

PROVISO REPORT

**(Proviso 1.74, SDE: Physical Education Assessment Program –
Students Health and Fitness Act of 2005)**

February 6, 2008

Prepared by:

**Valerie Harrison, EdD, Deputy Superintendent, Division of Standards
and Learning; and**

**James Strainer, Education Associate, Office of Academic Standards;
and**

Andrea S. Keim, EdD, Independent Consultant

Report on Proviso

**South Carolina Physical Education Assessment Review Panel
Report**

South Carolina Physical Education Assessment Review Panel Report



Additional copies of this report may be obtained from the South Carolina Department of Education's Office of Academic Standards, by contacting James Strainer at 803-734-8099 or visiting <http://www.ed.sc.gov/agency/offices/cso/pe/>

Contents

Introduction.....	1
Panel A Focus Group.....	3
Panel B Focus Group.....	11
Panel C Focus Group.....	20
Appendix A: Recommendations for Physical Education Assessment Review/Revision Panels.....	28
Appendix B: Discussion Guide for Focus Groups.....	30
Appendix C: Assessment Panel Focus Group Questions.....	31
Appendix D: Feedback on the <i>Focus Groups Final Report</i> by all panel members from the November 16, 2007 meeting.....	37
Appendix E: Edited list of comments given at the Standards Support Institutes regarding SCPEAP.....	46
Appendix F: Timeline for South Carolina Physical Education Curriculum Standards and Assessment Review, Revision, and Implementation.....	49

South Carolina Physical Education Assessment Program (SCPEAP)

Focus Groups Report

October 2007

**Prepared by Dr. Andrea Keim for South Carolina State Department of
Education**

Introduction

The South Carolina Physical Education Assessment Program (SCPEAP) is designed as a state level assessment of physical education programs and is based on the *South Carolina Physical Education Curriculum Standards 2000*. In 2007/08 the State Department of Education (SDE) will review and revise the *South Carolina Physical Education Curriculum Standards 2000* as well as revise the program assessment component (SCPEAP).

In an effort to involve educators in the revision process, the SDE formed a Revision Panel of physical education experts and practitioners who are charged with the responsibility to review SCPEAP and make recommendations for revisions to the SDE. To assist the Revision Panel to collect data regarding the current assessment program, three review panels were formed from a pool of applicants recommended by districts. The review panels will make recommendations to the Revision Panel for changes to the program assessment based on their involvement and experience with the assessment process. (It should be noted that formation of the review panels is only one of the data collection strategies that will be used by the Revision Panel to inform their revisions of SCPEAP.) See list of panel members in Appendix A of this report.

On October 1, 2, and 3, 2007 three focus group meetings were conducted with the review panels. Each panel reflected a balance of school levels, geographic areas of the state, as well as experience with SCPEAP. There were two University professors, seventeen elementary teachers, five middle school teachers, and three high school teachers. Two participants identified themselves as practitioners at all school levels. The Revision Panel attended all focus group meetings as observers and listeners in order to hear first-hand the comments made during the focus group meetings. The groups were composed as follows:

Panel Experience with SCPEAP	Number of Panel Members in Attendance	Meeting Date 9:00 a.m. – 1:00 p.m.
Panel A - Attended SCPEAP training, administered assessment and reported data	10	October 1
Panel B - Attended SCPEAP training and administered assessment	9	October 2
Panel C - Attended SCPEAP training	7	October 3
Panel D - Revision Panel	14	October 1, 2, and 3

Each focus group was facilitated by Dr. Andrea Keim who directed the content and flow of the group's discussion, made sure the main topics were covered and ensured all focus group members had a chance to share ideas and provide input. The facilitator has over 25 years of experience as a teacher, district administrator, and state-level consultant and has not worked within the field of physical education.

Each focus group followed a discussion guide (framework of questions) developed by the facilitator with the flexibility to allow for exploration of some issues in greater depth as and when they appeared important. See Appendix B to view the discussion guide.

Each member of the focus group was asked to

- Listen to the question and think about the issue for a few minutes.
- Make notes about ideas you want to share.
- Share your response with the group.
- Once everyone has given a response, share your second or third response until all of your responses have been noted.
- Participate in an open discussion. Major opinions and themes which emerge and common points will be noted on a flip chart.

The next three sections of this report describe the responses of each focus group panel to SCPEAP.

PANEL A FOCUS GROUP

(Attended SCPEAP training, administered assessment, and reported data)

Warm-up Question: Participants were asked to rate from 1 - 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest) their satisfaction with SCPEAP training, SCPEAP administration, and SCPEAP data reporting. See table below for results.

School Level	Ratings Given to Training	Ratings Given to Administration	Ratings Given to Data Reporting
Elementary	5, 5, 5, 2 Aver. = 4.25	4, 1, 3, 1 Aver. = 2.25	4, 2, 3, 1 Aver. = 2.5
Middle	5, 4, 4 Aver. = 4.3	3, 5, 4 Aver. = 4.0	1, 4, 4 Aver. = 3
High School	4, 3, 2 Aver. = 3	1, 2, 4 Aver. = 2.3	2, 2, 3 Aver. = 2.3

Question One: What is the *most* important outcome SCPEAP has had or will have on your PE program? On the students? Summarize how or why that will happen.

Outcome of SCPEAP on the PE Program

- Will standardize assessment statewide - accountability
- Will produce better teaching
- Will standardized instruction
- Will identify our weak areas
- Will show difference between and within school levels

Outcome of SCPEAP on students

- Higher standards
- Held students accountable
- Some students looked forward to being assessed and being videotaped
- Some students were self-conscience
- Students more responsible for learning

Sample of Comments from Participants

Elementary

- Guides the curriculum and makes me accountable for what I teach.
- Students became better analyzers of their own work.
- In its present form, none. Assessment is a valued tool, but it should be for the student's growth.

Middle

-Made me look at my teaching and made me realize there must be a standard for all PE teachers in the state.

High school

- Makes everyone more aware of the standards and what is expected.*
- Forces teachers to really teach.*
- Makes students realize that PE is an important subject.*

Question Two: In what ways do you believe teachers' professional practice (i.e., teaching) has improved or will improve through the use of SCPEAP? If not, why not?

- Scheduling will be an issue
- Teachers will teach to the test
- Communication has improved between professionals
- Assists in the interpretation of standards
- Empowered me as a teacher
- Taught new units – stretched repertoire
- Organized teachers

Sample of Comments from Participants

Elementary

- SCPEAP has not improved my teaching.*
- Improvement depends on the individual. Some will use it to identify weakness in current programs and modify strategies.*
- Improved our technology skills.*

Middle

- Excellent teachers were recognized.*
- Coordinates teachers and teaching methods within the school and district.*

High school

- Don't believe it has an impact on teacher's practice.*
- Teachers will now teach to the test.*
- For some, it will provide guidelines.*

Question Three: What changes (revisions) would you make to SCPEAP, if any?

Changes to Administration

- Inform school administrators about SCPEAP
- Don't video tape curl-ups
- Use electronic forms /data templates
- Reduce amount of taping at all levels
- Change process used to make-up a program
- Reduce number of classes to assess

- Spread out assessments across grades
- Revise protocols—but don't do it during an active cycle
- Change scoring – teachers should not score
- Make it teacher-friendly and not time consuming
- Give feedback sooner on which classes chosen to assess
- Reduce the content – consider the facilities, teaching staff, schedules and time school has to commit to assessment
- A monitor should be required to assist teacher implementation of SCPEAP
- Study the impact of funds (lack of funds) to support assessment

Sample of Comments from Participants

Elementary

- Cut down on paper work; use technology.
- Reduce number of tapes required, number of classes assessed and number of protocols.
- Make allowances for facilities, equipment, and settings.
- Don't test only one class on five skills- spread out across.

Middle

- Set standards and stay with it.
- Require principals/administrators' involvement.
- Modify test based on number of teaching days, time for teaching, number of students and lack of facility space.

High school

- Use less stringent protocols.
- Don't video sports; video a lesson.

Changes to Training

- Increase hands-on and scoring samples
- Trainers should respond to questions consistently
- Reduce size of training groups
- Use technology to enhance peer training
- Emphasize district staff development
- Make it mandatory for all PE teachers
- Set protocols before training. Stop changing

Sample of Comments from Participants

Elementary

- Be sure that protocols are finalized prior to training.
- Use same trainers to eliminate giving different information.
- Need more scoring examples.

Middle

- Make it mandatory.

- Train by district.
- Give us more samples.

High school

- Increase hands-on practice.
- Offer more video samples.

Changes to Data Reporting

- Need a technology-friendly system
- Reduce the amount of recorded data
- Address rubrics– More uniformity between levels
- Need clearer scoring guidelines and make them more objective

Sample of Comments from Participants

Elementary

- Rubric- use average and not lowest score on rubrics.
- Reduce the number of tapes.
- Fitnessgram manual says it should not be used for teacher/program evaluation and yet we are using it in SCPEAP.

Middle

- Use electronic system and move from paper and pencil.

High School

- Need more detailed explanations of how to score.
- Use technology and make it less time consuming.

Question Four: What was the one most vexing problem(s) that occurred during either the administration, training, or reporting of data? Do you have a suggestion for how the problem can be fixed?

