

Initial submissions SCORES

1 Main Street
City, NJ 12345

Praxis® Performance Assessment for Teachers

Submission Window: Fall XXXX

Report Date: XXXXX XX, XXXX

Educator Preparation Program: AAAA (1234)

ETS ID#: 1234567892

Your Score Summary

Task	Date Submitted	Your Score
Task 2	October 15, 2015	6.00 out of 12
Task 3	October 15, 2015	8.00 out of 16
Task 4	October 17, 2015	16.00 out of 32

Cumulative Score for All 3 Tasks

Total Score

30 out of 60

To see the passing score for your state or institution, go to the Praxis Performance Assessments website at <http://www.ets.org/ppa/test-takers/teachers/scores/understand/>

Initial submissions SCORES

ETS ID#: 1234567892

Praxis® Performance Assessment for Teachers

Report Date: XXXXX XX, XXXX

Detailed Feedback on Your Scores

The score range for each step is 1–4, with 4 being the highest. A “0” means that the evidence was either missing or did not address the rubric.

For more information, or to see feedback for all score points for this assessment, see the “Understanding Your Scores” page of the Praxis Performance Assessments website at <http://www.ets.org/ppa/test-takers/teachers/scores/understand/>.

ETS reserves the right to cancel scores at any time when, in its judgment, there is an apparent discrepancy in a test-taker’s identification, there is evidence that text submitted is substantially similar to that found in other performance assessment responses, or the score is invalid for another reason.

Task 2

Submitted: October 15, 2015

Assessment and Data Collection to Measure and Inform Student Learning

Your Score

Step 1:

Planning the Assessment

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective writing. Often, a response assigned a score at score level 2 places a large emphasis on descriptive writing. As you read through your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Also consider the comments below.

2.00 out of 4

Your response at score level 2 on this step provides some evidence that supports your choice of an assessment and demonstrates how the assessment connects to standards, learning goal(s), and student needs. The assessment may be too simplistic and/or the connections to the standards, learning goals, and students’ needs may need to be more detailed. There is discussion of the data used to establish a baseline for measuring student growth related to the learning goal(s), but the evidence showing the connections between the data and the lesson goals may not be clear. There is also evidence of a rubric/scoring guide, but its alignment to the learning goal(s) and its communication to the students may need more explanation. You provide some evidence of a plan for data collection; the rationale for your method may need to be more detailed, and the description of the data-collection process may need to be clearer. 2.1.1

The learning activities and student groupings may not directly fit the assessment. The materials, resources, and technology may need to be more significant and more tightly connected to the administration of the assessment. The rationale may need more detail. 2.1.2

There is some evidence identifying the learning needs of each Focus Student, but the difference between the needs of the students could be clearer. Providing more evidence to show the differences would make the response stronger. The data used to establish a baseline for the growth of the two Focus Students provides some detail. There is evidence that shows how knowledge of each of the Focus Students informed the modification of the assessment, but a more detailed rationale is needed for why the modification was necessary. A stronger connection needs to be made between the modification and the students’ needs. 2.1.3

Initial submissions SCORES

ETS ID#: 1234567892

Praxis® Performance Assessment for Teachers

Report Date: XXXXX XX, XXXX

Step 2:

Administering the Assessment and Analyzing the Data

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective writing. Often, a response assigned a score at score level 2 emphasizes descriptive writing. As you read through your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Also consider the comments below.

2.00 out of 4

Your response at score level 2 on this step provides evidence of a graphic representation that may not provide a detailed look at the data. The analysis of the data to determine students' progress toward the learning goal(s) may not be a reflection of the graphic representation. Overall, there is some evidence of the analysis of student progress toward the learning goal(s), but more use of data to support your conclusions may be needed. The analysis of the efficiency of the data-collection process selected may not have been detailed, or examples to make this a strong analysis may not have been clearly connected. You provide evidence of the sharing of data with the whole class, but the examples may need to more clearly show the extent to which the students were able to analyze their own assessment results and understand their progress toward the learning goal(s). 2.2.1

You provide evidence of what you learned about the two Focus Students' progress toward the learning goals. You use evidence from the assessment data (both the baseline data and the data represented graphically); more detail from the data might make the analysis stronger. You provide evidence of the impact of your modification on the learning of each of the Focus Students; more connection to the details of the assessment data may be needed. There is evidence that data was shared with each of the Focus Students, but more details may be needed to clarify the students' analysis of their assessment results and their understanding of their own progress. 2.2.2

Step 3:

Reflecting

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective writing. Often, a response assigned a score at score level 2 places a large emphasis on descriptive writing. As you read through your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Also consider the comments below.

