

## 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: Reading, Writing and Communicating</b>
<b>Name of Assessment: NYC Writing (Center for Assessment, Dover, NH)</b>
<b>Reviewer: Content Collaborative</b>
<b>Date of Review: October 8, 2012</b>

**PLEASE NOTE:** Depth of Knowledge (DOK) Considerations for Reading, Writing and Communicating Assessments In August 2012, Colorado became a Governing State in the [Partnership for Assessment of College and Career Readiness \(PARCC\)](#) multi-state assessment consortium. At this time, PARCC has not released DOK indicators for the Common Core State Standards which the consortium is set to assess in 2014-2015. In order to move forward with the alignment portion of the assessment review process, the Colorado Reading, Writing and Communicating Content Collaborative utilized DOK indicators that were previously published by the [Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium's](#) Content Specifications for the Summative Assessment of the Common Core State Standards for English Language Arts and Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects. As additional information becomes available from PARCC, adaptations and revisions will be made to the assessment reviews in this Resource Bank, as necessary.

[PARCC http://www.parcconline.org/](http://www.parcconline.org/)

[SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium \(Content Specifications for the Summative Assessment of the Common Core State Standards\) http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/ELA-Literacy-Content-Specifications.pdf](http://www.smarterbalanced.org/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/12/ELA-Literacy-Content-Specifications.pdf)

### 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

**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?

Check All That Apply
X
X
X

Other:

Performance Assessment on writing that is tied to the reading of two short stories.

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

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
<p><b>1a.</b></p> <p>Grade Level(s): 4-5</p> <p>Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: RWC10-GR.4-S.2-GLE.1-EO.aj; RWC10-GR.4-S.2-GLE.1-EO.aiv; RWC10-GR.4-S.3-GLE.2-EO.ai; RWC10-GR.4-S.3-GLE.2-EO.aii; RWC10-GR.4-S.3-GLE.2-EO.aiii; RWC10-GR.4-S.3-GLE.2-EO.aiv; RWC10-GR.4-S.3-GLE.2-EO.av; RWC10-GR.4-S.3-GLE.2-EO.avi; RWC10-GR.4-S.3-GLE.2-EO.avii; RWC10-GR.4-S.3-GLE.2-EO.aviii; RWC10-GR.4-S.3-GLE.3-EO.g; RWC10-GR.4-S.4-GLE.1-EO.ci</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) : 2-3</p>		<p><b>Strengths:</b> The DOKs of the 4th grade assessment are at analyze DOK 2, evaluate DOK 3...align very strongly with the intended DOK of the standards. The rigor of the assessment is high, and it equates to the rigor of the standards.</p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p>
<p><b>1b.</b> Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Reason, Analyze, Evaluate, Comprehension</p>		
<p><b>1c.</b> List the skills/performance assessed: Purpose, Organization, Details, Elaboration, Voice and Tone. Command of conventions. Refer to details; describe in depth a character, informative/explanatory text, cite textual evidence; introduce claim; support claims; provide concluding statement; maintain formal style; vary word choice, sentence structure and</p>		
<p><b>1d.</b>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? <b>Use the definitions below to select your rating.</b></p> <p><b>X Full match</b> – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Close match</b> – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partial match</b> – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Minimal match</b> – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>No match</b> – task or most items are not related to the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</p> <p><b>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response:</b> One-to-one correspondence between the wording of the standards addressed and the task requirements.</p>		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
<b>Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating</b>	<b>5</b>	
	<b>Rating Column</b>	
<p><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></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>More rigorous</b> – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Similar rigor</b> – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Less rigor</b> – 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: Scaffolded DOKs: on the high end of the range of DOK listed for our GLEs: Common Core standard rubrics allow for differentiation of skills: Novice, Apprentice, Practitioner, Expert.		
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=2, Less Rigor=1	
Rigor Level Rating	2	