- Classroom management during taping
- Testing took up too much time
- Number of tapes should be reduced and/or number of classes reduced
- Make-up taping is a problem
- Rigidity of protocol
- Takes too much of my time after school day
- The video camera did not do adequate job
- Assist with scheduling written test administration

Sample of Comments from Participants

Elementary

- Very subjective.
- It is assumed that our district was meeting the time requirements.

Middle

- Not all teachers attended training.
- Curl-up is too individualized.
- Set-up time for equipment was time consuming.

High School

- It was difficult to get everyone videotaped.
- If you have 40-50 students and you are filming 1 or 2 students at a time, you cannot monitor the rest, let alone engage them in a meaningful way.

Question Five: On a scale of 1 - 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest) rate how well you believe SCPEAP is assessing the quality of a PE program. Give a reason for your rating?

School Level	Rating	Average
Elementary	3, 1, 4, 4	3.0
Middle	2, 4, 4	3.3
High School	4, 1, 3	2.7

Participants were asked a follow-up question: Does SCPEAP assess the PE program or the teacher? Response was mixed: some participants said it addressed the program, some of the teacher, and some said it did both.

Question Six: What were your expectations for SCPEAP training? Were they met? Why or why not?

Most participants said training met their expectations. The following comments are representative of all school levels.

- Offer more than six hours of training
- Offer more hands-on activities and more samples
- Sometimes teachers got inconsistent responses to questions
- Administrators need to be involved and need a customized training for their role in assessment.
- Size of training groups too large

Question Seven: Are there activities/topics covered in the training that should be omitted or revised? Please elaborate.

Question Eight: Are there activities/topics not currently in the training that should be included? Please elaborate. How about follow-up training?

The following responses are representative of all school levels to questions 7 and 8.

- Increase amount of time to score tapes
- We need a district "go-to person"
- We need follow-up training

- Need more staff in SCPEAP office to respond to questions
- Need a refresher video online or on DVD
- Need more time to practice scoring
- Curl-up too time consuming
- Use successful teachers in training to offer advice and create a list of common mistakes

Question Nine: What training materials did you find the most useful in terms of increasing your understanding of SCPEAP? Least useful?

The following comments are representative of all school levels.

- Need an online update at scheduled times throughout the year. Not all teachers got the updates
- Add tabs to the manual and make sure it includes recent updates
- Provide more videos with rubrics
- Every teacher should have a manual
- Get feedback (scores) sooner

Question Ten: What barriers have you encountered in terms of getting the SCPEAP training or materials you want and/or need?

The following comments are representative of all school levels.

- Each school should send a representative to training
- All physical education teachers should attend training
- Some schools may lack funds to send teachers to training
- Administration does not understand SCPEAP

Question Eleven: Write a question regarding SCPEAP for this Focus Group panel to respond to.

During the focus group meeting participants developed and discussed the following questions. During the discussion the Revision Panel and/or the representative of the SDE responded to clarify certain points.

- If you had to choose one element of the Fitnessgram, which element would be more of an indicator that the student would perform well?
- Do you believe PE program assessment is important to SC?
- Is there a more accurate way to assess without using one class performing 5 or 6 times?
- -The PE assessment is a great program, but you cannot blanket us with a one size fits all – where is the flexibility?
- When will the scores matter and how will they affect us?
- What is going to happen to SCPEAP if the state does not fully fund the Health/PE Act?
- Why not use other elements (weighted) as indicators of quality?

Question Twelve: As I have mentioned, the goal of this focus group was to identify recommendations for revision to the SCPEAP. If you had to summarize your advice to the Revision Panel in one sentence, what would your sentence be?

- Make SCPEAP doable
- Create consistency across levels and make it less subjective
- Determine a way to assess a fitness component
- Make it count/ make it mean something. Support will not come until it counts.
- Cut out elementary assessment items.
- Remember our differences: scheduling, number of students, facilities
- Make it teacher friendly, but accountable
- Make certain that the testing does not interfere with the limited amount of instructional -time we have to work with
- When SCPEAP first began, I attended meetings and my voice was not heard. I believe in assessment and accountability – but this is not the way. The main drive of revision should be teacher-led not professors who have not been in the classroom with children.
- Majority of the problems are in the elementary section.

Last Activity for Panel A: Participants were given an edited list of comments collected at the Standards Support Institutes regarding SCPEAP. Focus group members circled the five comments in each category (positive aspects, changes, and solutions) that they would like the Revision Panel to pay particular attention to.

While the Revision Panel should read all of the comments from the Institutes, the table below lists the comments that the focus group cited as important to bring to the Revision Panel’s attention.

Positive Aspects of SCPEAP
Supports the credibility of PE as an important part of the total curriculum; educating whole child.
Opportunity to obtain necessary and needed equipment
Consistency between schools
Staff development opportunities and resources.
Student outcomes is the focus
Changes to SCPEAP
Assessment is not consistent between schools; differences in facilities; facilities not taken into account; not all facilities are the same
Take averages of student scores with the lowest score being the ultimate score; maybe take average of scores rather than taking lowest score.
Time consuming; too much data; Need to reduce the time away from instruction because of video taping; Eliminate or change data collection through video taping; grading videos takes too much time.

Make the assessment less subjective; there is a lack of consistency in grading
Solutions SCPEAP
Consider using the total program (facility, teacher schedules, numbers of students served, number of minutes, etc) as a way to assess the PE program; determine multiple measures of accountability for complete program assessment
Unannounced visits to assess programs; State Visitation Team; periodic visits by an assessment/monitoring team (unannounced); outside evaluators; unannounced visits by an assessment team who would look at multiple components of instruction
Electronic reporting via technology.
Assessment should reflect differences in facilities and students (socio-economic factors/student physical limitations, etc.); include facility issues in assessment impact
Submit curl-up scores – not video

PANEL B FOCUS GROUP
(Attended SCPEAP training and administered assessment)

Note: Panel B had seven elementary school participants, one middle school participant, and one university participant with high school, elementary, and middle school experience. The ratings and comments will not be displayed by school level so as not to attribute specific responses to any one individual. A panel member of Focus Group B sent additional comments after the meeting to the facilitator via email. These comments are listed at the end of this section.

Warm-up Question: Participants were asked to rate from 1 - 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest) their satisfaction with SCPEAP training, SCPEAP administration, and SCPEAP data reporting. See table below for results.

School level	Ratings given to Training	Ratings given to Administration
Elementary (7) Middle (1) University (1)	4,4,4,4,3,4,3,4,1 Average = 3.4	5,2,4,3,4,3,4,1, nr Average = 3.25

Question One: What is the *most* important outcome SCPEAP has had or will have on your PE program? On the students? Summarize how or why that will happen.

Outcome of SCPEAP on the PE Program:

- None
- Brought attention – got some money and time
- Organize curriculum both at school and across state
- Accountability and recognition
- Data to support needed changes
- Empowered teachers

Outcome of SCPEAP on students

- Students became more motivated because of accountability
- Some students uneasy with individual focus
- Expectations are clear to students
- High level students feel positive but lower level students didn't like it
- Improved student performance
- Pride in seeing themselves perform on video

Sample of Comments from Participants

Program

- SCPEAP takes up many weeks and shrinks curriculum.
- SCPEAP raised the importance of PE in school (respect from others).
- Gives a framework to develop long range plans.
- Focused each unit more specifically on the standards.
- This program has not helped me but has caused me great concern. Cuts into real teaching time.
- If implemented accurately teachers will have data to reflect on their programs and support their claims of student learning, equipment, facility and time needs.

Students

- I have always assessed students so this was nothing new to them. Less skilled students had an attitude, "I failed because I am not good enough."
- Accountability – makes every teacher teach appropriate skills and not just "rolling out the ball."

Question Two: In what ways do you believe teachers' professional practice (i.e., teaching) has improved or will improve through the use of SCPEAP? If not, why not?

- Guideline for curriculum improvement
- Aligned assessment with standards
- Helps improve observational techniques
- Increase in standards-based statewide training and professional development
- Holds teachers more accountable for teaching the standards
- Time consuming; takes away from instructional time

Sample of Comments from Participants

- There will be less time for planning and involvement in other school activities.
- Assessment aligned with the state standards.
- Benchmarks and objectives are clear.
- There is now a focus on updated training and development.
- Action research at it's best will allow teachers to reflect on the process as well as the data and make necessary adjustments or reinforce good practices (teaching strategies).

Question Three: What changes (revisions) would you make to

SCPEAP, if any?

Changes to Administration

- Eliminate curl-up and replace it with another component. It's hard to get it all on video.
- Sampling overall rather than one class is the "fair way."
- Time consuming. Why not eliminate teachers required to go back and watch own video?
- Eliminate some performance indicators in elementary, such as throwing and catching, creative movement, throwing, and refine curl-ups.
- Shorten movement forms (dance).
- Condense or reduce assessments in elementary.
- Use an observation team to film teaching whole class.
- Why are we using Fitnessgram in SCPEAP?
- Require each district to have a PE Coordinator (with no other duties).
- Require one or two assessments every year instead of the three-year cycle.

