

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Music

Task 2, Step 3, Textbox 2.3.2: Reflecting on the Assessment for Each of the Two Focus Students

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.3.2 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 2.3.2

- Choose one successful aspect of the assessment for either Focus Student. Provide a rationale for your choice.
- How will your data analysis inform or guide future instruction for each of the two Focus Students?
- What modifications would you make to the assessment for future use for each of the two Focus Students? Provide a rationale.

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

- A successful aspect of the assessment for Focus Student 2 were the overall skill scores on her performance assessment. Not only did the student play her scales more accurately, but the student was able to demonstrate her overall musicianship.
- For Focus Student 1, my data analysis will lead me to give the student assignments and information in a more condensed format. The student clearly demonstrated that he is able to digest smaller amounts of information much more efficiently. Knowing this, I will be able to assign written homework in smaller portions for this student which should allow him to focus solely on the task at hand rather than the assignments as a whole. Any materials that I may use in the future will follow this model. As far as Focus Student 1 is concerned, I will modify the assessment next time to include slightly less information. While he was able to do well with a narrower focus, his performance suffered towards the end of the assessment. I will select only the most pertinent information to include in his assessments from this point forward.

- c. My data analysis on Focus Student 2 will allow me to assign her more difficult parts in band class to ensure that she is challenged to improve at an appropriate pace. Whereas before I was unable to get a true measure of her overall skill, now I have an accurate assessment of her musical ability. The data analysis shows me that she is ready to progress much more quickly than I thought she would be. On future assessments I will modify assessments to allow the student more opportunities to record herself in order to give a true representation of her skill.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.3.2 and ask yourself:

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

- A successful aspect of the assessment for one of the focus students and a rationale for the success
- Modifications to be made for future use in the choice of student activities and groupings and/or materials, resources, and technology for each Focus Student.
- How data analysis will inform or guide the next steps for teaching each of the focus students

Why is the candidate's reflection analytic?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

- a. Since the assessment focus student one is beginning to perceive notation from a problem solving perspective, and thinks more critically about situations that occur in music notation. Most importantly the student is beginning to understand the various subdivisions of musical meter at a much broader level than before. This is likely due to giving the student more obscure meters that break the mold of standard rhythms.
- b. Both focus students can be tested at even higher levels. Despite having challenges with each others rhythms, their own seemed to be fairly comfortable to them.
- c. In the future I may focus on rhythms and meters that force the students to continue to audiate (play the music in their head) even after their minute is up in order to perceive the differences. This will also help to building their tonal memory, and audiation skills.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.3.2 and ask yourself:

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

- A successful aspect of the assessment for one of the focus students and a rationale for the success
- Modifications to be made for future use in the choice of student activities and groupings and/or materials, resources, and technology for each Focus Student.
- How data analysis will inform or guide the next steps for teaching each of the focus students

Why is the candidate's reflection incomplete?

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.

Copyright © 2017 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
ETS, the ETS logo and PPAT are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service (ETS) in the United States and other countries.