

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Elementary Education

Task 2, Step 2, Textbox 2.2.2: Analysis of the Assessment Data and Student Learning for Each of the Two Focus Students

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.2.2 as excerpted from the portfolios of two different candidates. The candidate responses were not corrected or changed from what was submitted. One response was scored at the Met/Exceeded Standards Level and the other response was scored at the Does Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level. This information is being provided for illustrative purposes only. These excerpts are not templates for you to use to guarantee a successful score. Rather, they are examples that you can use for comparison purposes to see the kinds of evidence that you may need to add to your own work.

The work you submit as part of your response to each task must be yours and yours alone. Your written commentaries, the student work and other artifacts you submit, and your video recordings must all feature teaching that you did and work that you supervised.

Guiding Prompt for Task 2, Textbox 2.2.2

- What did you learn overall about the progress of each of the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s)? Cite evidence from each of the two Focus Students' completed assessment and any other related data to support your analysis.
- Based on the assessment data, both baseline and graphic, what impact did your modification(s) of the assessment have on the demonstration of learning from each of the two Focus Students? Cite examples to support your analysis.
- Describe how you engaged each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her own assessment results to help understand progress made toward the learning goal(s).

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

- I learned that both students made progress towards the achievement of the learning goal, nine out of 20 correct for Focus Student 1 and 20 out of 20 correct for Focus Student 2. Both students answered five questions correctly on the pre-assessment but this lack of proficiency was expected given that we had not covered the material for the unit. For Focus Student 1, despite her increased score, an analysis of the assessment reveals a lack of understanding when it comes to connecting the concepts of weather measured in this assessment. For Focus Student 2, her assessment reflects her ability to understand how the concepts of weather are interrelated in order to accurately accomplish our learning goal of being able to analyze data to predict the weather.
- For Focus Student 1, I learned that her improved score does not reflect an increase in understanding because upon analyzing her data, it appears as though she made the correct selection on some questions without any clear understanding of the material. I

was able to reach this conclusion when comparing the questions she answered correctly to the ones she answered incorrectly because there was little consistency in her answers. For example, she answered question six correctly about weather associated with low pressure but that same information did not translate to other questions about air pressure. This means that my modifications had little impact on helping her demonstrate her understanding of the learning goal because if the modifications did have a positive impact, she would have shown consistency in her answers across her assessment. Regarding Focus Student 2, the modifications to her assessment reflected a strong understanding of the material because she was able to answer all of the questions correctly despite the test being short answer instead of multiple choice. Focus Student 2's proficiency increased from the gathered baseline data to the assessment, an expected result after learning the material, but an additional note is that her assessment was the only one with every question answered correctly.

- c. After the assessment, I met with both students to review their respective assessments. When meeting with Focus Student 1, we discussed her issues with this learning goal. I learned that she has some measure of proficiency when verbalizing the concepts but her challenge lies in making connections across the concepts, for example how air pressure affects the types of clouds that are formed. I discussed with her that we will continue to conduct spiral review, where we review as a class concepts we have already learned, and that repeated exposure will possibly help her understand the concepts. As noted, Focus Student 2 is the only student to attain 100% on this assessment, as such, I discussed with her how she might use the connections she has made with the concept to possibly help those who struggle. She seemed receptive to this idea, especially because she already enjoys helping her peers.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.2.2 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's response, where is there evidence of the following?

- An analysis of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An example of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An analysis of the impact of the assessment modifications made for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An example of the impact of the assessment modifications made for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- The engagement of Focus Student 1 in reviewing the assessment results for understanding of his or her particular progress
- The engagement of Focus Student 2 in reviewing the assessment results for understanding of his or her particular progress

Why is the candidate's analysis substantive?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

- a. I learned that both students were able to complete the pre and posttest. I did modify in the writing portion. FS 1 was asked to explain and give examples in the writing portion while FS 2 was asked to list words or simple sentences to explain. I also gave extended explanation of directions and questions for FS 2. I felt this was a good assessment because it required following direction, reading, identifying, explaining and writing all in one.

- b. I think the biggest impact that the modifications had was it showed the absolute best ability of each child. FS 1 was able to show his reading and writing skills while FS 2 was able to understand and complete the task without frustration or misunderstanding. What he didn't know he learned and was able to answer during the post test. I feel in teaching this is what we all strive for, growth and knowledge. This was seen throughout the class.
- c. I was able to engage both students in reviewing and analyzing their test by having them evaluate their progress from one test to the other. They were able to see which ones were missed and why. This was very successful.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.2.2 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's response, where is there evidence of the following?

- An analysis of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An example of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An analysis of the impact of the assessment modifications made for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An example of the impact of the assessment modifications made for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- The engagement of Focus Student 1 in reviewing the assessment results for understanding of his or her particular progress
- The engagement of Focus Student 2 in reviewing the assessment results for understanding of his or her particular progress

Why is the candidate's analysis uneven?

Suggestions for Using These Examples

After writing your own rough draft response to the guiding prompts, ask the question, "Which parts of these examples are closest to what I have written?" Then read the 4 levels of the matching rubric (labeled with the textbox number) and decide which best matches your response. Use this information as you revise your own written commentary.

Lastly, using your work and/or these examples as reference, consider what you believe would be appropriate artifacts for this textbox.