Sample of Comments from Participants

-Do less taping; tape the whole class practicing skills.
-Prioritize assessments given to 2nd and 5th grades in order to condense the process.
-Reduce the paperwork.
-Use a sampling of students from all PE classes.
-How can we improve fitness if we only see students 60 minutes a week?
-Consideration of individual circumstance such as schedules, students, etc.
-Find some balance for teaching and assessment in regards to time. For example, elementary teachers have 60 minutes a week and middle schools have students' everyday for 12 weeks for 50 minutes.

Changes to Training

- More time needed
- Follow-up training needed
- Need support training materials
- Revise CD and add more examples
- Training by district – district coordinator can be responsible for training support
- Content presented at each workshop should be consistent across state.

Sample of Comments from Participants

-Conduct training by performance indicator.
-Collaborative training on video analysis with own videos.

-Brush-up training could remain as is, however we need more in-depth training for teachers new to SCPEAP.
 -Be more open to suggestions. I did not feel like my input was welcomed.
 -Create online discussion groups or certain "homework" practice activities to reinforce the concepts learned in the one- day training.
 -Create multiple opportunities for training; mandate teachers to attend.

Question Four: What was the one most vexing problem(s) that occurred during either the administration and training? Do you have a suggestion for how the problem can be fixed?

- Teachers requirement to watch tapes
- Time
- Curl-ups
- Getting help to assist with classroom monitoring
- Spread out assessment across cycle
- The number of tapes to watch
- Consistency of trainers
- Rubrics were not clear; could not determine between points
- Training too short
- At all levels the "playing fields" are not equal: facilities, equipment, instruction time, support.

Question Five: On a scale of 1 - 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest) rate how well you believe SCPEAP is assessing the quality of a PE program. Give a reason for your rating?

School Level	Rating	Average
Elementary, Middle, University	4,4,4,4,4,2,2,3, nr	3.4

Sample of Comments from Participants

Rated a 2

-If the goal is to be an assessor on a few skills, then it is working. If it is to provide a wide-variety of opportunities for students to learn, then it is not assessing quality of a PE program.

-I don't feel this instrument is looking at the "total program" I feel it is more of a teacher assessment, can he/she follow the test protocol. Fitness should not be graded, that should be only for the student to look at improvement.

Rated a 4

-SCPEAP addressed basic skills that are needed to be a physically active person for life and assesses the standards.

*-No assessment is perfect. There may not be a way to evaluate all areas and aspects of a PE program, however the SCPEAP evaluates the curriculum being taught, teaching strategies and effectiveness and student learning.
-Assessing specific (individual, dual, team, dance, fitness) areas and quality of these components. -Not an assessment of the entire program.
Snapshot/overview and not a comprehensive assessment.*

Not Rated

-Holds teachers accountable for student learning in their programs –what else has done that at the state level in PE? This was the first attempt for our profession and we need to fight to retain SCPEAP in some fashion.

Question Six: What were your expectations for SCPEAP training? Were they met? Why or why not?

- Good overview and implementation but lacked follow-up
- Never explained the purpose of SCPEAP
- Too confusing, too much information

Sample of Comments from Participants

*-The first training was great, subsequent training was too short, too narrow and not hands-on.
-Need more video examples.
-What is the purpose of the assessment: To measure the teacher? Program? Students?
-Expectations were met through information sharing, problem solving and shared concerns to improve the quality of programs.
-Yes. It consisted of the overview of SCPEAP, its requirements and implementation protocols. Comes down to time, follow up and ongoing support.*

Question Seven: Are there activities/topics covered in the training that should be omitted or revised? Please elaborate.

Question Eight: Are there activities/topics not currently in the training that should be included? Please elaborate. How about follow-up training?

Participant's responses to these two questions are summarized below.

- Have smaller groups
- Have teachers bring a practice tape from their own class to work with and incorporate into the training
- Create sessions on in-depth or more specific training on certain skills
- Schedule training in different areas of the state
- Spend more time in training session on each protocol

- Need more time
- Follow-up training should be ongoing and consistent and have input from the teachers
- Involve a district PE coordinator

Question Nine: What training materials did you find the most useful in terms of increasing your understanding of SCPEAP? Least useful?

- Need more support documents such as handouts with samples on how to implement
- Need group of helpers to assist statewide

Question Ten: What barriers have you encountered in terms of getting the SCPEAP training or materials you want and/or need?

- Lack of support - can't get time off and haven't had proper financial support.
- Lack of administrative support at district and school level.
- There are no consequences if district does not submit or is not compliant.
- Districts not compliant still get money.
- Accountability – where are districts spending their money?

Question Eleven: Write a question regarding SCPEAP for this Focus Group panel to respond to.

During the focus group meeting participants developed and discussed the following questions. During the discussion the Revision Panel and/or the representative of the SDE responded to clarify certain points.

- Make sure we are willing to put teeth into the PE Bill – consequences.
- Make sure the assessment will have a positive impact on our teachers and students.
- Are there any components of the assessment that could be eliminated?
- Should the Fitnessgram be replaced and by what tool? And justify why Fitnessgram is being used.
- Is it necessary for teachers to go back and grade their student's from the videos in order to show an effective PE program?
- The performance indicators need to be cut down as a whole to only the most important.
- By reducing some of the categories, would not we still meet the criteria?
- What is the purpose of the assessment? Is it to assess the teacher's ability to teach and assess, to assess the student's ability to complete skills, or to assess the entire PE program?
- The Fitnessgram test instructions say "not to be used for assessment purposes" – come up with a plan or statement to justify SCPEAP use or

justify not using and brainstorm alternatives to satisfy the same objectives.

- How can we convince local/district administration that the SCPEAP program will be maintained and implemented regularly to hold PE programs accountable?

Question Twelve: As I have mentioned, the goal of this focus group was to identify recommendations for revision to the SCPEAP. If you had to summarize your advice to the Revision Panel in one sentence, what would your sentence be?

- Stress to SDE and lawmakers the value to SC schools of quality PE programs (back up with data to support position.)
- A “bionic” PE assessment program, meaning make it better, stronger, faster, etc. than before.
- If you were still in school as a student, would you like spending nearly half of a school year on practicing video taping and fitness assessing (2 times) a year? There are lots of “PE voices” not being heard. Try to listen to all.
- Make this assessment more manageable by reducing the number of performance indicators.
- Keep the assessment for accountability and support but make changes in order to help make the program more manageable.
- Look at the time constraints when developing the revisions.
- Be fair and open to all comments concerning the assessment. Realize that the opposition *wasn't equal in representation. Don't sit back and think a Bill is passed and we'll be ok!!*

Last Activity for Panel B: Participants were given an edited list of comments collected at the Standards Support Institutes regarding SCPEAP. Focus group members circled the five comments in each category (positive aspects, changes, and solutions) that they would like the Revision Panel to pay particular attention to.

While the Revision Panel should read all of the comments from the Institutes, the table below lists the comments that the focus group cited as important to bring to the Revision Panel's attention.

Positive Aspects of SCPEAP
Supports the credibility of PE as an important part of the total curriculum; educating the whole child.
Student Health and Fitness Act is Positive
Created communication and dialogue with other professionals; opportunities for sharing among districts and with others
Focused on the standards so teachers must know standards
Uniform assessment system

Changes to SCPEAP
Assessment is not consistent between schools; differences in facilities; facilities not taken into account; not all facilities are the same
Time consuming; too much data; Need to reduce the time away from instruction because of video taping; Eliminate or change data collection through video taping; grading videos takes too much time.
Fairness and subjectivity concerns regarding "grading" using the rubric
Inequity in time "exposure" with students
Solutions SCPEAP
Training-include the instruction tasks; More quality, meaningful training
5 th grade – too rigorous; Eliminate 5 th grade curl-up video
Need fewer number of elementary skills
Students inactive during individual videotaping

Excerpt from Panel B member email received by the facilitator October 11, 2007.

...I will list below the areas that concern my district about SCPEAP:

SCPEAP is not clear about whom they are assessing: program, student, or teacher? It appears "teacher," since we have to grade the tapes and then send them off to be graded again. This is not necessary and a waste of our time. And can the SCPEAP board assure me that the teacher grading my tapes is more qualified than me...or is it the "roll the ball out" teacher grading me?

Taping the skills is time consuming, because only one child can be taped at a time. Teacher observation and checklists are faster and NO child is singled out!!!! Every child is working at the same time on the skill. In this situation, all children are looking at the child performing. When a child is taking the PACT test, is the rest of the class leaning over his/her shoulder to see what they do?

All schools are NOT created equal! When we administer SCPEAP not all schools have the same teaching situation with regard to how many times the students are seen in a week, length of the PE period, student/ teacher ratio, facilities, equipment, etc. In the classroom, all students are taught every day all year long the same number of minutes in math, language arts, science, and social studies. At best, students have physical education once or twice a week.

Required testing dimensions force classes that are normally taught inside to have to TEST outside. This adds another variable to the test results, and this is generally not a positive variable

Fitnessgram should not be used as a means of assessment but as a tool for the children to see where they need to improve. It should be a personal experience for

the child to consult with his teacher and not be embarrassed by the process of taping!!!!

Bottom line: If the SDE wants to know if the districts are providing PE programs that promote and support the Student Health and Fitness Act, then they should send an evaluating team to observe!!!!!! And if the teacher has been truly teaching, it will be evident by what is taking place in the room! The team should see confident children who have been exposed to a well-rounded program, enjoying activities that promote a healthy lifestyle. You can't fake that!!!!!!

