SCILLSS Classroom Science Assessment Workshop

**Task Development and Review Worksheet**

## Directions

1. To support the development of a high-quality science assessment task, consider the evidence/artifacts of student learning that need to be elicited in order for an educator to assess students’ science knowledge, understanding, and possible misconceptions to inform instruction.
2. Consider the following criteria for high-quality science assessments when designing or evaluating an assessment task:
   * intentional design based on the assessed knowledge, skills, and abilities;
   * phenomena and problem-focused;
   * reasoning/sensemaking using the dimensions;
   * equitable and fair; and
   * right stakeholders, right information.
3. As you evaluate science assessment tasks, consider the evidence/artifacts of student learning that the task elicits to rate each question on a scale of strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree. For any ratings of strongly disagree or disagree, please provide an explanation in the space provided (e.g., identify which items do NOT meet the criteria and explain).
4. Plan to share a response with the larger group.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Do the items in the task reflect an intentional design based on the assessed knowledge, skills, and abilities (e.g., varying degrees of complexity, types of demonstration of student learning, types of work products)? | | | |
| **Strongly**  **Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| 1. Are the items in the task driven by a high-quality scenario that focuses on phenomena or problems (i.e., a phenomenon or problem is present; the information in the scenario is necessary and adequate to respond successfully to the task)? | | | |
| **Strongly**  **Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| 1. Does completing the task require students to use reasoning and integration of the three dimensions (SEP, CCC, DCI)? | | | |
| **Strongly**  **Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| 1. Are the items fair and equitable (i.e., relevant and interesting, include multiple modes for students to respond, accessible by all learners including students with disabilities or who are English learners, use scientifically accurate information)? | | | |
| **Strongly**  **Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
| 1. Do the items provide evidence/artifacts that can be used by educators to make inferences about student learning that, in turn, can inform adjustments to planning and instruction and provide feedback to students (e.g., identify/make visible, accurate science knowledge; partial science learning; and misconceptions)? | | | |
| **Strongly**  **Agree** | **Agree** | **Disagree** | **Strongly Disagree** |
|  |  |  |  |
| **Notes:** | | | |
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