2.00 out of 4

Your response at score level 2 on this step provides evidence of an analysis of the data as part of your reflection to inform or guide the next steps of your instruction for the whole class. The connection between the two may be general in nature and needs more specific detail for support. There may be partial evidence of modifications to be made to the data-collection process for future use. More detail of what was successful and what did not work well would support your modifications. There may be some evidence regarding modifications to the assessment for future use; the rationale may need more detail connecting the assessment with the reasons for the modifications. There may be some evidence of the identification of an assessment that is different from the type used earlier in the response, but the details of the effectiveness of the alternate assessment may not be clear. 2.3.1

There is evidence of your reflection to determine an aspect of success. The rationale connecting the analysis of the extent of student learning to your reflection may need to be stronger. You provide evidence of an analysis of the data as part of your reflection to inform or guide the next steps of your instruction for each of the two Focus Students. There is a general connection between the students and the next steps in their learning, but greater detail about each of the students may be needed. There is some evidence of a modification you could make to the assessment for future use with each Focus Student. The rationale may need further explanation. 2.3.2

Initial submissions SCORES

ETS ID#: 1234567892

Praxis® Performance Assessment for Teachers

Report Date: XXXXX XX, XXXX

Total Score

6.00
out of 12

SAMPLE

Initial submissions SCORES

ETS ID#: 1234567892

Praxis® Performance Assessment for Teachers

Report Date: XXXXX XX, XXXX

Task 3

Submitted: October 15, 2015

Designing Instruction for Student Learning

Your Score

Step 1:

Planning the Lesson

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective writing. Often, a response assigned a score at score level 2 emphasizes descriptive writing. As you read through your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Also consider the comments below.

2.00 out of 4

Your response at score level 2 on this step may provide some evidence of an identified learning theory/method to guide the planning process or how you will make use of it. More detail describing the impact of the learning theory/method on the lesson plan may be needed. In addition to the learning theory/method, your plan may partially address learning goal(s), content standards, and their connection to the planned learning activities. Two other areas may need greater explanation: (1) the impact of prior learning on the content being taught for this task and (2) your awareness of the difficulties students might encounter with the content. Make sure there is evidence that what you planned had a direct connection to the difficulties you expected students to have with the content. More emphasis on analysis may be needed. 3.1.1

Although you may have referenced the instructional strategies as part of your plan to promote student engagement, the rationale provided for each selection may need to be clearer and/or more closely connected to each strategy. There may be evidence of the grouping you will use, but the reasons for that grouping may need greater explanation. 3.1.2

Your response may include learning activities, but the activities are not challenging. The connections between the choice of activities and the students' strengths and the class demographics need to be more fully developed. 3.1.3

There may be evidence of resources and materials used to support instruction, but the resources and materials may not be significant, and more detail about the reasons for your choosing them may be needed. The explanation of how the technology is to be used needs to be clearer. The explanation of how it will enhance instruction and student learning must be emphasized. 3.1.4

Step 2 :

The Focus Students

Consider your choice of Focus Students. Notice that the descriptions of the activity and the guiding prompts make use of terminology such as "different learning needs." Choosing different students allows you to show how you apply different strategies when working with different individuals. If you do not choose students with different challenges, you minimize your opportunity to show a variety of teaching skills. When you are reading your response, think about the different evidence you provided for each of the two Focus Students. Also consider the comments below.

2.00 out of 4

Your response at score level 2 on this step may provide some evidence of your knowledge of each Focus Student's strengths and of challenges related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson. Limited evidence may have been presented regarding the differentiation of specific parts of the lesson to help both Focus Students meet their goals. Your response may identify limited evidence to be collected to show the progress of each Focus Student. 3.2.1

Initial submissions SCORES

ETS ID#: 1234567892

Praxis® Performance Assessment for Teachers

Report Date: XXXXX XX, XXXX

Step 3:

Analyzing the Lesson

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective writing. Often, a response assigned a score at score level 2 emphasizes descriptive writing. As you read through your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Also consider the comments below.

