

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Family and Consumer Science

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

a. Focus student 1 received a score of 10 out of 20 points, or 50 percent, on the pre-assessment. After the pre-assessment, I discussed the importance of doing well on the post-assessment so that she could join her classmates in the culinary lab, which is why she is taking the class. The student agreed that it was important to be able to meet the goal score and make safe food in the lab. For the post-assessment, I read the instructions out loud, then student 1 worked through the questions on her own before raising her hand to have me read any of the questions she wanted clarified. Student 1 had marked answers for most of the questions before she asked me to read some of them to her. After I read her the questions she asked about, she changed her initial answers on chemical contaminants. It was clear that she didn't comprehend what she was reading the first time, but she did know the correct answers. During her extra time on the assessment, I helped her reframe some questions. I asked her to tell me the types of contaminants and whether or not they could hurt you if they were cooked to a high enough

temperature. She immediately answered correctly and circled the correct answer on her assessment. Her post-assessment score was 17 out of 20, indicating significant progress toward the learning goal. Focus student 2 had a pre-assessment score of 12 out of 20, or 60 percent. She stated that she became anxious about one of the questions and couldn't get that out of her mind to move forward with other questions. In addition, she is often distracted by what other students are doing. Prior to the assessment, I asked her to create a study guide for the class, with the purpose of reducing her test anxiety by ensuring she is familiar with the material and also to encourage her interest in helping others learn the material. For the assessment itself, student 2 was seated in the front row so that she would not see what other students were doing. On the post-assessment, student 2 received a score of 20 out of 20 points, or 100 percent. This indicates excellent progress toward the learning goal.

b. For student 1, reading the questions to her and re-wording some questions during her extra time allowance helped her realize that she knew the correct answer. It is a simple change, looking at the words on a paper versus hearing them, but it is effective for this student. This difference was obvious when she quickly changed some answers to the correct ones when I read the questions and possible answers to her. This student's pre-assessment score was only 50 percent correct, which was not passing by our school grading scale and did not meet the goal score of 80 percent. However, with the modifications on the post-assessment and a discussion to help her understand why this assessment was necessary, she improved to a score of 85 percent on the post-assessment. She moved from the lowest pre-assessment score in the class to the middle range of whole-class scores, and above the goal score, on the post-assessment. For student 2, preferential seating and additional activities before the post-assessment reduced her anxiety over taking a test, prevented others from distracting her during the assessment, and helped prepare her to more confidently take the industry certification test at the end of the unit. Creating a study guide for the rest of the class kept her highly engaged with the material since she is an advanced learner. The study guide also made sure she felt very confident about the assessment material and was less likely to get stuck on one question because she was unsure. Student 2 got 12 out of 20 points, the bottom quarter of whole-class pre-assessment scores, on the pre-assessment. This is 60 percent, just passing for our school scale and below the goal score of 80 percent for the class. On the post-assessment, with the modifications, student 2 got all 20 points on the assessment and the top score in the class.

c. In addition to going over the answers with the whole class, I met with student 1 and student 2 individually to talk about their progress. I showed each student their pre-assessment score and their post-assessment score side by side so that they could clearly see their progress. In addition, I showed these students the bar graphs of whole-class results and how their scores improved relative to the rest of the class. With student 1, I discussed the questions that she missed and ensured that she understood the correct answers. We talked about the methods I used to re-state questions and how she could try that on her own, as well. For student 2, she answered all of the questions on the post-assessment correctly, so there was no need to dive deeper on incorrect answers. However, we discussed how she can use this information to set herself up for less test anxiety in the future as she moves toward college.

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 clear?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. They did amazing! I was honestly surprised. But when I was asking the whole class questions as we reviewed the test, they did not mind also sharing what their questions were, so I was able to address it as a whole and not single anyone out. Focus Student 1 did great with receiving a 31 out of the 32. Focus Student 2 also did good, but missed a couple more than the first student and received a 29 out of 32.

b. I think the modifications demonstrated that the students comprehended what they were taught for the most part. Focus Student 1 was able to use the testing center and completed their test just fine. Focus Student 2 had one less answer based on their IEP and completed their test in the classroom with the other students. Just because each of them have modifications does not give them a better chance at a better grade, it levels the playing field to all the other students based on how that particular student learned and acquires their information.

c. As a class we discussed the answers to the test, and I answered questions that anyone had. If they had a question but they did not want to ask in front of the whole class, they came up to my desk when there was time in class for that or they came in at lunch to ask me questions about it. While the Focus Students were both apart of the whole-class discussion, I did spend time with each of them reviewing their assessments to be sure they understood the results they received

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.

Copyright © 2023 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.