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: Washington State: Concepts of Health & Fitness for High School: http://www.k12.wa.us/HealthFitness/Assessments.aspx

Reviewer: Content Collaborative

Date of Review: 9-20-2012

Assessment Profile	
Item Types - check all that apply (note: there is often overlap among certain item types):	Check All That Apply
Selected Response (multiple choice, true-false, matching, etc.)	Х
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)	х
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	Х
Sample evidence to show what student performance might look like	Х
Materials (if needed to complete the assessment)	X
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): High School		
Indicate the Colorado Academic Standards and Grade Level Expectations evaluated by the Assessment: PE09-GR.HS-S.2-GLE.1; PE09-GR.HS-S.2-GLE.3; PE09-GR.HS-S.4-GLE.2		
Indicate the intended DOK range of the Grade Level Expectations: 1-4 Indicate the intended DOK of the assessment (list DOK levels): 4		
1b. Describe the content knowledge/concepts assessed by the set of items or the performance task: FITT Principal, Components of Fitness, Training Principals, Energy Balance,		
1c. List the skills/performance assessed (what are students expected to do?): Critical thinking, Problem Solving, Analysis, Evaluating		
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: Standard 2 GLE 1 meets a majority of the EO's, GLE 3 has 1-2 EO's. Standard 4 in GLE1 meets 1/5 and GLE2 meets a small portion of the EO's.	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: The majority of the EO's really are matching the Depth of		
Knowledge		
	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

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 assessment. Provide an explanation of your response: Exemplars list specific look fors that meet the GLE's and EO's addressed	Yes=3, Somewhat=2, No=1	
Rubric Aligned to Standards Rating	3	
2b. Are the score categories clearly defined and coherent across performance levels? Provide an explanation of your response: Through the exemplars there are clear definitions	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. All tasks are aligned with a score and the rubric	High=3, Moderate=2, Low or None=1	
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. It is very specific and detailed in the scoring guide and exemplars take the subjectivity out of the test and increases objectivity.	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? Yes exemplars use real student answers from test pilot	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,	Rating Column	Comments
gifted and talented students, and students with disabilities) 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: Very clear on answers and responses, clean looking test.	High=3, Moderate=2, Low=1	The 92 page document is a bit wordy and cluttered to cover 1 assessments requirements
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	
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: Clearly written strait forward and easy to understand. Questions are clearly aligned with best practices in testing	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: Uses multiple types of names from different backgrounds, genders etc. Very aware of diversity	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. Well done for a high School	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. Seems aligned with quality wording and high school understanding	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=D efining%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.		
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.		
 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. 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. Accommodations listed for ELL, reading skills, writing skills, which fits really well for a cognitive test. Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	Yes, Some identified=2; None identified =1	

Adequate Accommodations Allowed Rating	2	
A high quality assessmentIncreases Opportunities to Learn		
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)		Standard 2 specific that hits on the Standard 4
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 of concepts for outside of the school realm and the real world	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: Some of the Depth of Knowledge is so advanced that they probably can not come in with that rigorous of criteria and would require direct instruction to derive at answers on this cognitive level.	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: A lot of information to be discussed and a broad learning target that the individual is looking at. Many of the concepts and understanding are addressed in any given question on the assessment. Such a high DOK give a meaningful conversation.	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: Critical thinking and analysis and decision making are skills that can transfer to rigor in other content areas as well as 21st century	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 : Variety of information gathered in multiple different questioning techniques. Differently framed questions can still show the same answer .	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: Clear teacher directions and plenty of exemplars can show the purpose of assessment.	High=3; Moderate=2; Low or None=1	
Clarity of Purpose Rating	3	
Summary	Earned	Possible
Standards Rating	3	5
Rigor Rating	2	2
Subtotal	5	7
		71.4%
Rubric Aligned w/Standards Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Coherent Rating	3	3
Rubric/Scoring Aligned with Task Rating Inter-rater Reliability Rating	3	3
Student Work Samples Rating	3	3
Subtotal	15	15
Subtotal	15	100.0%
Clear & Uncluttered Rating	3	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	2	2
Subtotal	17	17
		100.0%
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	55	57
		96.5%
		This ayample is specific to the

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

Fully Recommended	X
Partially Recommended	
Not Recommended	

This example is specific to the High School Level & is a cognitive test, it should be also reviewed the MS specific and aligned with GLE and EO's for those grade but validity and recommendation will be the same