences" and 7th grade being about "consequences". Assessment would be difficult to be used a whole to show student growth according to the standards yet specific questions would be beneficial.	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: Assessment would be difficult to be used a whole due to the mix-match of GLEs for 6th and 7th grade being put together in this assessment. (Note: The mix-match we are talking about is solely based on CO standards - whereas the assessment might work well in other states and their specific grade level standards).	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	2	
Summary		
	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	4	5
Rigor Rating	1	2
Subtotal	5	7
		71.4%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	1	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3	3
Student Work Samples Rating	2	3
Subtotal	11	15
		73.3%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	3
Straight Forward Rating	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	3
Academic Language Rating	3	3
Confusing Language Rating	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	2
Subtotal	14	17
		82.4%
Engagement Rating	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	2	3
Competency on Standards Rating	2	3
Locate Evidence Rating	2	3
Subtotal	13	18
		72.2%
Grand Total	43	57
		75.4%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	x
Not Recommended	