**Example Task 2, Step 2, Textbox 2.2.1**

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.2.1 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 candidates to use to guarantee a successful score. Rather, they are examples that candidates can use for comparison purposes to see the kinds of evidence that they may need to add to their 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.

**Step 1: Planning the Assessment**

**Textbox 2.2.1: Analysis of the Assessment Data and Student Learning for the Whole Class**

Met/Exceeded Standards Level

The pre-lesson assessment demonstrated the lack of understanding the students had. The post-lesson assessment demonstrates a large growth in the understanding and ability to correctly accomplish changing a mixed number to an improper fraction. The data-collection process was very efficient. All students were present for the pre-lesson assessment, lesson, and post-lesson assessment. The data-collection was both fair and reliable in determining individual student’s understanding of changing mixed numbers to improper fractions. Recording the data and analyzing the data was very easy to do. I was able to use an electronic spreadsheet to input the data that was collected. My familiarity with an electronic spreadsheet has been very beneficial in organizing the data. The pre-lesson assessments and post-lesson assessments were returned to each student to allow them to see their growth and personally evaluate their learning and progress toward meeting their learning goals. By requiring and allowing students the time to compare their pre-lesson assessment and their post-lesson assessment, they are held accountable for their work and progress toward achieving their learning goals.

Refer to the Task 2 Rubric for Textbox 2.2.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate’s analysis of the assessment data and student learning for the whole class, where is there evidence of the following?

- A comparison of the baseline data and the assessment data
- An analysis of the students’ progress toward the learning goals
- An analysis of the efficiency of the data-collection process
- Specific examples of the efficiency of the data-collection process
- Analysis by students of their assessments in relation to their progress toward the learning goals
- Why is the candidate’s analysis complete?
Step 1: Planning the Assessment
Textbox 2.2.1: Analysis of the Assessment Data and Student Learning for the Whole Class
Did not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a) Assessment scores: ME (Meets with Excellence) – 5 (31%), MP (Meets with proficiency) 5%), DP (Developing proficiency) – 2 (13%), WB (Well Below) – 5 (31%). The scores reflect that about half of the students understand the learning objectives and half do not. b) Data process: Corrected each student assessment by hand. I was able to assess each student’s strengths and weaknesses in a small area of math; equivalent fractions, adding fractions with like denominators, adding mixed fractions and word problems. Each section of this assessment had 4 problems each. I could tell if the student understood how to solve the problem or made a careless error by checking the amount of incorrect answers per section. c) I returned the assessment back to the students. They looked over their scores and the mistakes they made. They are well aware of the meaning of the scores and how it ranks. The students who scored a DP or WB took home the quiz for a parent signature to alert the parents and to gain parental assistance. Students were given the opportunity to stay in for morning recess to get extra help in the areas they did poorly on.

Refer to the Task 2 Rubric for Textbox 2.2.1 and ask yourself:
In the candidate’s analysis of the assessment data and student learning for the whole class, where is there evidence of the following?
- A comparison of the baseline data and the assessment data
- An analysis of the students’ progress toward the learning goals
- An analysis of the efficiency of the data-collection process
- Specific examples of the efficiency of the data-collection process
- Analysis by students of their assessments in relation to their progress toward the learning goals
- Why is the candidate’s analysis limited?

Suggestions for Use
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.