**PANEL C FOCUS GROUP
(Attended SCPEAP training)**

Panel C had five elementary school participants, one middle school participant, and one high school participant. The ratings and comments will not be displayed by school level so as not to attribute specific responses to any one individual.

Note: To prepare for the Panel group discussion, one participant surveyed twenty-one PE teachers (representing all school levels) about SCPEAP. This participant's comments (orally as well as written) reflected these surveyed teachers. The participant was encouraged to send the completed survey with comments to the SDE contact.

Warm-up Question: Participants were asked to rate from 1 - 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest) their satisfaction with SCPEAP training. See table below for results.

School level	Ratings given to Training
Elementary (5)	5,5,4,4,4,3,2
Middle (1)	Average = 3.8
University (1)	

Question One: What is the *most* important outcome SCPEAP has had or will have on your PE program? On the students? Summarize how or why that will happen.

Outcome of SCPEAP on the PE Program

- The teacher will only be able to work on the one or two things that are going to be assessed.
- I have used authentic assessment techniques (rubrics, video, activity logs). SCPEAP has helped me put what is most important first. The requirements of the program have helped revise my philosophy of doing what's right for kids versus what I want to do.
- SCPEAP has caused a lot of ill feeling in our district. We do feel accountability is needed. But have not felt comfortable with the way this program has been administered. This program has been very time-consuming and frustrating for the teachers.
- Holds teachers accountable. Integrates PE into school curriculum and lets others see importance of PE programs.
- Gives the program a variety of areas to cover and holds schools accountable for providing resources/equipment in order to complete testing. Limits a variety of activities.
- It will allow me to see how the students develop. It holds me responsible to plan meaningful lessons. It gives specific outcomes to

lessons. It allows other teachers to see that we are accountable for something other than just "rolling out a ball." Some classroom teachers don't like it because extra PE time takes away from instruction.

- It will give my program the validity it deserves. It will demand a budget for my program that I have never had. It will require my fellow classroom teacher to acknowledge me as a professional.

Outcome of SCPEAP on Students

- I have not filmed the students. Adding the filming of individual students for assessment would take away from my other activities and teaching. My students have "bought into" improving their fitness. I do think seeing your class on film and students seeing themselves are beneficial.
- My students are receiving more fitness activities. I have also noticed an increase in the students' outside activity. Also, outcomes over time allow the student to see progressions.
- It will make my students and their families open their eyes to the importance of *physical* fitness and physical activity as it relates to their lifelong fitness.
- They can see their development in certain areas. It allows them to see growth in weaker areas. For parents they see there is a purpose to PE.
- Holds them accountable, with the different areas to be administered it allows different ability levels to succeed at different activities (one student may not be a great runner, but a great thrower).
- Because teachers must teach to standards – programs that are not conforming will be recognized and therefore improve with assistance. Schools that are being tested have to provide equipment and enough time for our students to learn. We need to give our students more time in PE or make choice not to have high national standards.
- As the district's facilitator for the middle school scope and sequence last year all middle school teachers are teaching 1.5 weeks of fitness, then 3 weeks of bowling, then 3 weeks of racquet ball, then 1.5 weeks of fitness. We are teaching the same schedule for all 4 nine weeks. That's because we are being assessed in 2 areas plus the Fitnessgram. The problem is that we are being made to teach to the test and the children are being left out.

Question Two: In what ways do you believe teachers' professional practice (i.e., teaching) has improved or will improve through the use of SCPEAP? If not, why not?

- We need to have more credibility, but the current system is not the answer.
- Spending too much time teaching the assessment.

- Will allow those “roll out the ball teachers” to just teach the assessment just so it will make them look good and they continue to “roll the ball out and read the newspaper.
- Forces teachers to teach to standards. Forces teachers to grow and use technology and best practices. Forces many to change – but more important to grow and teach more effectively. Dance and gymnastics are now taught.
- Holds teachers accountable. Teachers are required to teach a variety of activities that they may not have taught before.
- It gives you a very specific thing to work on. The time constraint is my main concern. If we focus on all events/parts it can take away from teachers’ individuality.
- It will make teachers teach skills and not just play games for the fun of it. By teaching skills students will have the confidence and knowledge to use the rest of their lives to stay moving.
- I am a better time manager. I am a better assessor. PE teachers will need to earn their paychecks and put their students first (not their athletes). I am frustrated that one teacher can read the newspaper and get the same paycheck as I do.
- Accountability is necessary for professionalism. We need to teach to our standards if we were not already.

Question Three: What changes (revisions) would you make to SCPEAP, if any?

Changes to Training

- The training is probably adequate for what is to be taught. We need to allow more time for the components. Teachers do not need to grade as it is too time consuming.
- More time and perhaps offer at district level.
- Assessment plan is not scored, but Performance Indicator One is. So spend more time in workshops on what receives a higher percentage of the score.
- Longer training session. Maybe break it into more days. I could use more training on scoring the students.
- Use real life teaching situations. More hands-on activities. I am a learner by doing not watching.
- Training was always in ideal settings that I don’t have.
- Spend more time actually assessing standards.
- Teachers expressed they need more training because of the amount of material presented. Also need training on classroom management.
- Make-up test for students is time consuming.

Question Four: What was the one most vexing problem(s) that occurred during either the administration and training? Do you have a suggestion for how the problem can be fixed?

With the permission of the Panel, facilitator did not ask Panel C to discuss Question Four.

Question Five: On a scale of 1 - 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest) rate how well you believe SCPEAP is assessing the quality of a PE program. Give a reason for your rating?

School Level	Rating	Average
Elementary, Middle, HS	2, 3, 3, 4, 4, 1.5, 4.5	3.1

Sample of Comments from Participants

Rated a 1.5

-Because of too many discrepancies. Being put in front of a camera can be intimidating for a child. Students not being filmed are not involved in moving and are missing out on activity time.

Rated a 2

-Should it be SCPEAP or building administrators who assess a quality PE program? Is SCPEAP pushing us more toward teaching to the test and wasting instructional time? We question valid results – it is too subjective.

Rated a 3

*-By providing you with what you will assess it limits those that have students that excel in other activities.
-It does look at a variety of activities, but I don 't like other students waiting on someone to be tested.*

Rated a 4

*-It was derived from our PE standards. If you are teaching the standards then your PE program should be fine.
-On the right path of accountability, but need higher benchmarks and an affective component (initiative and enthusiasm from the child). Question the objectivity of the assessment. But it was developed by the teachers, for the teachers.*

Mixed Ratings

*2nd grade = 5
5th grade = 4.5 Grade invasion/net assessments are actually below grade level*

Question Six: What were your expectations for SCPEAP training? Were they met? Why or why not?

Sample of Comments from Participants

-I expected more hands-on training with more time. I also was surprised in the training to be told that middle school is just a mess and not sure what we are going to do about that.

-PE teachers at my level showed me how to collect data.

-Yes. My expectation was to be informed.

-Yes. As for helping me with questions on how to score the videos. I was very concerned before the training, but felt more at ease after. And no, in that I wish more emphasis was placed on how to set-up the test.

-Yes. Information provided with some hands-on. No- real situation; I expected more on rating and information collection.

-Yes. They did what they said they were going to do. Always efficient, many applicable handouts. Actually exceeded my expectations.

-Yes/No/ok. Needed more time for training. More information on class management, how to justify reduction of instruction time caused by assessment, and how to deal with facility problems.

Question Seven: Are there activities/topics covered in the training that should be omitted or revised? Please elaborate.

Question Eight: Are there activities/topics not currently in the training that should be included? Please elaborate. How about follow-up training?

Participants' responses to these two questions are summarized below.

- Less time on planning and more time on actual test.
- Shorten time spent on assessment plan. More time on scoring of students.
- The training dates fell on a holiday for our district. Offer more training dates options.
- Need more information on what to do with students not being filmed, set-up and more hands-on.
- More time on how to score. Make connection between program and student assessment.
- Follow-up training should include more time for setting-up video and more time for scoring students.
- Use real life teaching situations, more set-up instructions and more hands-on.
- More training sessions. Spread information out across sessions.
- Suggest activities other students can do while you are assessing.
- Justify the waste of instructional time. Students are off task during testing.
- Need more hands-on tasks.

Question Nine: What training materials did you find the most useful in terms of increasing your understanding of SCPEAP? Least useful?

Sample of Comments from Participants

- *Make sure update gets to PE teachers.*
- *Need money to purchase materials.*
- *Handbook and CD are useful.*
- *Keep handbook updated. Information is always changing.*
- *The constant changing (revision) of handbook can be confusing. If the teacher does not take the incentive to get updates, the wrong information can be given to students.*
- *I use handbooks on a regular basis.*

Question Ten: What barriers have you encountered in terms of getting the SCPEAP training or materials you want and/or need?

Sample of Comments from Participants

- Need a fulltime PE coordinator.*
- Lack of leadership is a barrier. Confusing channel of communication – Is SDE, SCAHPERD, or SCPEAP running the show?*
- Who is in charge of the programs at the district?*
- Leadership is lacking.*
- None – We have done some “in house” district in-service with our PE teachers but we need more. We will meet again in January and will invite a SCPEAP representative to help clear up misinformation.*

Question Eleven: Write a question regarding SCPEAP for this Focus Group panel to respond to.

