## **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

**Content Area: World Languages** 

Name of Assessment: FLENJ Getting to Know You-Identity Card Revised

**Reviewer: Content Collaborative** 

9/20/2012

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.)	Check All That Apply	
<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.)	х	
<b>Extended Response</b> (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)	х	
<b>Product</b> (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)	х	
<b>Performance</b> (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)	х	
<b>Process</b> (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)	х	
The assessment includes:	Check All That Apply	
<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)	х	
Scoring Guide/Rubric	х	
Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like	Х	authentic carte d'identite
Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)	Х	
Estimated time for administration	Х	
Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?	x	
Other:		

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		Students have the opportunity to
Range Level(s): Novice-Low to Novice-Mid		achieve novice-mid in this task
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by		even though it is just the first unit
the Assessment: WL09-NL-S.1-GLE.1; WL09-NL-S.1-GLE.2; WL09-NL-S.1-GLE.3; WL09-NL-		in level 1. All modes of
S.2-GLE.2; WL09-NM-S.1-GLE.1; WL09-NM-S.1-GLE.2; WL09-NM-S.1-GLE.3; WL09-NM-		communication and culture
S.2-GLE.2		standard are met at the
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: Level 1 Recall		appropriate range level.
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): Level 1		
<b>1b.</b> Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the		
performance task: I can identify basic personal information; I can ask and answer		
questions about personal information; I can provide personal information in writing		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): speaking,		
listening, reading and writing		
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? <b>Use the</b>		
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.		
<ul> <li>Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> </ul>		
□ <b>No match</b> – 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: ??		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating		
<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>	Rating Column	Comments
<ul> <li>□ More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.</li> <li>□ Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.</li> <li>□ Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.</li> </ul>		
Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: Students are asked to identify and tell who, what, when, where.		
	C: 'I D: 0.14	
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=3, Less Rigor=1	

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

Scoring Guide Present	Check all that apply:	Comments
<ul> <li>Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored</li> </ul>	Х	
☐ Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)	х	
□ Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)		
□ <b>Checklist</b> (e.g., with score points for each part)		
□ Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		
· ·	Rating Column	
<b>2a.</b> Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this	V2 Comhot-2	
assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: The scoring is based on a	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
detailed rubric aligned with CAS.	No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	3	
<b>2b.</b> Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels?	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Provide an explanation of your response: The scoring is based on a detailed rubric		
aligned with CAS.		
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	
<b>2c.</b> To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the demands within	High=3, Moderate=2,	
the task or item? Provide an explanation of your response. There is a different rubric		
for each mode of communication.	Low or None=1	
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	
<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.		
Provide an explanation of your response. The rubric vocabulary is not clearly defined,	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
such as "somewhat", "most", "many". But at other times the rubric vocabulary is clearly	No=1	
defined.		
defined.		

Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	2
<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> An authentic example is provided, but not a student example.	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
<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> There are titles and bullets, limited information on a page making the directions and task clear.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	
<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> There are titles and bullets, limited information on a page making the directions and task clear.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Straight Forward Rating	3	
<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> Students in rural areas of Colorado do not always have a street address, but use a PO Box.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	
<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> Words such as "comprehension", "communication strategies", etc. are explained in level-appropriate language.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Academic Language Rating	3	
<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> No homonyms are used.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Confusing Language Rating	3	
(http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwcy&cof=FORID:10&q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language)  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.  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.		
<ul> <li>Setting Accommodations — Change the location in which a test or assignment is given or the conditions of the assessment setting.</li> <li>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>Linguistic Accommodations — Allow English language learners (ELLs) to access</li> </ul>		
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.		
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	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	

Opportunities to Learn	Rating Column	Comments
(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and	0	
talented students, and students with disabilities)		
4a. Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new	High=3; Moderate=2;	
context, situation, problem or challenge? Provide an explanation of your response:	Low or None=1	
This is an everyday situation possible in the real world.		
Engagement Rating	3	
<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</b>	High=3; Moderate=2;	
an explanation of your response: The focus and depth of the rubrics enable the	Low or None=1	
assessment to meet the expectations of a high quality assessment.		
Classroom Learning Rating	3	
<b>4c.</b> To what degree do the results from this assessment ( <i>scores and student work</i>		
analysis) foster meaningful dialogue about learning expectations and outcomes with	High=3; Moderate=2;	
students and parents? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The lesson could be	Low or None=1	
taught based upon the expected outcomes of this assessment.		
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	
4d. To what extent do you believe the assessment can clearly communicate		
expectations for academic excellence (e.g., creativity, transference to other content	High=3; Moderate=2;	
areas or 21st Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: The	Low or None=1	
lesson could be taught based upon the expected outcomes of this assessment.		
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	3	
<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 (scores and student work analysis) to	High=3; Moderate=2;	
understand what competency on standard/s look like? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> The assessment and rubric are both in line with CAS	Low or None=1	
- 1		
Competency on Standards Rating	3	
<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</b>	High=3; Moderate=2;	
your response: The assessment is simple and aligns with CAS; it could serve many uses	Low or None=1	
based on teacher discretion.		
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	Earned	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	5	5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	7	7
		100.0%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	2	3
Student Work Samples Rating	2	3
Subtotal	13	15
		86.7%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	3
Straight Forward Rating Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Blas Rating  Academic Language Rating	2	3
Confusing Language Rating	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	2
Subtotal	15	17
		88.2%

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	53	57
		93.0%

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

Fully Recommended	Х
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	