

High Quality Assessment Content Validity Review Tool

To understand the review process and how to use the review tool, go to: [Assessment Review Tool](#)

Content Area: Physical Education

Name of Assessment: Locomotion and Pathways: <http://www.thenewpe.com/assessment/> -- Sample Rubrics for PE, page 1

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.)

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.)

Performance (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)

Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)

Check All That Apply

X

The assessment includes:

Teacher directions (may include prerequisites/description of instruction before giving the assessment e.g., this assessment should be given after students have learned ...)

Scoring Guide/Rubric

Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like

Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)

Estimated time for administration

Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?

Other:

Check All That Apply

X
X
X

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
<p>1a.</p> <p>Grade Level(s): K, 1st</p> <p>Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: PE09-GR.K-S.1-GLE.1-EO.a; PE09-GR.K-S.1-GLE.1-EO.d; PE09-GR.1-S.1-GLE.1-EO.b</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-2</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1-2</p> <p>1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Locomotor and pathways</p> <p>1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): skip, gallop, walk, run, slide, straight, curved zigzag pathways</p>		

<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Full match – all tasks or items fully address or exceed the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Close match – most tasks or items address the relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Partial match – many tasks or items partially address the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <input type="checkbox"/> No match – task or most items are not related to the skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s. <p>Please provide evidence from both the standards and assessment to support your response: There is a direct alignment to the evidence outcomes (i.e., locomotor movements, pathways).</p>		
	Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating	5	
<p>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.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> More rigorous – most items or the tasks reviewed are at a higher DOK level than the range indicated for the grade level expectations. <input type="checkbox"/> Similar rigor – most items or the task reviewed are similar to the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. <input type="checkbox"/> Less rigor – most items or the task reviewed are lower than the DOK range indicated for the grade level expectations. <p>Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: The rigor is consistent with the evidence outcomes and the grade level.</p>	Rating Column	Comments
	Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1	
Rigor Level Rating	2	

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

<p>Scoring Guide Present</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Answer key, scoring template, computerized/machine scored <input type="checkbox"/> Generalized Rubric (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs) <input type="checkbox"/> Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task) <input type="checkbox"/> Checklist (e.g., with score points for each part) <input type="checkbox"/> Teacher Observation Sheet/ Observation Checklist 	Check all that apply:	Comments
<p>2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: Aligned to the standards for locomotor skills and pathways.</p>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	2	

<p>2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: There are no score categories that differentiate ability. Teacher observation sheet only includes yes or no. The performance definitions (present, absent) do not clearly state how many attempts a student should make for each skill.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	
<p>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. Areas of the rubric are consistent with what is being asked of students. However, the performance definitions are not specific to how many attempts are needed.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	
<p>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. Does not provide evidence to scorers about what a proficiency in locomotor movements.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	
<p>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 that illustrates student mastery. Student work could include a video recording of performance.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
<p style="text-align: right;">Student Work Samples Rating</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	

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
<p>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: It is a teacher document. Teacher needs to make sure that he or she uses the appropriate directions from the top of the page (not for Overhand throwing and catching). Some tasks lack specificity. For example, "walk in a straight path, curved path, and zigzag path." It is unclear if the student needs to do all three or one at a time.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	
<p>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 specifically state what the students should do (e.g., skip width of gym in a straight path), but not specific for performance definitions (i.e., more/less than half the student's attempts).</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
Straight Forward Rating	3	
<p>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 bias.</p>	<p>High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1</p>	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	
<p>3d. Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. Language appropriate to language used in the standards.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
Academic Language Rating	3	
<p>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.</p>	<p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p>	
Confusing Language Rating	3	
<p><u>*Please reference "Defining Features of Academic Language in WIDA's Standards"</u> (http://wida.us/searchResults.aspx?cx=0001878867407992537742:bjkids4qwcy&cof=FORID:10&q=Defining%20Features%20of%20Academic%20Language)</p>		
<p>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 provided. Pictures would help with the ELLs and Students with Disabilities as well as non-readers.</p>		
<p>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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 provided.	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	

A high quality assessment...Increases Opportunities to Learn

Opportunities to Learn <i>(the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)</i>	Rating Column	Comments
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: Assessing locomotor skills, therefore there is no connection to the real world.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=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? Provide an explanation of your response: This is dependent on the level of the evaluator and how the assessment is administered. Proficiency is not identified, so lacks the ability to capture students' individual abilities. Would not know what pathway the student was able to do/not do because they are lumped together.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	2	
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: It promote dialogue with students and parents, but teacher would have to identify what the teacher was specifically looking for when assessing. For example, "skip width of gym in a straight path." Teacher would need to identify what aspect of the skip the teacher was evaluating.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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 areas or 21st Century skills) to students? Provide an explanation of your response: Not a 21st Century skill.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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 (<i>scores and student work analysis</i>) to understand what competency on standard/s look like? Provide an explanation of your response: With modifications this would be a three, but because it does not differentiate degrees of skill competency it is difficult to assessment competency.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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: Can be used for multiple types of measures.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	Earned	Possible

Standards Rating	5	5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	7	7
		100.0%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	2	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	1	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	2	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	2	3
Student Work Samples Rating	1	3
Subtotal	8	15
		53.3%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	3
Straight Forward Rating	3	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	3	3
Academic Language Rating	3	3
Confusing Language Rating	3	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	2
Subtotal	15	17
		88.2%
Engagement Rating	1	3
Reflects Classroom Learning Rating	2	3
Reflects Learning Expectations/Outcomes Rating	2	3
Communicates Academic Excellence Rating	1	3
Competency on Standards Rating	1	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	10	18
		55.6%
Grand Total	40	57
		70.2%

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

Fully Recommended	
Partially Recommended	X
Not Recommended	