2.00 out of 4

Your response at score level 2 on this step may provide some evidence of the use of instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to facilitate student learning. There may be some evidence of the students' demonstration of their use of the content to demonstrate meaningful learning, but the evidence may be weak. Evidence of the analysis of the effectiveness of the lesson, including its impact on student learning, may need to be added or a better connection may need to be made. More analysis and greater detail of evidence would provide a clearer explanation of how students' use of content resulted in meaningful learning, how adjustments to the lesson during instruction informed your practice, how appropriate steps to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions impacted student engagement and learning, and how appropriate feedback during the lesson had a positive impact on student learning. 3.3.1

The response may provide some evidence of the students' achievement of the learning goal(s) of the lesson; further evidence for each of the Focus Students might contribute to a more effective analysis of the extent of student learning. The response provides some evidence of the impact that the differentiation of the lesson had in helping each of the Focus Students meet the learning goal(s). More evidence that explains how the modifications impacted the learning might make this a stronger response. 3.3.2

Step 4:

Reflecting

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective writing. Often, a response assigned a score at score level 2 emphasizes descriptive writing. As you read through your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Also consider the comments below.

2.00 out of 4

Your response at score level 2 on this step may provide some evidence that you identified the instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology to be used to help students who did not achieve the learning goal(s). There may be evidence of partial reflection about the lesson and about how evidence of student learning will guide future lesson planning. Further evidence may be needed to show the analysis of the lesson and to show how the results of the analysis can be applied to your teaching in the future. 3.4.1

There is some evidence of reflection about planning future lessons for each of the two Focus Students; additional evidence might be needed to address the different learning needs of each of the Focus Students and to provide more details of how student learning will be impacted by the changes to future lessons. There is some evidence of the use of instructional strategies, resources, or technology; further detail in all three of these areas and about how each might impact the future instruction of each of these students might make this a stronger response. 3.4.2

Total Score

8.00
out of 16

Initial submissions SCORES

ETS ID#: 1234567892

Praxis® Performance Assessment for Teachers

Report Date: XXXXX XX, XXXX

Task 4

Submitted: October 17, 2015

Designing and Implementing Instruction to Promote Student Learning

Your Score

Step 1:
Planning

2.00 out of 4

There are three kinds of writing required in this task: descriptive, analytic, and reflective writing. Often, a response assigned a score at score level 2 emphasizes descriptive writing. As you read through your submitted response, consider how much analytic and reflective writing is present. Also consider the comments below.

Your response at score level 2 on this step may provide some evidence of a connection between the lesson and state and national standards and how they are appropriate considering the learning needs of the students. Evidence of the use of whole-class data to establish a baseline to measure student growth may be partial or loosely connected. There may be some evidence that the students' background and prior knowledge were considered, but evidence connecting students' background and prior knowledge to the lesson might make this a stronger response. 4.1.1

There may be evidence of your planning to engage students in critical thinking and evidence of your using academic content language to support the concept being taught. There may be evidence of your use of questioning skills and your plan to integrate reading into the content area. Some of the rationales for the choices of activities may need more detail, and some of the strategies may need to be more explicitly described and connected to the four topics. 4.1.2

There may be evidence of an activity that is the focus of the lesson, but the rationale for the choice of activity may need to be more robust and more closely linked to the anticipation of how students' learning needs will be addressed. There may be some evidence of a plan for monitoring student learning; more detail may be needed to make this a stronger response. A student work sample may have been part of the assessment of student learning for the lesson, but the rationale for the choice of this sample (or samples) may need more detail. This response may need to include more details regarding how these elements would be integrated into the lesson plan. 4.1.3

Initial submissions SCORES

ETS ID#: 1234567892

Praxis® Performance Assessment for Teachers

Report Date: XXXXX XX, XXXX

**Step 2 :
Implementing
the Plan**

2.00 out of 4

When you review your submitted response, consider the connection between the evidence you provided in the written commentary and the evidence seen on the video. Specifically, is what you wrote in your written response what you see in the video? Have you consistently cited evidence from the video to show support for your analysis in your written commentary? (Do not rely on the reader to see evidence; you need to cite details directly from the video to support your analysis.) Have you analyzed the significance of the evidence, or are you just describing what happened?

