

# Construct validity checklist

These quality assurance steps were part of the assessment design.

Assessment task: *Narrative Exam: Task 3 Short Story Transformation [supervised and seen]*

Quality criteria	Evident?	Comments
1. There is clear alignment between the assessment task and the syllabus dimensions and general objectives	Yes	D1, D2 and D3 [through creation of a character in contemporary context [that reflects <i>Crucible</i> themes] using figurative devices and motifs.]
2. The assessment task enables the demonstration of the full range of syllabus standards	Yes	Though we discussed how story seeds are mostly used by marginal students to access standards.
3. Scaffolding cues the expected processes and skills to allow the full range of standards to be demonstrated without so much scaffolding that responses are pre-determined.	Yes and No	We were happy with the "structure" scaffold, but deleted some of the style and added cohesive elements for consideration to give better access to that criteria.
4. The assessment instrument uses the accepted terminology of the syllabus.	Yes	
5. The language is free of bias.	Unsure	We think maybe some of the language on page two will exclude students who haven't used it prior to this unit. We have deleted and simplified language considerations.
6. The instrument makes good use of white space.	Yes	We have tried to simplify it and make task clear, without unnecessary clutter.
7. The order and arrangement of objects is logical and clear.	Yes	Task is obvious and clear.
8. Appropriate space and/or resources have been allocated for responses.	Yes	Unlimited exam paper. 100 word of notes page provided.
9. The layout helps the students access the important elements of the task.	Yes	Options are obvious at a glance.
10. Directions are clear	Yes	
11. The assessment is scheduled to give students the best opportunity for success.	Yes	Exam block in week 9.
12. Task is focused and integrated.	?	Again, this needs some clarification. Focused on 1 text, integrated in that 2 genres are taught concurrently.
13. Scope is there for students to respond with originality	Yes	Plenty of scope in choices of theme and motifs and characters and setting and plot.
14. Conditions meet syllabus requirements.	Yes	Taken straight from syllabus.
15. The scope of the task is such that students are able to respond within the prescribed conditions.	Yes	As per 2010 syllabus.
16. Students have access to information about how the quality of their work will be judged.	Yes	Criteria is attached. There are a range of E-A exemplars on different elements [eg. setting, description etc] Peer and teacher feedback on homework extended writing activities.
17. The language of the achievement standards are	Working	Students will be using achievement

evident in feedback to students.	towards	standard language to peer feedback to increase assessment literacy.
18. Authentication strategies are included.	Yes	Planning and rehearsal phase. Authentication sheet attached to draft. Turn it In/email peer and/or teacher feedback.

Additionally, the following processes were followed to quality assure the reliability of the design:

Adjustments made in light of student feedback on draft assessment task included:	No.
Adjustments made in light of teacher peer feedback on draft assessment task included:	No.
Opportunities for students to receive feedback during production included:	Teacher conferencing. Feedback on planning or ideas or practice piece.
Authentication strategies included:	Authentication sheet provided. Under exam conditions.

This argument for the validity of the assessment design was prepared by:

*Alarna Priestley and M'Leea Collins*