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 Physical Education Assessment Standard 3

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

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

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

| Alignment | Rating Column | Comments |
|--|---------------|----------|
| 1a. | | |
| Grade Level(s): K-5 | | |
| Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by | | |
| the Assessment: PE09-GR.K-S.2-GLE.3-EO.b; PE09-GR.3-S.2-GLE.2-EO.e; PE09-GR.4-S.2- | | |
| GLE.1-EO.a; PE09-GR.5-S.2-GLE.1-EO.h; PE09-GR.5-S.2-GLE.1-EO.i; PE09-GR.5-S.2- | | |
| GLE.2-EO.b | | |
| Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: K - 2.3.b: DOK 1; 3rd - | | |
| Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): DOK 1-4 | | |
| 1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the | | |
| performance task: Logging and analyzing activity time. | | |
| 1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): The | | |
| students will log their activity using a physical activity pyramid, physical activity | | |
| drawings, Activity logs and goals. | | |
| | | |
| 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? Use the | | |
| 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. | | |
|--|---|----------|
| ☐ Minimal match — some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. | | |
| □ No match – 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: It's a full match for 5th grade where mastery is required and a partial match for other grade levels. | | |
| | Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1 | |
| Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating | | |
| | 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. | | |
| for the grade level expectations. Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: Requires students to do out of school activities as well as in school. | | |
| | Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1 | |
| | | |

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

| Scoring Guide Present | Check all that apply: | Comments |
|--|----------------------------|----------|
| □ Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored | | |
| ☐ Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs) | | |
| Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task) | Х | |
| □ Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part) | Х | |
| □ Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist | | |
| · | Rating Column | |
| 2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: Aligns specifically to grade 5 and partially to grades K-4. | 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: It is very specific about the number of times each week the student should be active. | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 | |
| Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating | 3 | |
| 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. The rubric supports the task and is directly aligned. | | |
| Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating | 3 | |
| 2d. 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 is clear enough for multiple raters to arrive at the same score. | 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? Students complete and turn in a worksheet as evidence. | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 |
| Student Work Samples Rating | 3 |

A high quality assessment should be...FAIR and UNBIASED

A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn

Opportunities to Learn

| 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: The worksheet for 3-5 grades is clear, uncluttered, good graphic, and white space. The K-2 pyramid worksheet should have larger squares for the younger students to record their responses. | High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1 | |
| Clear & Uncluttered Rating | 2 | |
| 3b. To what extent are most of the items or the task presented in as straightforward a way as possible for a range of learners? Provide an explanation of your response: Tasks are straightforward and clear. | High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1 | |
| Straight Forward Rating | 3 | |
| 3c. To what degree is the vocabulary and context(s) presented by most of the items or task free from cultural or other unintended bias? Provide an explanation of your response: The content and vocabulary are free from cultural bias | 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. The assessment uses appropriate physical education language. | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 | |
| Academic Language Rating | 3 | |
| 3e. 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). Provide an explanation of your response. Language is not confusing. | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 | |
| Confusing Language Rating | 3 | |
| (http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwcy&cof=FORID:10&q= | | |
| 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. Minimal. Pictures are included for K-2 but other accommodations are not detected. | | |
| 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. | | |
| accommodation is based on an ELL's limited English language proficiency, which is | Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1 | |

Rating Column

Comments

| (the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and | | |
|---|--|--|
| talented students, and students with disabilities) | | |
| 4a. Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world, new context, situation, problem or challenge? Provide an explanation of your response: Tracking physical activity is important as students age for promoting lifelong health and fitness. | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | |
| Engagement Rating | 3 | |
| 4b. 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: Students are learning how to goal-set, log information, and choose appropriate physical activity - all of which students are learning in the classroom. | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | |
| Classroom Learning Rating | 3 | |
| 4c. 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? Provide an explanation of your response: The assessment promotes meaningful dialogue including how to goal set, log information, and specific types of physical activities. | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | |
| 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 areas or 21st Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: Decision making, goal setting, self direction are embedded in these assessments. | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | |
| Communicate Academic Excellence Rating | 3 | |
| 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 (<i>scores and student work analysis</i>) to understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your response: If you can trust the students' log information it can be very beneficial. | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | |
| 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. diagnostic, report card grades, adjusting instruction, etc.)? Provide an explanation of your response: Can be used as part of the body of evidence to report a grade on the standard. Can be used to drive instruction. | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | |
| | | |
| Clarity of Purpose Rating | 3 | |
| Clarity of Purpose Rating | 3 | |
| Clarity of Purpose Rating Summary | 3 Earned | <u>Possible</u> |
| | <u>Earned</u> | <u>Possible</u> 5 |
| Summary | <u>Earned</u> 4 | |
| Summary Standards Rating | Earned 4 2 | 5 2 7 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal | Earned 4 2 6 | 5 2 7 85.7% |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating | Earned 4 2 6 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 3 3 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating Student Work Samples Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 3 3 3 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 3 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 3 3 3 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 3 3 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating Student Work Samples Rating Subtotal | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 3 3 14 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 3 3 15 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating Student Work Samples Rating Subtotal Clear & Uncluttered Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 3 14 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 3 3 15 93.3% |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating Student Work Samples Rating Subtotal Clear & Uncluttered Rating Straight Forward Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 3 14 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 3 3 15 93.3% 3 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating Student Work Samples Rating Subtotal Clear & Uncluttered Rating Straight Forward Rating Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 3 14 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 3 3 15 93.3% 3 3 |
| Summary Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating Student Work Samples Rating Subtotal Clear & Uncluttered Rating Straight Forward Rating Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating Academic Language Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 3 14 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 4 4 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 3 3 15 93.3% 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 |
| Standards Rating Rigor Rating Subtotal Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating Student Work Samples Rating Subtotal Clear & Uncluttered Rating Straight Forward Rating Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating | Earned 4 2 6 2 3 3 3 14 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 | 5 2 7 85.7% 3 3 3 3 3 15 93.3% 3 3 3 |

| | • | 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 | 2 | 3 |
| Locate Evidence Rating | 3 | 3 |
| Subtotal | 17 | 18 |
| | | 94.4% |
| Grand Total | 52 | 57 |
| | | 91.2% |

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

| Fully Recommended | X |
|-----------------------|---|
| Partially Recommended | |
| Not Recommended | |