

## 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](#)

<b>Content Area: Comprehensive Health Education</b>
<b>Name of Assessment: HEAP Module 241: <a href="http://heaphealthliteracy.com">http://heaphealthliteracy.com</a></b>
<b>Reviewer: Content Collaborative</b>
<b>Date of Review: 10/25/12</b>

Assessment Profile								
<p><b>Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):</b></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%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Check All That Apply</th> </tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">x</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">x</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">x</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;"> </td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;"> </td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;"> </td></tr> </table>	Check All That Apply	x	x	x			
Check All That Apply								
x								
x								
x								
<p><b>The assessment includes:</b></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><b>Scoring Guide/Rubric</b></p> <p><b>Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like</b></p> <p>Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)</p> <p><b>Estimated time for administration</b></p> <p>Student Directions &amp; Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?</p>	<table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <th style="background-color: #cccccc;">Check All That Apply</th> </tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;"> </td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">x</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">x</td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;"> </td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;"> </td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;"> </td></tr> </table>	Check All That Apply		x	x			
Check All That Apply								
x								
x								
<b>Other:</b>								

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

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
<p><b>1a.</b></p> <p>Grade Level(s): 8</p> <p>Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: CH09-GR.8-S.2-GLE.3</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-2</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1-2</p>		
<p><b>1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task:</b> Defining STDs, short and long term symptoms of STDs, difference between viral and bacterial.</p>		
<p><b>1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?):</b> Reasoning, explanatory writing, source identification</p>		
<p><b>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.</b></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 standards</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/</p>		

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standards <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. <b>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response:</b> Assessment matches 1 out of the 4 evidence outcomes within the GLEs really well (DOK of 1-2 matches) However, the other evidence outcomes are not touched upon. Assessment therefore is only a partial match to meeting the GLE.		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
<b>Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
	<b>Rating Column</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>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.</b> <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. <b>Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response:</b> The assessment does not meet the majority of evidence outcomes to pursue a higher level of rigors towards meeting the standard. The rigor is matched exactly with a DOK of 1-2 within 1 evidence outcome yet the other EOs are not addressed making this only less rigor assessment.		
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	
<b>Rigor Level Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	

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

<b>Scoring Guide Present</b> <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	<b>Check all that apply:</b>	<b>Comments</b>
	<b>x</b>	
	<b>x</b>	
	<b>Rating Column</b>	
<b>2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The rubrics are general in nature vs. specific to the wording found within the standards (i.e. rubric mentions "core concepts" but doesn't specifically mention or align to the wording within the standards) However, the scoring criteria does in fact partially align to the state standards (i.e. vocabulary, work choice, etc.)	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response:</b> Yes - the rubric does provide a breakdown of each performance level (4,3,2,1).	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	

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. Again - due to the holistic nature of the rubric (based on its defined purpose to be general so it can be applied to multiple things) there is a slight loss in meeting each of the demands of the assessment.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1	
<b>Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
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. Scorers would be advised to add their specific "analytic rubric" verbiage to the holistic rubric to improve this score. In other words, teachers would add to the rubric to make the rubric more demanding and reflective of classroom instruction.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	
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? 0 exemplars were provided for the assessment. They would be helpful to promote interrater reliability.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Student Work Samples Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	

### 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: Assessment is clear and formatted.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
<b>Clear &amp; Uncluttered Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
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: Assessment is clear and straightforward.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
<b>Straight Forward Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
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? There are no issues with vocab. or context creating bias within the assessment.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
<b>Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. Assessment does a good job of being appropriate for both the grade level and content area.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Academic Language Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
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. Vocabulary or word choice is well written and would not be confused with other terms.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
<b>Confusing Language Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's Standards" ( <a href="http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bikids4qwcyc&amp;cof=FORID:10&amp;q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language">http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bikids4qwcyc&amp;cof=FORID:10&amp;q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language</a> )		
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>		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>o Setting Accommodations—Change the location in which a test or assignment is given or the conditions of the assessment setting.</li> <li>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.</li> <li>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.</li> </ul>		
<b>3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response. Provide an explanation of your response. It does not provide any accommodations but there could be easy modifications added by teacher.</b>	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
<b>Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	

### 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
<b>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:</b> We felt that the appropriate nature for a 8th grade "real world" connections is good but not at the highest standard. Ex - kids who are sexually active.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	The assessment does a good job of providing a base of understanding towards standards and the level of DOK.
<b>Engagement Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>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:</b> The assessment uses a variety of avenues to allow students to show learning - i.e. selected response, short answer, extended response are all in the same assessment. The coverage of the evidence outcomes cover 1 out of 4 and is a low DOK.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
<b>Classroom Learning Rating</b>	<b>1</b>	
<b>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:</b> This is a DOK level 1-2 so providing meaningful feedback about critical thinking skills is limited. The reality of dialogue would be specific to student interest (i.e. emotions that would relate to age appropriate situations).	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
<b>Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	
<b>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:</b> DOK is a level 1-2 so the opportunity for true 21st century skills again is limited. Students are, in essence, only asked to describe or list or complete lower level skill.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
<b>Communicate Academic Excellence Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	

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: DOK is specific to content understanding. With the descriptors of describe, identify, etc. it would be easy to analyze student performance.	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: This assessment could be used as a basic summative assessment for the small component of the GLE that it addresses. But it should not be used for a comprehensive assessment of the content and skills expected in the GLE.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	2	
<b>Summary</b>	<b><u>Earned</u></b>	<b><u>Possible</u></b>
Standards Rating	3	5
Rigor Rating	1	2
Subtotal	4	7
		57.1%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	2	3
Student Work Samples Rating	1	3
Subtotal	11	15
		73.3%
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	1	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	11	18
		61.1%
Grand Total	42	57
		73.7%

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

Fully Recommended	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------	--------------------------

<b>Partially Recommended</b>	x
<b>Not Recommended</b>	

Discrepancy of not only the number of evidence outcomes but the quality and depth of the assessment meeting the evidence outcome it did match was questionable. However, the general nature of the assessment would make for a solid DOK 1-2 if needed.

|

|

|

Vertical line segment on the left side of the page.

Vertical line segment on the left side of the page.

|

|

|

|

|