High Quality Assessment Content Validity Review Tool

Content Area: Reading, Writing, and Communicating

Name of Assessment: Defined STEM -- Literacy Tasks (only) for HS only: www.definedstem.com

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: October 20, 2012

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/

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

Assessment Profile

Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):	Check All That Apply
Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)	n/a
Short Answer (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)	n/a
Extended Response (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)	x
Product (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)	x
Performance (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)	N/A
Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)	N/A

The assessment includes:	Check All That Apply
Teacher directions (may include prerequisites/description of instruction before giving the assessment e.g., this assessment should be given after students have learned ...)	X
Scoring Guide/Rubric	X
Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like	
Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)	X
Estimated time for administration	
Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?	X
Other:	

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		We only reviewed the Literacy Tasks which include
Grade Level(s): 9th-12th Grade; assessed against 10th grade CAS and EOs		

Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: RWC10-GR.10-S.2-GLE.2-EO.a, RWC10-GR.10-S.2--GLE.2-EO.g, RWC10-GR.10-S.3-GLE.1-EO.a, RWC10-GR.10-S.3-GLE.2-EO.a, RWC10-GR.10-S.3-GLE.3-EO.a, RWC10-GR.10-S.3-GLE.3-EO.b, RWC10-GR.10-S.3-GLE.3-EO.c, RWC10-GR.10-S.3-GLE.3-EO.d, RWC10-GR.10-S.3-GLE.3-EO.e, RWC10-GR.10-S.3-GLE.3-EO.f, RWC10-GR.10-S.4-GLE.1-EO.a, RWC10-GR.10-S.4-GLE.1-EO.b, RWC10-GR.10-S.4-GLE.1-EO.d, RWC10-GR.10-S.4-GLE.1-EO.e, RWC10-GR.10-S.4-GLE.1-EO.f, RWC10-GR.10-S.4-GLE.1-EO.g, RWC10-GR.10-S.4-GLE.2-EO.a

Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: DOK 1-4

Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : DOK 3-4

1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Rhetoric
Comprehension – constructing meaning
Analysis of nonfiction text
Interpretation of technical texts
Analysis of textual features
Analysis of Argument
Evaluation of texts
Expression of understanding of author's craft
Inference
Summarization
synthesis of information, citing relevant information, making knowledgeable claims, identifying counter-claims, arguing against counter-claims, awareness of audience, bias, organization of claims and argument, matching style to purpose and audience, thesis,

1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?):Identify rhetorical device and influence on meaning
Recall of details
Identifying important information (summary)
Differentiation of fact vs. opinion
Determination of authorial purpose, theme
Application of understanding of rhetorical device and strategies
Read multiple texts, articles and write an organized essay

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.**
□ **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.
□ **Minimal match –** some tasks or items match some relevant 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:

argumentative, persuasive, narrative, and informational writing. The Performance Tasks do include listening, speaking, and researching components that could be aligned to CAS; we just didn't include that work in this review. Each of these tasks is already aligned to Common Core Anchor Reading and Writing Standards but are not articulated by grade level. We chose to compare the assessment to grade 10. We love that students have to read multiple texts, collect information from multiple texts , and synthesize information for argumentative paper.

	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**
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.**		Text complexity is of wide variety. Some of the texts have concept-specific jargon which makes the

