

## 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: World Languages</b>
<b>Name of Assessment: FLENJ - Relationships-Somebody Important</b>
<b>Reviewer: Content Collaborative</b>
<b>Date of Review: 9/20/2012</b>

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

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

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
<b>1a.</b> Grade Level(s): <b>High School: Novice High to Intermediate Low</b> Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Range Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: WL09-NH-S.1-GLE.2; WL09-NH-S.1-GLE.3; WL09-NH-S.2-GLE.2; WL09-NH-S.3-GLE.2; WL09-NH-S.4-GLE.2 Indicate the intended DOK range of the Range Level Expectations: <b>DOK 2-4</b> Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : <b>DOK 2-4</b>		<i>There are some of pre-assessment activities included that are not part of the performance assessment itself or evaluated in the rubrics, but are still valuable in the learning process and foster some of the deeper thinking skills.</i>
<b>1b.</b> Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Vocabulary: relationships, music, feelings		
<b>1c.</b> List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): <b>Write, describe, infer, inform, identify, communicate, summarize, suggest, express, publish, share</b>		

<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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Full match</b> – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Close match</b> – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Partial match</b> – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Minimal match</b> – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li><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.</li> </ul> <p><b>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response:</b> Each one of our Standards is addressed and assessed individually in the rubrics.</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>	<b>Comments</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> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><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.</li> <li><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.</li> <li><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.</li> </ul>		
<p><b>Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response:</b> The DOK for the Range Level expectations and the assessments are the same. Deeper thinking and higher order thinking skills are expected in both as indicated by the vocabulary in the tasks and rubrics.</p>		
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	
<b>Rigor Level Rating</b>	<b>2</b>	

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

<p><b>Scoring Guide Present</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored</b></li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Generalized Rubric</b> (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Task-Specific Rubric</b> (only used for the particular task)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Checklist</b> (e.g., with score points for each part)</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> <b>Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist</b></li> </ul>	<p><b>Check all that apply:</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">X</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Comments</b></p> <p><i>Separate task-specific rubrics are provided for each component. Student pre-assessment guiding worksheets are included.</i></p>
<p><b>2a.</b> Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> While written in student-friendly language, the range levels listed match our Colorado Standards in definition and application.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<b>Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<p><b>2b.</b> Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The categories are clearly defined in student-friendly language focusing on the student's learning.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<b>Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	

<p><b>2c.</b> To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the demands within the task or item? <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> There is a separate rubric for each task. The rubric allows the student to see areas of strength and weakness.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1</p>	
<p><b>Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>2d.</b> 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. <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> Not only should another rater arrive at a similar score, but the student's should as well given the rubrics provided.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p><b>Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>2e.</b> Is there student work (e.g., anchor papers, video, portfolio) which illustrates student mastery? <b>If so, describe. If not, what student work would be needed?</b> A student product at the range levels would be helpful.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p><b>Student Work Samples Rating</b></p>	<p><b>1</b></p>	

## 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> It's well organized with different sections for the different tasks in the order they might should happen.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
<b>Clear &amp; Uncluttered Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<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 tasks and rubrics are all presented in student-friendly language. There is little room for ambiguity.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
<b>Straight Forward Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<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> T It displayed no cultural or gender or need-based bias.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
<b>Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<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> Specific vocabulary is used to indicate the use of higher-order thinking skills. The language in the prompt directly aligns with the DOK in the rubric.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<b>Academic Language Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<p><b>3e.</b> 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). <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> The assessment doesn't use any confusing words.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<b>Confusing Language Rating</b>	<b>3</b>	
<p>*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's Standards" (<a href="http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwc&amp;cof=FORID:10&amp;q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language">http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwc&amp;cof=FORID:10&amp;q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language</a>)</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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b></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:</b> Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> The assessment doesn't provide any specific accommodations, but there is a differentiated product rubric. The assessment doesn't provide any specific accommodations, but the teacher could easily incorporate some: extra time, lessening task, scheduling accommodations.</p>	<p>Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1</p>	

**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
<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> It's real-world in that students often have relationship problems and music reflects that. It does allow for creativity, requires higher-order thinking skills, and transference into real-life situations.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p><b>Engagement Rating</b></p>	<p><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 the necessary steps from Novice High to Intermediate Low.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p><b>Classroom Learning Rating</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>4c.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> . Student performance can indicate their ability to initiate and sustain a conversation and directly aligns with given learner targets. Also, because this is a real world situation, it becomes obvious to students and parents which skills have been developed or not developed yet.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p><b>Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>4d.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> It allows for creativity, empathy, and initiative plus it depends upon transfer knowledge of the language.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p><b>Communicate Academic Excellence Rating</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>4e.</b> 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> If a teacher looks at the entire unit, then they can get good picture of student progress and performance as well as the targeted range level. Teachers can also look at specific areas on the rubric to see specific strength and weakness. Matching the task, rubrics, and product should provide a clear example of an Intermediate-Low.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p><b>Competency on Standards Rating</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>4f:</b> 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.)? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The purpose is identified and clear in the overview and tasks.</p>	<p>High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1</p>	
<p><b>Clarity of Purpose Rating</b></p>	<p><b>3</b></p>	
<p><b>Summary</b></p>		
	<b>Earned</b>	<b>Possible</b>
Standards Rating	5	5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	7	7
		100.0%
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	1	3
Subtotal	13	15
		86.7%
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	3	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	3	3
Competency on Standards Rating	3	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	18	18
		100.0%
Grand Total	55	57
		96.5%

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

Fully Recommended	x
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	