

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Social Science

Task 2, Step 3, Textbox 2.3.1: Reflecting on the Assessment for the Whole Class

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.3.1 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 2.3.1

- How will your data analysis inform or guide future instruction for the whole class?
- What modifications to the data-collection process would you make for future use? Provide a rationale.
- What modifications to the assessment would you make for future use? Provide a rationale.
- In what ways would an assessment that is different from the type used in this task allow students to further demonstrate their achievement of the learning goal(s)?

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

- My data analysis will inform or guide future instruction for the whole class by allowing me to see if any of the targeted content needs to be re-taught. For this class period, I noted that 8 students fell into the Approaching category. My goal was that every student complete the learning objectives of being able to explain the significance of the Articles of Confederation and identify the strengths and weaknesses that it had. My data analysis allowed me to focus on the questions that students in the Approaching category missed and the learning goal(s) that they still needed to accomplish. By doing this, I could analyze information that was missed, which was mostly the overall significance and effectiveness of the Articles of Confederation. I could then spend an adequate amount of time on each of the fallacies that my students had in a re-teach to make sure every one of my students falls into the Meeting category and achieves their learning objectives.
- A possible modification I could make to the data-collection process is changing the scoring guide for categorizing my students. To make sure every single student has the most understanding of the Articles of Confederation, I would change the Meeting category to

every student getting every question correct to make sure everyone had a full understanding. Therefore, I could quickly observe the students who have the highest understanding of the Articles of Confederation at the target goal, and continue re-teaching the content until every one of my students is able to get every single question correct. In terms of data-collection, I could also provide a final post-assessment, in which students are given the same assessment a third time to determine if they reached the Meeting category and their learning objectives after I re-taught the content. I could also change the way I collected data on the assessment, breaking it up into different parts of understanding what the Articles of Confederation were, identifying the strengths and weaknesses, and understanding and being able to explain if it was an effective document or not. By doing this, I could further analyze where the troubles of the students emerged, and work on helping them gain an understanding in those areas and achieve their learning goals. Another modification that I could make to the data-collection process would be administering the assessment on notebook computers. This would be a good way to integrate technology and make it easier to get the data on the students' responses, as I would be able to see the percentage of students who got certain questions wrong and analyze why that might be.

- c. A modification to the post-assessment that I could use for future use is changing the multiple choice questions into short answer questions. By doing this, I could further analyze student growth by having them recall information they learned and apply it to a short answer question, rather than just recognizing an answer and choosing it. The reason multiple choice is often complicated is that it can skew results of understanding if students guess the correct answer. I think by having the students actually list out some of the strengths and weaknesses, it would better show their understanding and further help them understand the content. The reason I decided to go with multiple choice for this assessment is because I felt like it was appropriate in evaluating the learning goals of identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation. I believed if they were able to eliminate answers that weren't a strength or a weakness and pick the correct answer, they would still be completing the learning goals that went with this assessment as they are using their identification skills.
- d. An assessment that consists of short answer questions rather than multiple choice questions would allow students to further demonstrate their achievement of the learning goals, which are identifying the strengths and weaknesses of the Articles of Confederation and explaining the significance of it. If they had to list out each of its strengths and weaknesses, this would demonstrate a deeper understanding, despite being more difficult. I could also do this for the learning goal of explaining the significance of the Articles of Confederation if I would have had them write a letter or diary entry of a colonist reacting to the Articles of Confederation, as this would allow them to demonstrate more of an achievement than simply answering whether it was effective or not and why.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.3.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's reflection on the assessment for the whole class, where is there evidence of the following?

- How the data analysis will inform future whole-class instruction
- A rationale for how the data analysis will inform future whole-class instruction
- Necessary modifications to the data-collection process in the event that the assessment is administered again

- A rationale for the modifications to the data-collection process
- Consideration of a different assessment that will allow students to demonstrate their achievement of the same learning goals

Why is the candidate’s reflection substantive?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

- a. While my baseline and formative assessment did not necessarily match to create an accurate depiction of data, it is evident that the majority of the students met the learning goal. I will use this information and continue onto a new topic with the students.
- b. I would make the modification of giving the same baseline assessment for the baseline as well as the summative assessment. I want to compare them side by side as well as use the same recollection skill set that was asked of them in the first baseline assessment. I would do this so that I can get a more accurate and measurable result.
- c. As stated above I wouldn’t use their magazine spread as there assessment at the end of the lesson. Comparing the magazine and the bell ringer was comparing apples to oranges. In hindsight I see the problems with that now.
- d. If I had done the bell ringer as a bell ringer for baseline data and as an exit slip for the summative assessment, it would have been a clearer measure of growth and of learning. I also think that I would have students write a reflection on what they said to the class about what they learned so that they had more of an idea of the growth that they made and I would take that into consideration when looking at their exit slip assessments.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.3.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate’s reflection on the assessment for the whole class, where is there evidence of the following?

- How the data analysis will inform future whole-class instruction
- A rationale for how the data analysis will inform future whole-class instruction
- Necessary modifications to the data-collection process in the event that the assessment is administered again
- A rationale for the modifications to the data-collection process
- Consideration of a different assessment that will allow students to demonstrate their achievement of the same learning goals

Why is the candidate’s reflection minimal?

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.