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

Scoring Guide Present	Check all that apply:	Comments
<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	x	<p><b>Strengths:</b> This is an assessment that integrates reading and writing. It also addresses our Research and Reasoning Standard. Comment on the assessment include well defined rubric on varied genres. Student work analysis forms that sort students' work by degree of objectives met, which creates an opportunity for differentiated strategy groups.</p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b> It does not address every aspect of writing or reading nor is it intended to.</p>
Rating Column	X	
Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	X	
Scoring Guide Appropriate to Task Rating	3	
2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: The tasks and rubric tell which CCSS are addresses, and our CAS use the CCSS.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	3	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: Wording is clear across proficiency levels within the scoring rubric. Rubric leveled from novice to expert.	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 task or item? Provide and explanation of your response. Each rubric element is clearly delineated and summaries of proficiency are provided. CCSS are referenced in the assessment.	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 and explanation of your response. Because there are anchors/exemplars for the rubric, inter-rater reliability would be consistent.	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? Anchors/Exemplar papers are needed for each level of proficiency. examples of novice and an apprentice were available and clearly aligned with the rubric, we assume that practitioner and expert anchors could be made available and would align with the standards.	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
<p><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> The main tasks for the assessment are underlined. Visually appealing, large front. Additional directions are listed in a separate box to insure expectations are understood and met.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	<p><b>Strengths: Suggestions:</b> High-level inference/metaphorical content in article A-Z may make comprehension challenging for ELL or SPED students but would be appropriate/challenging for grade-level learners.</p>
<p align="center"><b>Clear &amp; Uncluttered Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>	
<p><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> The items are presented in easy-to-understand language for most students. Normal accommodations to address specific student needs could easily be utilized. It is unknown if enhanced versions of the video are available for blind and deaf students.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Straight Forward Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>	
<p><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> The two articles about students provide real world connection. Most students have either studied other countries and/or know what a recipe is and/or are fascinated with eating bugs.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>	
<p><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> Both scientific and high-academic language are included in the articles, which are appropriate for grade-level learners. Ex: context clues, decodable multisyllabic words: Ex. Entomophagy</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Academic Language Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>3e.</b> Does the assessment limit the usage of words that can be confused with one another (homonyms)?</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Confusing Language Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>1</b></p>	
<p><small>Please reference: <a href="http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwcy&amp;cof=FORID:1">http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwcy&amp;cof=FORID:1</a></small></p>		
<p><b>3f.</b> 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?</p>		
<p>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o <b>Presentation Accommodations</b> —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 <b>Response Accommodations</b> —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 <b>Setting Accommodations</b> —Change the location in which a test or assignment is given or the conditions of the assessment setting.</li> <li>o <b>Timing and Scheduling Accommodations</b> —Increase the allowable length of time to complete an assessment or assignment and perhaps change the way the time is organized.</li> <li>o <b>Linguistic Accommodations</b>—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>		

<p><b>3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response:</b> Information was not provided. The pieces of the pilot program that we were able to see did not provide a teacher manual. If standard accommodations are in place, maintain these accommodations. "Students who receive scribing or directions read aloud should receive the same modification for this assessment. Students who receive time and a half or double time should receive the same modification. During the assessment, teachers should take the opportunity to observe students' test-taking behaviors, recording observations that may lead to small group instruction during test prep."</p>	<p>Yes, Several allowed=3; Yes, Some allowed=2; None allowed =1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>1</b></p>	

**A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn**

<p align="center"><b>Opportunities to Learn</b> <i>(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Rating Column</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>Comments</b></p>
<p><b>4a.</b> Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new context, situation, problem or challenge? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The content is of high interest to the majority of students at this age. A-Z could be considered a challenge piece because of the high level of inference and metaphorical allusions.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	<p><b>Strengths:</b> The real-world nature of these tasks make them interesting and engaging to students, as do the topics. The prompt empowers students to think about the world around them and connect to their authentic voice.</p>
<p align="center"><b>Engagement Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>4b.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> It provides information from two diverse short stories to compare characters personalities citing textual evidence to support analysis.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Classroom Learning Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>4c.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The use of the analytic rubric pin-points strengths and weaknesses, allowing for dialogue among all vested parties. Students could have the rubric before the assessment. Data can be shared with students and parents, and can be discussed by teachers in PLC. Student could be scored collaboratively. Because the skills and concepts assessed are "high leverage" skills and concepts in literacy, they can form the basis for good prior instruction without the teacher feeling that time spent preparing for the assessment is taken away from "real learning".</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>4d.</b> To what extent do you believe the assessment can clearly communicate expectations for academic excellence to students? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The use of the analytic rubric pin-points strengths and weaknesses, allowing for dialogue among all vested parties. The rubric outlines the performance expectations in student-friendly language, so they know what they are accountable. Additionally; teachers, students and parents can utilize the Student Work Analysis/Formative Assessment Tool to assess writing strengths and weakness, as well as identify differentiated strategies to move students forward and note any patterns or trends.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p align="center"><b>Communicate Academic Excellence Rating</b></p>	<p align="center"><b>3</b></p>	

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: The Student Work Analysis sheet acts as a student data flow collection that quickly gives the teacher accurate assessment information on the group as a whole and on individual students. Use of this data sheet makes this an assessment for learning as well of learning. Allowing for both diagnosis and reporting.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1
<b>Competency on Standards Rating</b>	<b>3</b>
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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> An explanation of standards alignment in the assessment information sheet supports where the assessment falls in the curriculum. The Performance Assessment Data Sheet acts as a student data flow collection that quickly gives the teacher accurate assessment information on the group as a whole and on individual students. Use of this data sheet makes this an assessment FOR learning as well as an assessment OF learning, allowing for both diagnosis and reporting.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1
<b>Locate Evidence Rating</b>	<b>3</b>

Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	5	5
Rigor Rating	2	3
Subtotal	7	8
		<b>87.5%</b>
Scoring Guide Appropriate Rating	3	3
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3	3
Student Work Samples Rating	2	3
Subtotal	17	18
		<b>94.4%</b>
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	1	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	3
Subtotal	14	18
		<b>77.8%</b>
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
		<b>100.0%</b>
Grand Total	56	62
		<b>90.3%</b>

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

Fully Recommended	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Partially Recommended	<input type="checkbox"/>
Not Recommended	<input type="checkbox"/>