Your response at score level 2 on this step may provide some evidence from the video of the use of academic content language to advance understanding of the concept being taught in the lesson. The evidence of the engagement of students in critical thinking may need more detail or examples. Evidence of your use of questioning skills to promote student learning may need more detail or examples. Your citing of evidence from the video may be limited, or your rationales for your instructional choices may be only loosely connected. The evidence you provided may not demonstrate the integration of reading into the content of the lesson. 4.2.1

There may be some evidence in the video that you monitored student learning. Evidence of the impact of your monitoring or instructional decision making during the lesson may be lacking detail. There may be evidence that feedback was given to students, but the analysis of the impact of that feedback both on individual students and on the whole class may be weak. There may be discussion of the use of verbal communication techniques, but the analysis of the effectiveness of those techniques may be too general. The evidence related to nonverbal communication techniques may be lacking detail. Your citing of evidence from the video may be limited, and the connections made in your analysis may be overly broad. 4.2.2

There may be some evidence of the use of classroom management strategies to promote a positive learning environment; the analysis of the effectiveness of those strategies and the evidence seen on the video may be partially related. Partial evidence from the video may be cited, and the connections to support the analysis may be general. 4.2.3

**Step 3:
Student Work**

2.00 out of 4

Consider your choice of Focus Students. Notice that the descriptions of the activity and the guiding prompts make use of terminology such as “different learning needs.” Choosing different students allows you to show how you apply different strategies when working with different individuals. When you do not choose students with different challenges, you minimize your opportunity to show a variety of teaching skills. When you are reading your response, think about the different details of evidence you provided for each of the two Focus Students. Also consider the comments below.

Your response at score level 2 on this step may provide some evidence of the learning strengths and challenges of the two Focus Students, although more evidence may be discussed for one of the students than for the other. There may be some evidence of the use of baseline data to measure students’ growth, but the connection between the data and the areas of growth measured may need to be stronger. The evidence collected to show the progress each of the Focus Students made toward the learning goals may be only loosely connected. 4.3.1

Initial submissions SCORES

ETS ID#: 1234567892

Praxis® Performance Assessment for Teachers

Report Date: XXXXX XX, XXXX

Step 4: Reflecting

2.00 out of 4

When you review your submitted response, consider the connection between the evidence you provided in the written commentary and the evidence seen on the video. Specifically, is what you wrote in your written response what you see in the video? Have you consistently cited evidence from the video to show support for your analysis in your written commentary? (Do not rely on the reader to see evidence; you need to cite details directly from the video to support your analysis.) Have you analyzed the significance of the evidence, or are you just describing what happened?

Your response at score level 2 on this step may provide some evidence of an analysis of the extent of learning accomplished by the students. More detail that directly connects the extent of student learning to the learning goals may be needed. More evidence cited from the various sources (e.g., the video) may also strengthen the response. If there is some evidence of the positive impacts that your instructional strategies, interactions with students, and classroom management had on student learning, then more evidence concerning areas of revision for the future and greater use of supporting details may be needed. There may be some evidence that supports your choice of possible revisions to the plan for future use, but the reasons may be too general or not tightly connected to the lesson plan, video, and/or student work. 4.4.1

Evidence of the extent to which each Focus Student achieved the learning goal(s) of the lesson, may be loosely connected to the use of the baseline data or the student work samples. The evidence may not address both sources and both students. There may be some analysis of a plan for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students; the plan is based on the baseline data and the student work samples. There may be some evidence of your planning for future lessons, but there is little or no analysis of how the student work samples or baseline data connect to the planning. 4.4.2

Total Score

16.00 out of 32 (Weight * 2)

Task 4 represents the culmination of the teacher candidate's clinical experience and contains a video of the candidate's performance. Because of these factors, the final score for this task is double-weighted.