During the focus group meeting participants developed and discussed the following questions. During the discussion the Revision Panel and/or the representative of the SDE responded to clarify certain points.

- If you do not like this assessment process, how would you assess differently? What changes would you make?
- How do you justify some PE teachers being able to complete the assessment that have facility differences?
- When will Cycle 3 be assessed? What will happen to schools that don't perform well?
- Why do we only assess 2,5,8, and HS?
- What is the timeline for revision?
- Will the current SCPEAP be revised or will the Revision Panel start with a new assessment blueprint?
- Who really is SCPEAP? Materials, workshops come from various groups and that is confusing administrators.
- What happens to schools that are not compliant (minutes)?

Question Twelve: As I have mentioned, the goal of this focus group

was to identify recommendations for revision to the SCPEAP. If you had to summarize your advice to the Revision Panel in one sentence, what would your sentence be?

- To look at the overall assessment – the time it takes to administer and grade. Look at another way to collect data.
- Please make your revisions with what is best for SC children and their health in the front of your mind and heart.
- Do what is best for our students and our PE programs.
- Make the assessment more time manageable for the teachers and the students.
- Consider: Communication of information, time management, and how to manage students who are not tested.
- Keep the assessment, but revisions are needed. At 5th grade only do one dance. And after all the cycles are done, revise to make assessments more rigorous.
- It would be helpful if a survey was sent to all active certified PE teachers in SC to receive feedback from ALL. Listen to all teachers and not just members of PE organizations.

Last Activity for Panel C: Participants were given an edited list of comments collected at the Standards Support Institutes regarding SCPEAP. Focus group members circled the five comments in each category (positive aspects, changes, and solutions) that they would like the Revision Panel to pay particular attention to.

While the Revision Panel should read all of the comments from the Institutes, the table below lists the comments that the focus group cited as important to bring to the Revision Panel’s attention.

Positive Aspects of SCPEAP
Supports the credibility of PE as an important part of the total curriculum; educating the whole child.
Professionalism and respect as educators.
Staff development opportunities and resources.
More feedback to parents
Student Health and Fitness Act is Positive
Changes to SCPEAP
Make the assessment less subjective; there is a lack of consistency in grading
Time consuming; too much data; Need to reduce the time away from instruction because of video taping; Eliminate or change data collection through video taping; grading videos takes too much time.
Assessment is not consistent between schools; differences in facilities; facilities not taken into account; not all facilities are the same
Fairness and subjectivity concerns regarding “grading” using the rubric

Solutions SCPEAP
Peer monitoring committee grades the video tapes rather than the teacher who taped the video; teachers do not self-evaluate video; eliminate self-evaluation
Unannounced visits to assess programs; State Visitation Team; periodic visits by an assessment/monitoring team (unannounced); outside evaluators; unannounced visits by
More communication between trainers and classroom teachers.
Use Fitnessgram for documentation of fitness

Appendix A
Recommendations for Physical Education
Program Assessment Review Panels

Panel A — Attended training, administered SCPEAP, and reported data

Name	District	Position	Level
Anne O'Sullivan	Dorchester 2	Teacher	E
Chuck Parker	Anderson 5	Teacher	M
Cynthia Heos	Greenville	Teacher	M
Jane Abbott	Spartanburg 7	Teacher	E
Calvin Hudgens	York 3	Teacher	H
Lori Florence	Anderson 2	Teacher	M
Thomasine Bowling	Greenwood 50	Teacher	E
Maeberta Bob	Winthrop	Retired	ALL
Ramona Gonzalez	Richland 2	Teacher	H
William King	York 4	Teacher	E
Nancy Vickers	Cherokee	Teacher	E

Panel B — Attended training and administered SCPEAP

Name	District	Position	Level
Donavan Carr	Colleton	Teacher	E
Gina Hilts	Richland/Lexington 5	Teacher	E
Kathy Linton	Aiken	Teacher	E
Kelly Kowalchuk	Charleston	Teacher	E
Kathy Dorn	Lexington 1	Teacher	E
David Vaughan	Anderson 1	Teacher	E
Pamela Banks	Berkeley	Teacher	E
Scott Arrington	Oconee	Teacher	M
Sandy Wilson	Winthrop	Professor	ALL

Panel C — Attended training only

Name	District	Position	Level
Todd Seagle	Spartanburg 2	Teacher	E
Erin Coleman	Aiken	Teacher	E
Kathy Keane	Richland 2	Teacher	E
Lindsay Jameson	Orangeburg 5	Teacher	E
Lisa Davis	Lexington 5	Teacher	M
Mary Helen Martin	Pickens	Teacher	E
Sandra Osborne	Lexington 1	Teacher	H

Panel D — Revision Panel

Name	District	Position	Level
Clare Hodge	Lexington 1	DO	ALL
Dan Young	Spartanburg 3	Consultant	ALL
Lisa Frampton	Greenville	Teacher	E
Kym Kirby	Lander	Professor	ALL
Debbie Bernhagen	Richland 2	Teacher/DO	M
Frances Driggers	Horry	Teacher	H
Gwen Massey	Anderson 4	Assistant Principal	E
Jane Page	York 3	Teacher	M
Lisa Curtis	Richland 1	Teacher	E
Mike McGee	Union	DO	ALL
Mickey Taylor	Winthrop University	Retired	ALL
Skip Strainer	USC	Professor	ALL
Kathy Sullivan	Lancaster	Teacher	M
Kelly Hoy	Darlington	Teacher	E
Denise Rush	Berkeley	Teacher	E/M

Appendix B

Discussion Guide for Focus Groups

Comments from the facilitator

The role of facilitator is to direct the content and flow of the group's discussion and to make sure that the main topics are covered. I am here to ask questions, to listen, and to make sure everyone has a chance to share ideas and provide input.

A written report describing today's discussion will be prepared and given to the State Department of Education. All information collected is confidential as to who provided it.

Objectives

Our purpose today is to discuss **SCPEAP**. The primary objective is to make recommendations for revision to the program based on your involvement and experience with the assessment process.

Ground Rules

Before we begin the discussion, I would like to go over two basic ground rules.

1. Express your own views even when they are not in agreement with other speakers. We need to know the range of opinion held by all focus group members. This is not intended to be an exercise where you try to persuade others to your own point of view.
2. There aren't any right or wrong answers, so feel free to offer both positive and negative viewpoints.

The Process

Each participant will

- Listen to the question and think about the issue for a few minutes.
- Make notes about ideas you want to share.
- Share your response with the group.
- Once everyone has given a response, share your second or third response until all of your responses have been noted.
- Participate in an open discussion; major opinions and themes which emerge and common points will be noted on a flip chart.

Appendix C
SCPEAP Panel Focus Group Questions

Because each focus group has different experiences with SCEAP, not every issue (question) will be addressed with each focus group and issues may be addressed as they arise that are not on this list.

Warm-up: Please write a number from 1 - 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest) to describe your satisfaction with each component of SCPEAP. Please write a short reason for each rating.

SCPEAP Training _____:

SCPEAP Administration _____:

Reporting SCPEAP data _____:

1. What is the *most* important outcome SCPEAP has had or will have on your PE program? On the students? Summarize how or why that will happen.

PE Program:

On the students:

2. In what ways do you believe teachers' professional practice (i.e., teaching) has improved or will improve through the use of SCPEAP? If not, why not?

3. *What changes (revisions) would you make to SCPEAP, if any?*

Administration:

Training:

Reporting of data:

4. What was the one most vexing problem(s) that occurred during either the administration, training, or reporting of data? Do you have a suggestion for how the problem can be fixed?

5. On a scale of 1 - 5 (1 = lowest; 5 = highest) rate how well you believe SCPEAP is assessing the quality of a PE program. Give a reason for your rating?

6. What were your expectations for SCPEAP training? Were they met? Why or why not?

7. Are there activities/topics covered in the training that should be omitted or revised? Please elaborate.

8. Are there activities/topics not currently in the training that should be included? Please elaborate. How about follow-up training?

9. What training materials did you find the most useful in terms of increasing your understanding of SCPEAP? Least useful?

10. What barriers have you encountered in terms of getting the SCPEAP training or materials you want and/or need?

11. Write a question regarding SCPEAP for this Focus Group panel to respond to.

12. As I have mentioned, the goal of this focus group was to identify recommendations for revision to the SCPEAP. If you had to summarize your advice to the Revision Panel in one sentence, what would your sentence be?

13. Is there anything else you would like to tell the group about your experience with SCPEAP?

14. Now for the last activity: Look at the list of comments given during the Standards Support Institutes regarding SCPEAP and respond as indicated.

Thank you for your participation

Appendix D
Feedback on the *Focus Groups Final Report* by all panel
members from the November 16, 2007 meeting

I agree with the findings presented in the report.

