

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Early Childhood

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

- From the baseline data chart that was provided we can see that the students did not really have any knowledge of coins by their name and amount. Then as you compare the baseline data to the assessment data taken from each focus student they both made great strides in demonstrating mastery of coin knowledge and recognition. Focus student 1 and 2 made growth in the areas of coin recognition and their money word problem abilities. By looking at focus student one, we can see that the student used an illustration technique to foster the visual learning abilities in which she learns. Focus student one made a 75% growth from the baseline data to the assessment data that we can see in the chart. For focus student two he just worked through the problem because he learns by having a hands-on learning experience so he works through it with the imitation coins and just writing down the answer. Focus student two made a 50% growth increase from the baseline data collection to the assessment data collection. Both of the focus students did

very well on the assessment and were able to demonstrate mastery for the learning goals and standards laid out for this lesson.

- b. We can see on the base line data graphic representation and the graphic representation of the assessment that the students made a huge jump in their learning of money. In the baseline data we can see that most if not all the students in the class could not identify money and how much it is worth. They did demonstrate knowledge of money but the students could not use the knowledge they had properly to give the correct answers. We can see in the baseline data representation that focus student one only could complete 25% of correct answers out of 100%. For focus student 2 they knew 50 % of the 100% of the data that was taken for the baseline assessment. In the graphic representation for both focus students we see that the students completed 100% recognition of the same data that was obtained in the baseline data. My two students made quite a jump in their learning because of the stride made to differentiating the learning activities that were molded to the students learning styles.
- c. To engage the students in the analysis of their own assessment results, I had the students checking their own work. The students were engaged in seeing how much they have grown from the baseline data to the assessment data taken by them participating in the assessment. I was able to show the students where they started as a whole in the baseline data graphic representation that I made. We talked about the results and the students came to the conclusion that they did not do very well on the baseline data. Then I showed them the assessment data that I took from the assessment they have taken. The students had to draw conclusions about their learning and told me they think they did better on their assessment than when I took their baseline assessment. The learning goals were written on the board for the students to see what we were working toward and as a class with the two representatives of data that I showed the class took a vote. The class voted by the analysis of the assessment chart that they demonstrated mastery in their learning.

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 student 2 was more motivated with the learning goal. Student 1 has a harder time getting and staying motivated about learning since it is harder for her.

- b. I think the modifications had a positive impact on student 2. He felt like he was being challenged enough but was still able to complete the tasks at hand. The modifications had little impact on Student 1. Even with modifications she did not want to complete the tasks.
- c. I had the students "grade" their own work throughout the unit. This way students could recognize their own errors and have a chance to fix them.

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.