### **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: Let's Get Physical	
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.)	х
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 giving the assessment e.g., this assessment should be given after students have learned)	Check All That Apply
Scoring Guide/Rubric Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like	X X
Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)  Estimated time for administration  Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?	X X X
Other:	*

## A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

Alignment	Rating Column	Comments
1a.		
Grade Level(s): 2, 3, 5		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated		
by the Assessment: PE09-GR.2-S.3-GLE.1-EO.a; PE09-GR.2-S.3-GLE.1-EO.b; PE09-		
GR.2-S.3-GLE.1-EO.c; PE09-GR.3-S.3-GLE.1-EO.a; PE09-GR.3-S.3-GLE.1-EO.b; PE09-		
GR.3-S.3-GLE.1-EO.c; PE09-GR.3-S.3-GLE.1-EO.d; PE09-GR.3-S.3-GLE.1-EO.e; PE09-		
GR.3-S.3-GLE.1-EO.f; PE09-GR.3-S.3-GLE.1-EO.g; PE09-GR.5-S.3-GLE.1-EO.c; PE09-		
GR.5-S.3-GLE.2-EO.a; PE09-GR.5-S.3-GLE.2-EO.b; PE09-GR.5-S.3-GLE.2-EO.c; PE09-		
GR.5-S.3-GLE.3-EO.b		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-4		
Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): 1-4		
<b>1b.</b> Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Personal and social responsibility/behavior		

1. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?):		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): demonstrate responsible behavior; positive social interaction; accommodation		
individual differences; listening to the ideas of others; encouraging others;		
constructive feedback		
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.		
□ 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.		
<ul> <li>Minimal match – some tasks or items match some relevant skills and knowledge described in the corresponding state standard/s.</li> </ul>		
□ <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: All aspects aligned to the standards (i.e., demonstrate responsible		
behavior; positive social interaction; accommodation individual differences;		
listening to the ideas of others; encouraging others; constructive feedback)		
	Full Match=5; Close	
	Match=4; Partial	
	Match=3; Minimal	
	Match=2; No Match= 1	
Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating		
Anglica to colorado Academic Standards Nating	Rating Column	Comments
	nating column	Comments
<b>1e</b> . Are the set of items or tasks reviewed as cognitively challenging as the grade		
level expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating.		
level expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating.		
level expectations? Use the definitions below to select your rating.		
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.		
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		
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.		
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		
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		
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		
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.		
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: Level of rigor is appropriate for 5th grade. Documents	Similar Rigor=2, More	
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: Level of rigor is appropriate for 5th grade. Documents		
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: Level of rigor is appropriate for 5th grade. Documents	Similar Rigor=2, More	

## 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>		With the given documents, it is
☐ <b>Generalized Rubric</b> (e.g., for persuasive writing, for all science labs)		not clear how the teacher will
<ul> <li>Task-Specific Rubric (only used for the particular task)</li> </ul>	Х	arrive at an overall score. How
□ <b>Checklist</b> (e.g., with score points for each part)		are the assessment forms used?
□ 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: Appropriate for all identified grade levels and alignment to state standards.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	3	
<b>2b.</b> Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? <b>Provide an explanation of your response: Specific about what is needed at each achievement level.</b>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	

<b>2c.</b> To what degree does the rubric/scoring criteria address all of the demands within the task or item? <b>Provide an explanation of your response. Rubric includes</b> all aspects of the assessment that are measured.	
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. Can be too subjective. Some behaviors are relevant to the teacher.	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1
Rubric/Scoring Different Raters Same Rating	2
<b>2e.</b> Is there student work (e.g., anchor papers, video, portfolio) which illustrates student mastery? <b>If so, describe. If not, what student work would be needed? The group assessment sheet is student work that illustrates student mastery.</b>	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: While it is written clearly, the organization does not make it easily readable. The assessment forms are not clear in terms of how to respond.	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: This assessment, in its current form, does not allow for an easy understanding of what the learner is to do. Hellison's model is taught, but it lacks specificity.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Straight Forward Rating	2	
<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:</b> Usage of the British spelling, word choice and semantics may distract the reader.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	
<b>3d.</b> Does the assessment use appropriate levels of academic language for the grade and content area? Provide an explanation of your response. Appropriate for 5th grade and up.	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. Tick (check mark)/tick (bug)</b>	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Confusing Language Rating	2	
*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. Pictures would help with the ELLs and Students with Disabilities as well as non-readers. Assessment would need to be read aloud.		
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	

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

A riigii quanty assessmentmicreases Opportunities t		Commonts
Opportunities to Learn (the areas below should also be discussed relative to the needs of ELLs, gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities)	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: Application to real world situations and challenges because it is not specific to one skill or game, but social responsibility.	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: Aligned to the standards and students are engaged in writing and the writing must correspond with the evaluation of the adult leader assessor.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Classroom Learning Rating	3	
4c. To what degree do the results from this assessment (scores and student work analysis) foster meaningful dialogue about learning expectations and outcomes with students and parents? Provide an explanation of your response: Students and parents can receive information based on multiple measures and the connection between the student's work and the adult leader's evaluation. Proficiency is clearly identified on the rubrics.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
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: 21st Century skill including communication, appropriate social behaviors.</b>	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Communicate Academic Excellence Rating	3	
<b>4e</b> . 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? <b>Provide an explanation of your response:</b> Can be used to inform instruction.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Competency on Standards Rating	3	
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 purposes formative and summative.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Cummany	Earned	Dossible
Summary Standards Pating	<u>Earned</u>	<u>Possible</u>
Standards Rating	5	5 2
Rigor Rating Subtotal	1 6	7
Subtotal		85.7%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating	3	3
Inter-rater Reliability Rating	2	3
Student Work Samples Rating	3	3
Subtotal	14	15
		93.3%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	2	3
Straight Forward Rating	2	3
Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating	2	3

Academic Language Rating	2	3
Confusing Language Rating	2	3
Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	1	2
Subtotal	11	17
		64.7%
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	3	3
Locate Evidence Rating	3	3
Subtotal	18	18
		100.0%
Grand Total	49	57
		86.0%

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

Fully Recommended	X-5th
Partially Recommended	X- 2nd & 3rd
Not Recommended	