- All districts are not the same. Please keep in mind that to have an excellent program for our students, it must start from the top down. Teachers are going to have to be held accountable to do their job with what they have. We have to start something to get to where we need to be in the future.
- I don't agree with everyone's comment but everyone is entitled to an opinion.
- Everything appears to have been covered.
- I agree that assessment is needed, but a tool that is less subjective, less time consuming and less data. I agree that there is too much inconsistency in training, collection and grading.
- Under Q11 – First question was incomplete. Question was "If you had to choose one element of the Fitnessgram to indicate overall fitness, which element would be more of an indicator that the student would perform well on other elements?" Revision panel did not respond to questions but developed questions.
- I think that the report was accurate. The elementary, middle and high school levels are totally different documents – seems that if answers were broken down into these levels, the responses would be more targeted and efficient.
- I think the report is an accurate representation of the panel discussions. But I do not think that many of the statements are an accurate representation of the PEAP or of PE standards and assessment process. Statements often based on emotion rather than professional knowledge or actual experience with PEAP (surprise).
- But have some reservations. After reading the report, it appears that there was not a consistent or even representation of the 3 levels. The elementary level had very large numbers, and the middle and high school were lower. As a middle school assessment trainer, a evaluator of the assessment, and (!) lastly a Cycle 2 participant, this concerns me. I feel the middle school assessment was more in tone with the needs of middle school Physical Educators. In working with elementary teachers in my district, I felt their objections seemed valid. So, it concerns me that this process is "lumping" the 3 levels together. I feel it is an important part of the process to look carefully at each level. It would seem appropriate that levels of assessment would be very different, in order to match the standards. What is appropriate assessment for a 2nd grader would not be an appropriate assessment for an 8th grader. With this in mind, I feel an appropriate assessment can be designed. And this should assist changing the assessment in a more analytical manner, more than emotional. I am saying it is not standard based to lump the assessment! Thank you for your hard work and effort!
- I don't know how Dr. Keim did it . . . but she captured all sides of the assessment concerns! I still don't feel there were enough teachers that had my concerns on her panel, but Dr. Keim did get most of the bigger issues that we feel the panel needs to consider!
- Number of tapes at the elementary level must be reduced. Objective scoring. Testing took too much time.

- I believe that the major points of concern expressed during our meeting have been addressed within the focus group report document.
- The report is a pretty good summary. I hope that the writing team will not completely scrap the current assessment. A lot of good came from the PEAP as it is. The biggest problem was the number of tapes and the fact that student performance was weighted so heavily. Maybe adding an assessment of facilities, equipment and minutes taught and weighing that into the final score would work.
- I think the report was accurate with the information that was shared during my panel group.
- I agree with the findings.
- Accurate, well presented.
- Our comments were represented well in this document. I was disappointed in our reflections being directed only toward the training in question #3. I know that was our panels experience, yet I wish we could have shared more on the tool.
- The program will be effective as everyone gets on board from administrators, principals, and all P.E. teachers. Each school is different, from scheduling to facilities, equipment and the students, but if this program can better equalize the playing field across the state, the kids will be the better for it. But if you blanket us without recognizing the differences, good programs will fail.
- Report was compiled accurately by mediator.
- Filming is difficult with large classes and it would be a big help if teachers did not have to self-assess and to have help during filming with management of the large group not being filmed.
- I believe the report for panel B compiles the information we discussed very concisely.
- Very well done.
- Very interesting to look at all the comments. Even though we were at different levels of implementation, we shared common concerns.
- I agree with the findings with these concerns:
 - Testing seems to be unequal on the 3 levels.
 - ❖ More testing elementary
 - ❖ Less time middle
 - ❖ High testing is not as rigorous
 - One element seems to “pop-up” more than others. Time for P.E. on all three levels.
 - Fitness/Fitnessgram and wellness program. Combining these two programs along with physical activity to give the elementary teacher more time in planning activities.
 - Every county should have a Fitnessgram, and installed at each school.
 - Would like to share info with districts in the low-country (Beaufort and Jasper counties).
 - Provisions made for catastrophic weather (hurricane).
- Andrea did a good job leading discussion of questions. I would have liked to have been able to talk.
- I thought this was a wonderful process!
- Very thorough! Compared to my notes and it seems it is all there.

I find the following inaccuracies in the report.

- Told that 1 person surveyed 21 teachers. This person was against the SCPEAP. I also know just as many teachers that are for this process, but did not mention this. If teachers test one class for dance, another for throwing, another for gymnastics, etc., teachers then will heavily teach dance to the tested class, and heavily teach gymnastics to the class that will test that activity, etc. To keep it honest, it needs to remain the same. To avoid testing a bad skilled class, why not let teacher pick their classes to test?
- "Statements about PEAP not based on standards." PEAP is based on present PE standards! I don't understand the reference to PEAP being sport oriented. All P1 10 include areas not sport oriented (dance, gymnastics, orienteering, etc.). P12 cognitive on fitness, P13 outside activity (anything, not just sport). P14 fitness.
- I think the rating scores only reflect the people in attendance of her panel, which was not equally represented with regard to for and against.
- The numerical rating is not a fair reflection. I represented 20 elementary teachers who totally disagree with this assessment. There is not enough representation at the high school level. Written test at the HS and middle needs consistent answer. Student received less PE due to SCPEAP. I spent 22 days (1/3) of my instructional time on assessment.
- Question 11 – The revision panel did not respond to those questions. We were not allowed to comment. Actually I do not think we were in any position to comment at the time. We were allowed to send questions up but really nothing was done to answer them.
 - Panel C – shows no high school participant, there was one.
 - Students did not like being put through the assessment (But what child does?) This was said each day so I felt it needed to be put.
 - There needs to be 3 different levels. Elem, middle, high revision writing groups.
 - What is best for the students?
 - High schools should have had more representation
 - ❖ 3 on panel A
 - ❖ 1 on C
 - ❖ None on B
 - SCPEAP – several former members continue to give out information that only few changes will be made. These false truths must stop. This keeps others in an uproar.
 - Please do not rush this process! We should pace the revisions so we get everything addressed. There should be 3 revision panels, one for each level.
 - Active Phys. Ed. Professionals need to be more in leadership positions with the assessment revision process. There are some who have not been in a public school teaching role ever or over 30 years. Too many on the revision panel had ownership to the first assessment.
 - Monitoring committee – needs to have strict guidelines and qualifications to be allowed to "grade" the assessment. Also, when seeking people this should be advertised to all teachers in the state.
 - Score results are not a total indication of the program. Good PE teachers scores make bad PE teachers look good (high school).
- The areas presented on this report reflected what I heard in our meeting (panel A). If this is a tool to evaluate individual P.E. teachers, say it. If it's to be use to evaluate a program, say it. I was told (in training) no individual

- would be evaluated, but when individual % were stated on the report card, I was surprised.
- For H.S. it can be very unfair if one teacher can choose the 2 sports for P.I. 1 that are easiest to score high on, and then another teacher ends up having to do sports that are much harder to score high on. More choices in sport could help because we often teach the same sports based on student interests. On the H.S. P.I. 2 assessment it would be more objective if we had a multiple choice test. I had an entire class test “thrown out” because of the word “light” used to describe intensity level. As it is now, some teachers tell their students what is on the test and what they should put. We need more direct observation of teaching.
 - I think the suggestion of looking at the NASPE assessment material be reviewed by panel D.

In my opinion, the following information is omitted from the report:

- MS and HS under-reported to have any weight to make significant changes to them.
- I am not sure that all teachers in our state have had input in the process. Maybe that is not possible, but needed.
- From my observation and the information contained in the report, the only panel to have high school representation was panel A. Why weren't we split up among the other two panels? Your panel B participant with H.S. experience is a supervisor of student teachers and has never taken a public school class and administered the assessment program. There needs to be more representation from the High School on the review panel. Why are their retired college professors on the revisions panel or even involved in this process?
There needs to be clarification on what we can do with the Fitnessgram and what we can't do.
When considering the High School assessment, you need to take into account the fact that almost all H.S. PE teachers also coach multiple sports and are already working a tremendous number of hours.
- We also need to take into consideration the validity of how videos are assessed. You were given a 30 min training, and then instructed to develop consistently while viewing with another assessor and then you could assess tapes. My concern is that some individuals (assessors) were still not in agreement with how movements should be assessed. I feel that because there were so many movement forms there was no real consistency and validity.
- Opportunity to discuss monitoring (scoring) was not given in group meeting but #2 scores had not been sent out. After receiving scores, I have some thoughts and concerns.
 - On items that are “NA – less than 80% agreement” feedback should be given to show which students were scored/monitored. Teacher could review as a learning tool.
 - Scoring protocol by monitors should be published. What steps are taken during monitoring to insure bias does not take place. For example, if a score is “NA – not 80% agreement” when monitor #1 finds a lack of agreement what happens to the tape? Is put back into a “blind” stack with no indication that it is “NA” or is someone asked to

- look at the tape make certain it is "NA"? Information on monitoring needs to be published.
- Also, testing protocol should be put into a bulleted or numbered format. For example, the fact that only one person was to be video taped at a time on curl-ups was buried in the middle of a paragraph and was only one short sentence.
- Opinions from other P.E. teachers in the state.
 - The SDE should be grading the assessment including the video tapes. No other discipline has to grade their assessment. More training must be given to people assessing videos. More than ½ hour is needed.
 - Questions #1 – Several instances from one person in our group kept saying that this test limited their program and minimized creativity. The assessment allows for choices, and tests 4 or 5 (depending on level) different areas. It does not limit your program. What limits our programs is the amount of time we have our students.
 - The value of PEAP in improving conditions in physical education through out the state. If we adjust the assessment based on conditions in each school team there will never be improvement. Administrators (like all of us) respond to pressure and PEAP provides pressure to make those improvements.
 - This issue was not omitted but we never had a chance to discuss this. I think SCPEAP's solution of who gets to grade the tapes needs to be looked at more carefully. It has been told that graduate students are being asked to join the "grading" group of the tapes. I think there should be criteria of who gets selected for this assignment.
 - I would hope that SC would look outside of this state. I have been in contact with people outside of SC that were shock that SC is focusing on sports skills. Less than 3% of the population plays team sports for their form of physical activity. Please look at the organization PE4Life. It's main objective is quality physical education. www.pe4life.org – this org. testified in front of Congress on quality PE.
 - We may need some information and data from the SCPEAP office to address some of the ideas in the report. For example: Does SCEAP have data that supports the objectivity of using rubrics as an assessment tool.

