#### **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: Physical Education
Name of Assessment: Ohio Department of Education (Standard 4)-Level K-2-Benchmark A
Reviewer: Content Collaborative
Date of Review: 10.24.2012

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	
Short Answer (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)		
<b>Product</b> (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)		
Performance (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)  Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)	Х	
The assessment includes: Teacher directions (may include prerequisites/description of instruction before	Check All That Apply	
giving the assessment e.g., this assessment should be given after students have learned)	Х	
Scoring Guide/Rubric	X	
Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like  Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)	X	
Estimated time for administration  Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?		
Other:		

# A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		
Grade Level(s): K-2		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated		
by the Assessment: PE09-GR.K-S.2-GLE.3-EO.b; PE09-GR.1-S.2-GLE.1-EO.c		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-3		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): 1		
<b>1b.</b> Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the		
performance task: Health-related fitness		
<b>1c.</b> List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?):		
aerobic capacity, muscular strength and endurance, flexibility		
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</b>		
the definitions below to select your rating.		

<ul> <li>Full match – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li>Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> <li>Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> </ul>		
☐ Minimal match — some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge		
described in the corresponding state standard/s.		
□ <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: Kindergarten is only aerobic capacity; 1st is only strength and muscular		
endurance.		
enduration.	Full Match=5; Close	
	Match=4; Partial	
	Match=3; Minimal	
	Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating		
	Rating Column	Comments
<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>		Comments
<ul> <li>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.</li> <li>More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than</li> </ul>		Comments
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.  ☐ More rigorous — most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.		Comments
<ul> <li>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.</li> <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</li> </ul>		Comments
<ul> <li>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.</li> <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> </ul>		Comments
<ul> <li>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.</li> <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</li> </ul>		Comments
<ul> <li>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.</li> <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> </ul>	Rating Column	Comments
<ul> <li>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.</li> <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>	Rating Column	Comments
<ul> <li>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.</li> <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> <li>Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to</li> </ul>	Rating Column	Comments
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.  More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.  Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.  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: Flexibility is not in the kinder or 1st grade standards.	Rating Column	Comments
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.    More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations.    Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations.    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: Flexibility is not in the kinder or 1st grade standards.	Rating Column	Comments

# 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>		
☐ Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)		
<ul> <li>Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)</li> </ul>	X	
□ <b>Checklist</b> (e.g., with score points for each part)		
□ Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist	X	
	Rating Column	
2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: Rubric does not align exactly because out-of-grade level expectations are included. For example, flexibility is not in the kinder or 1st grade standards; strength and endurance is not in the kinder standards.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	2	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: Clear across performance levels. "Not met" is incorrect for muscular strength and endurance.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	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. Addresses all of the tasks (e.g., cardiovascular endurance, muscular strength and endurance, flexibility) identified in the assessment.	High=3, Moderate=2, 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. <b>Provide an explanation of your response. Clear criteria for raters to come to the same level of agreement.</b>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	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?  There is no student work. Video would enhance assessment.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=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
3a. 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)? Provide an explanation of your response: Rubrics (Benchmark Level and Rating) should be more clearly connected in the teacher materials. Layout of the assessment seems disjointed, but usable.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	
<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> Clear for the learner. Teacher is responsible for identifying and communicating the specific task requirements.	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: Free from cultural or unintended bias.</b>	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	
3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. Out of level skills are being assessed. Usage of different language for the same concepts (cardiovascular, aerobic capacity).	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Academic Language Rating	2	
<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. A teacher document.</b>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Confusing Language Rating	3	
*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's Standards" [http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwcy&cof=FORID:1 0&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. No accommodations. Teacher can select tasks, so there can be different tasks that could be specific to individual learners.		
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.  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.		
<b>3g:</b> Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? <b>Provide an explanation of your response.</b> The ability for the teacher to select the task can <b>provide accommodations for students.</b>	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	

### A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn

A nigh quality assessmentIncreases Opportunities to		Comments
Opportunities to Learn	Rating Column	Comments
(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)		
<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</b>	High=3; Moderate=2;	
response: Students are told explicitly what they need to do and there is no	Low or None=1	
connection to real-world applications.	2011 01 110110 2	
Engagement Rating	1	
<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?		
Provide an explanation of your response: Proficiency is clearly identified. Provides	High=3; Moderate=2;	
information regarding expectations for health-related components of fitness	Low or None=1	
specific to each grade level.		
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	High=3; Moderate=2;	
with students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response: Can provide	Low or None=1	
information to students and parents related to appropriate health-related	2011 01 110110 2	
components of fitness.  Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	
<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>	High=3; Moderate=2;	
It is a physical performance assessment, and students are told explicitly what they	Low or None=1	
need to do. 21st century skills are not included.		
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	1	
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 (scores and student work analysis)	High-2. Madayata-2.	
to understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
your response: The rubric only includes met or not met, so there is no level of	row or Mone-1	
performance differentiation within each task.		
Competency on Standards Rating	2	
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.	High=3; Moderate=2;	
diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation	Low or None=1	
of your response: Can be used as formative or summative.		
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
Summany	Earned	Possible
Summary Standards Rating	<u>Earned</u> 3	Possible 5
Rigor Rating	1	2
Subtotal	4	7
Justicial		57.1%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3	3
Student Work Samples Rating	1	3
Subtotal	11	15
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	73.3% 3
Straight Forward Rating	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	3
	2	3
Academic Language Rating		

Confusing Language Rating	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	2	2
Subtotal	15	17
		88.2%
Engagement Rating	1	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	3	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	3	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	1	3
Competency on Standards Rating	2	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	13	18
		72.2%
Grand Total	43	57
		75.4%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	Х
Not Recommended	