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 B

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: 10.25.2012

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.)	Х
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.)	
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 Materials (if needed to complete the assessment) Estimated time for administration	X
Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?	X
Other: Missing answers for questions.	

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		
Grade Level(s): K-2, but also aligns to CAS Grade 3		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by		
the Assessment: PE09-GR.1-S.2-GLE.1-EO.c; PE09-GR.3-S.2-GLE.1-EO.b; PE09-GR.3-S.2-		
GLE.1-EO.h		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-3		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): 1-2		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the		
performance task: Health-related fitness concepts		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): Cardio-		
respiratory endurance, flexibility, muscular strength, heart rate, pacing		
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: 1st grade standards address muscular strength only. Nothing in the 3rd grade standards about identifying activities that increase health-related fitness. 3rd grade standards address pacing.		
	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. 		
Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: More rigorous than the standards because there is nothing in the standards about identifying activities that increase all components of health-related fitness and/or why individuals should exercise.		
	Similar Rigor=2, More	
Rigor Level Rating	Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1 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 	Х	
☐ 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)		
□ Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist		
	Rating Column	
2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: Not all parts of the	No=1	
assessment are aligned to the 1st and 3rd grade standards.	140-1	
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 because advanced, proficient, and	Yes=3, Somewhat=2,	
limited are defined by percentage correct on the assessment.	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. Addresses all the	High=3, Moderate=2,	
demands in the tasks/questions (e.g. cardio-respiratory endurance, flexibility,	Low or None=1	
muscular strength, heart rate, pacing).		
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. Clear rubric and scoring guide used to score the students' answers.	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 respond on answer sheet.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Student Work Samples Rating	3

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: Numbering is not correct. There is not enough room for the students to write the answer for the second #1.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	Error in the answer for matching section.
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: Clear expectations for what the students are expected to do.	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: No biases in the writing.	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. Assessment uses aerobic endurance and standards use cardiovascular endurance.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Academic Language Rating	2	
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. No confusing words.	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: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. No accommodations. Pictures would help with the ELLs and Students with Disabilities.		
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.		
3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response. No accommodations.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	

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)		
4a. Does this assessment engage a student in thinking that connects to a real world,	High-2, Madagata-2,	
new context, situation, problem or challenge? Provide an explanation of your response: Only one of the six items relate to applying knowledge to real-world	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
context.	LOW OF HORE-1	
Engagement Rating	1	
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?	High=3; Moderate=2;	
Provide an explanation of your response: The assessment is not exactly aligned to	Low or None=1	
the standards, so the outcomes may not reflect what the teacher was expected to teach and the learner expected to learn.		
Classroom Learning Rating	1	
4c. 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 students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response: Can be used with	High=3; Moderate=2;	
students and parents to provide information, but only where the content is	Low or None=1	
appropriate for the student's grade level expectations.		
Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	
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:	Low or None=1	
Does not address 21st Century skills.		
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) to	High-2, Madagata-2,	
understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your response: Due to the fact that there is only a minimal match to the standards, there	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
is a low level of teachers' abilities to use the results to look at competency on	2011 01 110110 1	
standards.		
Competency on Standards Rating	1	
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: Due to the fact that there is only a minimal match to the standards,	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
there is a low level of teachers' abilities to use the results for summative or	LOW OF NOTICE	
formative assessments.		
Clarity of Purpose Rating	1	
Summary	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	2	5
Rigor Rating	1	2
Subtotal	3	7
Dubnic Aliened /Chandards Debine	2	42.9%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3	3
Student Work Samples Rating	3	3
Subtotal	14	15
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	93.3%
Straight Forward Rating	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	3

Confusing Language Rating	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	2
Subtotal	14	17
		82.4%
Engagement Rating	1	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	1	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	1	3
Competency on Standards Rating	1	3
Locate Evidence Rating	1	3
Subtotal	7	18
		38.9%
Grand Total	38	57
		66.7%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	Х
Not Recommended	