Additional comments:

- I didn't see much representation from the lower socio-economic districts in the state. Each school district should have been required to have a representative.
I would like for the Revision Panel to look at some of the rubrics for some of the assessment items and possibly consider revising some of them. If they would look at the items that are being done for the assessment they will be able to identify the activities that need to be looked at.
As the Physical Education Coordinator for Anderson 5 I feel that the assessment for high school is do-able but difficult. At the elementary schools where I have only one teacher the assessment will be very difficult to administer. My biggest concern is with the middle school assessment. In our district our middle schools are on an A/B schedule. We only have P.E. for one semester and the classes only last for 60 minutes. During the semester the kids will come to us for a maximum of 45 days. Of the 45 days we also have to teach health education, have MAPS tests and Pact tests. Throw in snow/ice days, assembly programs, emergency drills, early dismissal days and you will see that we would be lucky to be able to teach each kid P.E. for 25-30 days.

We can only achieve this if we only teach health education for 11-12 class periods instead of the state recommended 45 hours.
To top it all off, we are also aware the SDE is working on a required health assessment that will probably take away more of our P.E. days and turn them into health days.

- Andrea Keim did an outstanding job keeping the meetings on task. Would like to see the report format changed so that the answers from each panel are grouped by question. Ex:

Question 1: A's responses
B's responses
C's responses

The over-all report was great and covered all panel discussions.

- It should be stressed that SCPEAP is an assessment tool to assess outcome of the program, not to assess the teacher. Are we assessing the student's ability and fitness? Would a uniform testing date in springs be helpful in getting administration involved?

- This could add validity! Each of us on panel D is familiar with a particular level elem., middle, and high. I would think 3 committees or subcommittees would be needed to address each.
- We need more high school teacher. I know Gaye Driggers is interested in being a part of the panel. She is a new administrator and could not leave for those 3 initial days, but is willing and hoping she can still help. She has administered tests.
- Debbie Holcombe (Byrnes High School would be a good member as well.
- I am concerned about revising HS without more HS people.
- Do not feel you not rush the process. We need to take time and get this instrument to a place where it is teacher friendly, valid and will be looked at in higher regard.

- If panel A had their scores from SCPEAP prior to our meeting we could have given more specific feedback. A study of scores will help. Also in reporting scores to schools more specific feedback would be helpful. For instance some schools didn't get credit for curl-ups. The score sheet said "scores weren't accepted" or "done incorrectly."

One thing I need to add is that when we video tape in the future can we please not say both first and last name of students on the tape. Many parents and administrators are not comfortable with doing so.

Please address class ration not matching the teacher 1-500 number. The class ration of 1-28 is more do-able.

Look at the schools that scored an Excellent. I bet they all are at 60-90 min. Highlight those schools and what this law does to help others get to the same level.

Don't rush Cycle 3 into piloting if the instrument is not ready. If it is put off a year don't forget us.

- I feel that when giving a "program" score, we need to make sure we look at the total program (such as facilities, teacher schedules, equipment, # of students served, # of minutes, etc.) This should be included as part of the "score" for the community to see.

- Just a suggestion to get a "total program score"
 - ❖ 50% SCPEAP
 - ❖ 50% facilities, equipment, scheduling, # of students, etc.

The SDE needs to make sure the \$ from the 2005 Fitness Act is administered to the proper areas (physical education teachers, equipment for P.E.). When

looking at \$ for teachers, we need to look at number of classes not ration # of teachers to students. The ration does not match up with # of classes. It won't work into our schedules without doubling class sizes per teacher in order to meet the minutes.

If all of these materials are not ready, we shouldn't rush to pilot cycle 3 next year. Maybe wait another year so that the proper amount of time for training is given.

- While this does indirectly look at teachers' instruction it looks more at results/impact of teachers' instruction. It is not a tool to use to look at a teacher teach. It's about outcome assessment to say we should leave accountability to the building administrator would leave the field in the same low emphasizes marginalized status it now holds. ADEPT is the tool the state has developed to assess teachers' ability to teach. Outcomes assessment is about student outcomes of that teaching. While this is not a perfect tool, it is a good start to assess outcomes.

W/o "teeth", it will be ineffective and not done. History has proven that to be true. Physical education needs assessment and accountability or it will be left behind.

- My sincere hope is for us all to put our children first. No matter the assessment tool design, we must be teaching what is the best practice and curriculum for the children of South Carolina.

All members of the Revision Panel "D" have served in some capacity in the SCPEAP tool creation, monitor, pilot, or "prayer warrior." It is a passion of many of us to this tool. Please try to open your minds and hearts to a tool of revision or renewal. Think outside the "binder"!

- There are several problems I think need to be addressed by the writing committee:
 - SCPEAP random sampling of 1 class to do all 5 of assessments could sometimes give a false reading of a program. If a different selection such as random selection of 1 class do only one piece of the assessment so I would end up with 5 2nd grades each doing 1 indicator would give a more accurate accumulation of data.
 - Secondly, more definite feedback from the monitoring committee so schools receive a report with their scores so they can correlate the two.
 - Concerns about use of dollars by district need to be addressed (monitored?).
- I would like for each district to have an in house person to assess the programs. Sometimes having a familiar face will put less stress on some people. Having unannounced visit from SDE would not be a good thing in some cases. Me for example I have already been kicked out of my gym 10+ times this year because of various school events. This causes plans to change by being outside, or in a class if weather is bad. What happens if they arrive and you have no space and its pouring rain?
- Rearrange the report for panel D by putting all of the panel's responses together under each question. Thanks!
- Can we reorganize this for panel D as we begin our writing? I would like to have each panel separate so I can see all three panels' answers to question 1, to questions 2, etc. Needs funding policies that back teachers so districts are held accountable to make sure money gets used appropriately.
- Dr. Keim, outstanding work on her behalf. Please give her our Kudos!!
- One key to success for the SCPEAP program is extensive training of scoring and successful implementation of the protocols and video recording. As

teachers implement the program, their comfort level will increase and concerns should decrease.

Our elementary teacher was concerned with amount of tapes and number of classes assessed. She spent a lot of time with the assessment program. This needs to be reviewed and revisions made to make it more "do-able" for her level. Example: She turned in about 10 tapes for the assessment and I turned in 3 tapes at middle school.

Concern about number of high school teachers on revision panel. Only one and she is now an administrator. I believe there should be at least five teachers from each level on top of the other areas included. Need more people who deal with this on a daily basis.

Do not rush this process. Training after all revisions have been made! Do not assume that teachers will come in the summer for training. Suggestion:

2008 – 2009 Year 1 – Revisions from original → Pilot (cycle 3) →
Revisions based on pilot data.

2009 – 2010 Year 2 – Extensive training in how to use new instrument.

2010 – 2011 Year 3 – Start with cycle 1 submitting data.

- I do wish that more high school level PE teachers would get involved. It seems to me that most of the negative comments or "problems" talked about come from the HS level, in and outside of this panel. If you would like a HS PE teacher to represent on panel D, I would be happy to oblige and share my experiences of having administered and been scored twice already.
- This is an ES panel and should be identified so.
- I know you had to split up panel members from the same district, but for the record I have attended trainings since 1996 and administered the assessment just not reported data.

I would like to know how Fitnessgram was selected for SCPEAP and have Fitnessgram came up with the curl-up test. Just curious.

I was concerned to be told at the SCAPERD pre-convention workshop to be sure and repeat your student's name into the camera (after the student says their name) because on some sports (flag football) it is hard to see individual players (students), so by repeating their name, the monitor can possibly identify the student by their clothes (green shorts, blue socks, etc.) so when they are hard to identify on the camera they (monitor) could recognize the student by their clothes. What about schools that students wear uniforms, and what happened to the pennies with numbers?

- We seriously must reconsider this assessment tool and make it fair for each individual grade level: elementary/middle/H.S. What is appropriate for elementary may not be appropriate for middle and H.S.? If there are 1 – 2 movement forms assessed every year or two, I believe there will be an increase of quality teaching, training and consistency.

Why not put the assessment process off until the revisions have been made.

I don't think it would be good to rush, have revision panel meet over the summer (which will be difficult to get teachers together) make changes, get changes out to cycle 3 districts, which may be difficult for all info to be dispense to all districts and teachers. District PE leaders may be placed in a difficult position to get their PE teachers together to train them and help them prepare for the 08 assessment.

