

<p>Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: Waves and Motion: SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.4; EO.a; SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.4; EO.b; SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.4; EO.c; Force and Motion - Description of Motion: SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.1; EO.a; SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.1-EO.b; Nature of Force: SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.1-EO.a; SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.1-EO.b; SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.4-EO.a; Forces of Motion: SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.1; EO.a; SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.1-EO.b; Energy: SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.2; EO.a; Properties of Matter: SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.2; EO.a; Chemistry - Changes in Matter: SC09-GR.8-S.1-GLE.3</p>		<p>Matter section is also applicable to HS</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</p>		
<p>1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: See comments.</p>		
<p>1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): The skills/processes within the CAS are not assessed with this computer-based assessment. In the teacher support materials, there are recommended learning materials that require students to use skills.</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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. <input type="checkbox"/> Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <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. 		
<p>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response: See comments. Diagnoser includes many assessments, and many align to CAS. However, the assessments are limited to multiple choice and short response questions that assess students knowledge of the content at a DOK 1-2 level, therefore the assessments will not assess students' abilities with regard to designing investigations (DOK 3-4).</p>		
	<p>Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1</p>	
<p align="center">Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating</p>	<p align="center">3</p>	
	<p align="center">Rating Column</p>	<p align="center">Comments</p>
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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: The CAS include rigor that requires students to design, evaluate, plan, and think critically around the content and skills, these assessments are simply a set of short concise questions that reveal students' understanding of the content parts of the CAS. For example, teachers will find an assessment that would provide data on if 8th grade students can look at a position vs. time graph to describe an objects motion, but not if the student can design an investigation to analyze the forces acting on an object.		
	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	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	Checklist: The report generated provides feedback on how students did on each concept.
	X	
	Rating Column	
2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: The scoring criteria for the assessments on this website focus on the DOK 1-2 type questions, so do not align with CAS for higher level DOKs.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
	2	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: The skill level of the student is clear, however, the performance level compared to traditional state standardized testing is not present.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
	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 assessment is scored by the computer, so the scoring criteria is pre-determined based on the items provided.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1	
	2	
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: Computer-based and scored.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
	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? This is not applicable to a computer-based assessment.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
	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
<p>3a. To what extent do 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 items are clear and often include graphics or pictures to accompany the questions.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
<p>Clear & Uncluttered Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p>3b. To what extent do 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 items include text, pictures, and short response, so there is a variety of ways for students to access the question and show what they know.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
<p>Straight Forward Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p>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: Some items include contexts (ocean, bike riding, etc.) that could be unfamiliar to some students.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
<p>Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating</p>	<p>2</p>	
<p>3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response: The items are short and concise and focus on the content specific language.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p>Academic Language Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p>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: The items are short and concise, they do not include usage of words that could confuse students.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p>Confusing Language Rating</p>	<p>3</p>	
<p><i>*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)</i></p>		
<p>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: The assessment is computer-based, making it accessible for ELL's and Students with Disabilities outside the science classroom. The items include graphics that may help these students access the content.</p>		
<p><i>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 		

<p>3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response: Presentation of items is short and includes graphics. Setting can be changed due to the computer format. Timing can be adjusted for varying students abilities. The linguistic load of the assessment is as limited as it can be while still getting to student understanding of the content.</p>	<p>Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1</p>	
<p>Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating</p>		<p>2</p>

A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn

<p>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></p>	<p>Rating Column</p>	<p>Comments</p>
<p>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: The items brings in real life situations and contexts for students to solve problems related to the content.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Engagement Rating</p>		<p>3</p>
<p>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: The assessment provides good information on the lower level DOK content knowledge, but not the process skills related to the content that students should have obtained in the classroom.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Classroom Learning Rating</p>		<p>2</p>
<p>4c. To what degree do the results from this assessment (<i>scores and student work analysis</i>) foster meaningful dialogue about learning expectations and outcomes with students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response: The assessments here are high on obtaining meaning results on what students know with regard to the content, but the way the results are presented require the student and teacher to interpret the data together; the results are displayed as a question by question feedback on student learning.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating</p>		<p>2</p>
<p>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: The results that the teacher and student receive will help to clearly communicate what the student can do to improve with regard to their knowledge of content; however, the assessment itself does not include opportunities for creativity, transfer between content areas, or 21st century skills. These assessment items are very concise and specific to the science content.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Communicate Academic Excellence Rating</p>		<p>2</p>
<p>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 (<i>scores and student work analysis</i>) to understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your response: The results break down the content for the student and teacher to fully understand the students' competency on the content within a given standard.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Competency on Standards Rating</p>		<p>3</p>
<p>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: It is clear that the assessments here can serve multiple purposes for teachers (diagnostic, summative, formative, etc.). There is also two assessments provided for each strand.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p>Clarity of Purpose Rating</p>		<p>3</p>

Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	3	5
Rigor Rating	1	2
Subtotal	4	7
		57.1%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	2	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3	3
Student Work Samples Rating	1	3
Subtotal	10	15
		66.7%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	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	2	2
Subtotal	16	17
		94.1%
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	3	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	15	18
		83.3%
Grand Total	45	57
		78.9%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	X
Not Recommended	