

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: Dribbling Self Assessment Task Sheet: http://www.thenewpe.com/assessment/ -- Sample Rubrics for PE, page 9 |
| Reviewer: Content Collaborative |
| Date of Review: 10.24.2012 |

| Assessment Profile | | | | | | | | |
|---|--|----------------------|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):</p> <p>Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)</p> <p>Short Answer (short constructed response, fill in a graphic organizer or diagram, explain your thinking or solution, make and complete a table, etc.)</p> <p>Extended Response (essay, multi-step response with explanation and rationale required for tasks)</p> <p>Product (research paper, editorial, log, journal, play, poem, model, multimedia, art products, script, musical score, portfolio pieces, etc.)</p> <p>Performance (demonstration, presentation, science lab, dance or music performance, athletic performance, debate, etc.)</p> <p>Process (creation, development, design, exploration, imagining, visualization, experimentation, invention, revision)</p> | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; background-color: yellow;"> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"><th>Check All That Apply</th></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">X</td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">X</td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> </table> | Check All That Apply | | X | | | X | |
| Check All That Apply | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| X | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| X | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| <p>The assessment includes:</p> <p>Teacher directions (may include prerequisites/description of instruction before giving the assessment e.g., this assessment should be given after students have learned ...)</p> <p>Scoring Guide/Rubric</p> <p>Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like</p> <p>Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)</p> <p>Estimated time for administration</p> <p>Student Directions & Assessment Task/Prompt – what does the student see/use?</p> | <table border="1" style="width: 100%; background-color: yellow;"> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"><th>Check All That Apply</th></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td> </td></tr> <tr><td style="text-align: center;">X</td></tr> </table> | Check All That Apply | | | | | | X |
| Check All That Apply | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| X | | | | | | | | |
| Other: Rating scale for self-evaluation over time | | | | | | | | |

A high quality assessment should be...Aligned

| Alignment | Rating Column | Comments |
|--|---------------|----------|
| <p>1a.</p> <p>Grade Level(s): 1, 2, 3</p> <p>Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: PE09-GR.1-S.1-GLE.2-EO.a; PE09-GR.1-S.1-GLE.2-EO.f; PE09-GR.2-S.1-GLE.3-EO.a; PE09-GR.3-S.1-GLE.1-EO.c</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-3</p> <p>Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels) : 1</p> | | |
| <p>1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: Dribbling measured by self-evaluation</p> | | |
| <p>1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): Dribbling, preferred hand, self-space, traveling, traveling and switching hands, keeping head-up while dribbling, controlling the ball while dribbling</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: Grade one matches with dribbling with preferred hand, controlling the ball-partial match; Grade two matches with self-assessment, not dribbling skill-full match; Grade three matches all task/skills assessed on the task sheet-full match</p> | <p>Full Match=5; Close Match=4; Partial Match=3; Minimal Match=2; No Match= 1</p> | |
| <p align="center">Aligned to Colorado Academic Standards Rating</p> | <p align="center">5</p> | |
| <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 align="center">Rating Column</p> | <p align="center">Comments</p> |
| <p>Please provide evidence from both the grade level expectations and assessment to support your response: It is more rigorous for 1st because students are not expected to dribble while traveling and/or switching hands. It is similar rigor for 2nd because students are expected to self-assess. It is similar rigor for 3rd are expected to be able to dribble with preferred and non-preferred hand, dribble while traveling and switching hands, keeping head out and controlling the ball.</p> | <p>Similar Rigor=2, More Rigor=1, Less Rigor=1</p> | |
| <p align="center">Rigor Level Rating</p> | <p align="center">2</p> | |

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 | <p>Check all that apply:</p> | <p align="center">Comments</p> |
| <p>2a. Does the rubric/scoring criteria align to Colorado Academic Standards in this assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: There is no rubric/scoring guide provided to score the students' self-assessments.</p> | <p>Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1</p> | <p>No way to measure student work other than just observing completion, but no standards of completion. No rubric. More appropriate for an addition to a portfolio.</p> |
| <p align="center">Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating</p> | <p align="center">1</p> | |

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: No unsatisfactory level and no criteria for what is proficient completion of the self-assessment.</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. Unclear on the specific criteria for the skill proficiency.</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;">1</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. Too much subjectivity in scoring the students' completed task sheets because it lacks a teacher rubric/scoring guide.</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;">1</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? No. Video.</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: Not enough space to write. Not specific to what students should be doing.</p> | High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1 | |
| Clear & Uncluttered Rating | 1 | |
| <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: Appropriate for a range of learners, but lacks specificity in the degree to which students perform the tasks/skills. For example, time spent dribbling, distance to dribble, direction, speed.</p> | High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1 | |
| Straight Forward Rating | 2 | |
| <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. Language is specific to dribbling skills.</p> | High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1 | |
| 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. Uses the word preferred hand and the standards use the word dominant hand. This may be confusing for students.</p> | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 | |
| Academic Language Rating | 1 | |
| <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> | Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1 | |
| Confusing Language Rating | 3 | |
| <p><i>*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)</i></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. Pictures would help with the ELLs and Students with Disabilities as well as non-readers.</p> | | |
| <p><i>Accommodations are commonly categorized in five ways: presentation, response, setting, and timing and scheduling:</i></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. | | |
| <p>3g: Are there adequate accommodations permitted for this assessment? Provide an explanation of your response. There were no accommodations.</p> | 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: An isolated manipulative skill, 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 dependant on if the student is self-assessing accurately. Due to the fact that proficient performance is not clearly identified, it is difficult to know to what extent the students have learned how to dribble successfully. | 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: If self-assessment is accurate, information can provide evidence of student learning. | 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: No 21st century learning skills because it is an isolated manipulative 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: Issues related to self-reporting and, more importantly, proficiency is never identified. | 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: If students self-assess correctly, can be used as a diagnostic assessment and communication. Should not be included in report card grades or as a summative assessment. | High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1 | |
| Clarity of Purpose Rating | 2 | |
| Summary | | |
| | Earned | Possible |
| Standards Rating | 5 | 5 |
| Rigor Rating | 2 | 2 |
| Subtotal | 7 | 7 |
| | | 100.0% |
| Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating | 1 | 3 |
| Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating | 1 | 3 |
| Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating | 1 | 3 |
| Inter-rater Reliability Rating | 1 | 3 |
| Student Work Samples Rating | 1 | 3 |
| Subtotal | 5 | 15 |
| | | 33.3% |
| Clear & Uncluttered Rating | 1 | 3 |
| Straight Forward Rating | 2 | 3 |
| Free of Cultural or Unintended Bias Rating | 3 | 3 |

| | | |
|--|----|-------|
| Academic Language Rating | 1 | 3 |
| Confusing Language Rating | 3 | 3 |
| Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating | 1 | 2 |
| Subtotal | 11 | 17 |
| | | 64.7% |
| 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 | 2 | 3 |
| Subtotal | 9 | 18 |
| | | 50.0% |
| Grand Total | 32 | 57 |
| | | 56.1% |

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

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