- I believe it is hard to select panels of individuals that represent "the entire P.E. teaching field" it is important to get opinions from teachers (not just 40 individuals on the panel). I strongly feel some individuals on panels (teachers who grade the videos during the summer, present SCPEAP at workshops, and

original SCPEAP writers, etc.) have a greater influence on the revision panel in regards to SCPEAP.

There were a lot of "needs" in this report. Ex: go to person at district more time, support training, resources, facilities, etc. Are these going to be met before next year if SCPEAP is going to be required? Should we wait maybe another year to obtain needs?

Assessment should be used in every lesson taught. However, we should not take up so much instructional time singling out students to perform 5-6 skills. If this assessment is evaluating the teachers, would we use videotape to see if a regular classroom teacher grades a paper correctly? If this assessment is evaluating the students, would we give the math pact to students who receive math instruction once a week?

The term "roll out the ball" was used a few times in this report. It is not "roll out the ball" teachers concerned with SCPEAP. There are quality instructors concerned.

- I feel that there should be more people who have gone through this assessment process should be on panel D.
There are was to many people who have been on SCPEAP from the beginning who will have a problem making changes. More elementary teachers who have actually done (completed) the "whole process" should be on this committee. In our district we feel like most of this is coming from college professors.
 - We need to make sure that 1 teacher never has to 22 video tapes. This is way too much to keep up with.
 - Please make sure the scoring of the elementary rubrics are addressed.
 - The number of fifth grade assessments needs to be reduced. The number of dances needs to be reduced.
 - Do not change protocol during the year.
- Question 2, comments 1 -3, 06. Comments say decreases individuality and allows teacher to teach to test. I disagree – by testing the same classes you do not have time to just teach 1 or 2 items that are being tested. It shows the well roundedness of the program. This assessment does not allow a teacher to teach to one test but actually forces one to teach to the standards. To say that more opportunities for training were needed, it has been going on for years and years. You just have to actually go to training sessions. Why is a rep. from Palmetto Teachers Association here? Why have we not been told of this prior and had rep. from the SCEA?
If teachers test one class for dance, another for throwing another for gymnastics, etc. teachers then will heavily teach dance to the tested class, and heavily teach gymnastics to the class that will test that activity, etc. To keep it honest, it needs to remain the same. To avoid testing a bad skilled class, why not let teacher pick their classes to test?
It needs to mention how much time for PE per week.
- I am very concerned over time line for all that's left. Never mind, I know you are pushed as well.
- Scoring results – emphasis needs to address reporting results. I have received our schools results from cycle 2 and there is little explanation about things in the report. We need to address this in the future. Our results were excellent but scorings were not explained. I know there have been several schools upset about results and no information given. Example: 0 for a test. Why? Need more information in the report.
- Data that informs us about the how social economic schools performed.

Appendix E

Here is an edited list of comments given at the Standards Support Institutes regarding SCPEAP. Circle the five comments in each category that you would like the Revision Panel to pay particular attention to.

Positive Aspects

1. Supports the credibility of PE as an important part of the total curriculum; educating the whole child.
2. Created communication and dialogue with other professionals; opportunities for sharing among districts and with others.
3. Professionalism and respect as educators.
4. District and school accountability.
5. Uniform assessment system
6. Provides feedback to support instruction
7. "Theory" – we are improving both teaching skills and student fitness and skills.
8. Staff development opportunities and resources.
9. Taping via Fitnessgram motivated students; students proud to represent their school; student leadership, ownership, and assistance
10. Focused on the standards so teachers must know standards.
11. More feedback to parents
12. Opportunity to obtain necessary and needed equipment
13. Student outcomes is the focus
14. More cross-curricular blending of physical education and physical activity in the curriculum
15. Provides opportunities for teachers to identify areas of weakness through self-reflection.
16. Video training helpful (by level)
17. Student Health and Fitness Act is Positive
18. Consistency between schools
19. The video taping provides instructor accountability
20. Protocols good
21. High visibility – Report card is a good idea
22. Students know expectations through use of rubrics

Possible Changes to SCPEAP

1. Training-include the instruction tasks; More quality, meaningful training
2. Help with including standards into lesson plan objectives
3. Make the assessment less subjective; there is a lack of consistency in grading
4. Does not allow for measuring progression of student learning
5. Assessment is not consistent between schools; differences in facilities; facilities not taken into account; not all facilities are the same
6. Current components do not measure the quality of a PE program
7. Time consuming; too much data; Need to reduce the time away from instruction because of video taping; Eliminate or change data collection through video taping; grading videos takes too much time.
8. Other standards with the video
9. Too particular; too many details; too much repetition
10. 5th grade – too rigorous; Eliminate 5th grade curl-up video
11. Fairness and subjectivity concerns regarding “grading” using the rubric
12. Need fewer number of elementary skills
13. Takes enjoyment away from physical education teaching and learning
14. Students inactive during individual videotaping
15. Take averages of student scores with the lowest score being the ultimate score; maybe take average of scores rather than taking lowest score.
16. Competency skill levels
17. Inequity in time “exposure” with students
18. Continuity between levels; need to be sequential or progress from one level to the next; tasks too difficult at the elementary level.
19. Positive attitude toward training including facilitators; make sure group is ready for training to avoid confusion at trainings
20. High rate of failure for skills which causes self-esteem issues
21. Assess at only one elementary grade
22. Need study guide for written middle and high school assessment
23. Protocol needs to be more specific with exact instructions

Solutions, Suggestions, Ideas

1. Peer monitoring committee grades the video tapes rather than the teacher who taped the video; teachers do not self-evaluate video; eliminate self-evaluation
2. Unannounced visits to assess programs; State Visitation Team; periodic visits by an assessment/monitoring team (unannounced); outside evaluators; unannounced visits by an assessment team who would look at multiple components of instruction
3. Use lesson plans or long range plans as an examination of a program.
4. Post assessment – surveys and feedback.
5. More communication between trainers and classroom teachers.
6. Assistance from other people (team teaching, volunteers)
7. Consolidate paperwork.
8. Electronic reporting via technology.
9. 5th grade should look more like 2nd grade; consider administration in only one elementary school grade or lessen the requirements in both; Do only 5th grade assessment;
10. Submit curl-up scores – not video
11. Submit information as it is collected rather than at end of the year
12. Consider using the total program (facility, teacher schedules, numbers of students served, number of minutes, etc) as a way to assess the PE program; determine multiple measures of accountability for complete program assessment
13. Flexibility in assessment administration if there is a change in personnel; provisions for staff turnover
14. Fewer skills tested; reduce the number of required video tapes, protocols, performance indicators; reduce the number of video items
15. Teach basic skills and cardio fitness
16. Use Fitnessgram for documentation of fitness
17. Video tape an entire class activity rather than individual students
18. More task clarification
19. Assessment should reflect differences in facilities and students (socio-economic factors/student physical limitations, etc.); include facility issues in assessment impact
20. Begin skill practice in earlier grades using volunteers or certified assistants
21. Visit model/pilot schools where students are used to videotaping
22. Program assessment should be connected to SDE not professional organizations or higher education.

Appendix F

Timeline for South Carolina Physical Education Curriculum Standards and Assessment Review, Revision, and Implementation

2007	
Summer 2007	Solicit recommendations for people to serve on Standards and Assessment Review/Revision Panels Standards Support Institute, Session 1, preliminary data gathered concerning physical education standards and assessment
September— December	Notify PE Assessment Review/Revision Panels October 1, 2, and 3 — PE Assessment Review Panel meetings October 31 — Report of panel regarding South Carolina Physical Education Assessment compiled by the outside facilitator and submitted to the South Carolina Department of Education (SCDE) November 12 — Report shared with the Physical Education Assessment Review/Revision Panels November 16 — Reconvene Physical Education Assessment Review/Revision Panels for group verification of draft <i>South Carolina Physical Education Assessment Review Panel Report</i>
2008	
January	Update <i>South Carolina Physical Education Assessment Review Panel Report</i> , if needed, after November 16 meeting
February— April	Submit <i>South Carolina Physical Education Assessment Review Panel Report</i> to the Legislature Notify and convene Physical Education Standards Review/Revision Panel Update to the subcommittee meeting for Standards, Learning, and Accountability Develop and publish a field review draft of Physical Education Academic Standards and solicit feedback from the field for 45-60 days
May	Reconvene Physical Education Standards Revision Panel to make revisions to the field review document based on field review data Submit Physical Education Academic Standards 2008 draft document to SCDE Editor, Gail Swanson for final editing before going to the State Board of Education (SBE) Updated standards presented to the Standards, Learning, and Accountability subcommittee
June	First reading of the Physical Education Academic Standards by the SBE Convene Physical Education Assessment Revision Panel making revisions to the South Carolina Physical Education Assessment
July	Second reading of the Physical Education Academic Standards by the SBE
August	Professional development sessions regarding the revised South Carolina Physical Education Academic Standards and the South Carolina Physical Education Assessment
2008-2009 School Year	Begin using the <i>South Carolina Physical Education Academic Standards 2008</i> for instructional purposes Field test the revised South Carolina Physical Education Assessment with Cycle Three elementary, middle, and high schools
2009	
2009 Summer	Revise the South Carolina Physical Education Assessment if needed
2009-2010 School Year	Administration of the South Carolina Physical Education Assessment by Cycle One elementary, middle, and high schools to be used for state accountability purposes