	Check all that apply:	Comments
□ **More rigorous** – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.		text more complex.
□ **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: **RWC10-S.2--GLE.2-EO.a Cite strong and thorough textual evidence to support analysis of what the text says explicitly as well as inferences drawn from the text. (CCSS: RI.9-10.1)** **RWC10-S.2--GLE.2-EO.g By the end of grade 10, read and comprehend literary nonfiction at the high end of the grades 9-10 text complexity band independently and proficiently. (CCSS: RI.9-10.10)** **RWC10-S.3--GLE.1-EO.a Write narratives to develop real or imagined experiences or events using effective technique, well-chosen details, and well-structured event sequences. (CCSS: W.9-10.3); Use narrative techniques, such as dialogue, pacing, description, reflection, and multiple plot lines, to develop experiences, events, and/or characters. (CCSS: W.9-10.2b); Use precise words and phrases, telling details, and sensory language to convey a vivid picture of the experiences, events, setting, and/or characters. (CCSS: W.9-10.2d); Provide a conclusion that follows from and reflects on what is experienced, observed, or resolved over the course of the narrative. (CCSS: W.9-10.2e)** **RWC10-S.3--GLE.2-EO.a Write informative/explanatory texts to examine and convey complex ideas, concepts, and information clearly and accurately through the effective selection, organization, and analysis of content. (CCSS: W.9-10.2); Introduce a topic; organize complex ideas, concepts, and information to make important connections and distinctions; include formatting (e.g., headings), graphics (e.g., figures, tables), and multimedia when useful to aiding comprehension. (CCSS: W.9-10.2a); Develop the topic with well-chosen, relevant, and sufficient facts, extended definitions, concrete details, quotations, or other information and examples appropriate to the audience's knowledge of the topic. (CCSS: W.9-10.2b); Choose and develop an effective appeal; Collect, organize, and evaluate materials to support ideas; Use appropriate and varied transitions to link**		
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, 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
□ **Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored**		Some of the rubrics show evidence of incomplete development. The language in various strands isn't consistent-- for example level 4 (gluten-free bakery business) "effectively" later in the category uses "minimal" which causes the reader (teacher and student) to be confused. It is obvious that the rubrics are based on the Common Core language (claim, counterclaim, etc.). Holistic rubrics which are determined by mode. The argumentative rubric needs to have the concepts
□ **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**		
	Rating Column	
2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. **Provide an explanation of your response: The following includes specific language from the rubrics that aligns to the standards.** **Standards/Rubric: use of precise, knowledgeable claims; distinguishing claims from opposing claims; use of relevant evidence; analysis of strengths of claims and counterclaims; attention to audience; evaluates arguments; usage of standard English; logical sequence for claims, counter-claims, evidence, etc.**	**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: There are four performance levels for all task-specific rubrics that use the following categories: Extensive, essential, partial, and unsatisfactory.** **In the informative rubric--yes. In the argumentative rubric--no. There are a few words separating the proficiency levels which do not clearly separate the student behavior/outcome.**	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	delineated between proficiency categories.
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. Because the rubrics are task-specific, they are highly aligned to the tasks. There is specific language included in the rubric criteria that match the task.**	**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. With common scoring protocols, scorers could arrive at the same result.**	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	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?** Need to post student exemplars of informational and argumentative writing for each mode for each proficiency level including annotation of why each sample scored the way it scored.	**Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1**	
Student Work Samples Rating	1	

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: The student view include videos to build background knowledge, background information on the scenario that leads to the prompt, language prompt, guiding questions, research resources with hyperlinks, tier 3 vocabulary, and rubric for the prompt. Easy to read. Can export the data to Word and PDF formats.**	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	
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 topics are timely; however a student may not know much about a particular topic. There is much reading/viewing/listening providing the student with background knowledge. Modern-day technical topics which could be of high interest. Topics are relevant and applicable.**	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: Articles seem to provide a wide array of perspectives to lessen bias. Provides multiple texts for students to synthesize their own ideas and perspectives.**	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	
3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? **Provide an explanation of your response. Articles naturally pull in academic language appropriate to the content.**	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. We found no evidence of this in the items we reviewed.**	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=000187886740799253 7742:bjkids4qwcy&cof=FORID:1)		
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. No stated accommodations. Teachers will need to provide accommodations as necessary for student needs. Texts are naturally differentiated based on sources. Need to follow standard accommodations.**		
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.*		

	Rating Column	Comments
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. Yes, need to follow standard accommodations..**	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	2	

A high quality assessment…Increases Opportunities to Learn

Opportunities to Learn *(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)*	Rating Column	Comments
4a. Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new context, situation, problem or challenge? The are all problem-based scenarios which have to read text, research solutions, and write an argument supporting the position the student selects (real-life inquiry). Topics are relevant to modern-day (environmental issues, health, sports, innovation, technology).	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: It is a high quality assessment that assesses a wide array of reading and comprehension skills including analysis, interpretation, and evaluation. It also assesses writing through strong problem-solution format which a student has to synthesize multiple contexts to write a well-defined argument for a real-world situation.**	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	3	
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: Because of the nature of the topics and 21st Century skills, students and parents can see the transferability of skills. The only thing that is needed in this assessment is student exemplars with annotations.**	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: All the prompts have transdisciplinary lenses which means the learning transfers.**	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	3	
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: As in in-classroom assessment with common rubrics, this data could be very informative and for learning.**	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Competency on Standards Rating	3	
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: Most people would use these assessments as summative but depending upon the when each assessment was implemented could determine how the data could be used.**	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	2	

Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	5	5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	7	7
		100.0%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	2	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	2	2
Subtotal	17	17
		100.0%
Engagement Rating	3	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	3	3
Competency on Standards Rating	3	3
Locate Evidence Rating	2	3
Subtotal	16	18
		88.9%
Grand Total	51	57
		89.5%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	x
Not Recommended	