PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Special Education

Task 2, Step 1, Textbox 2.1.1: Selecting a Single Assessment

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.1.1 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 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 2.1.1

a. Provide an in-depth description of the assessment. Provide a rationale for choosing or designing the assessment based on its alignment with the standards and learning goal(s) that meet the students' needs.

b. What data did you use to establish a baseline for student growth related to this lesson's learning goal(s)?

c. Describe the rubric or scoring guide you have selected or designed. How does it align to your learning goal(s)? How will you communicate its use to your students?

d. What evidence of student learning do you plan to collect from the assessment? How will you collect the data? Provide a rationale for your data-collection process.

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. The assessment that I have chosen is an assessment that not only gauges the students' understanding but also assesses their understanding of how to write a complete sentence using simple subject and a simple predicate. The assessment I designed follows the common core standard CCSS.ELA-LITERACY.L.3.1.A. This standard states that my students should be able to explain the function of nouns, pronouns, verbs, adjectives, and adverbs in general and their functions in particular sentences. This standard is a little broad, so I broke it down into parts, with the overall goal of completing the whole standard but in smaller, less overwhelming portions. The data and assessment gather for this portion focused more on the nouns and verbs. So I broke this standard down and the overall goal of this assessment is as stated: "I can explain the function of nouns and verbs, in general, and in sentences." From this standard, I developed four learning objectives that I felt meet my students' needs. The objectives were to 1.)Learn that every sentence has a subject and a predicate. 2.) Identify the subject and predicate in a

sentence. 3.) To complete sentences by adding a subject or a predicate. 4.) To compose an original sentence that has a simple subject and simple predicate in it. The assessment I created gives my students the opportunity to model and demonstrate their mastery of these goals. For example questions, one, three, and four asked them to identify the simple subject and simple predicate within a sentence. Question two asked them to complete a sentence but adding a simple subject and simple predicate. Questions five and six asked them what a simple subject is and what a simple predicate is. The last question seven asked them to compose a sentence and label the simple subject and simple predicate.

b. To establish a baseline for my students' growth, I used data from a pre-diagnostic test. This test helped to determine where the students' strengths, weaknesses, knowledge, and skills were. This diagnostic test was on sentence structure, parts of speech, grammar, and mechanics. The test showed my students have yet to master the skill of sentence structure. Student 1 achieved 10%, Student 2 achieved 27%, Student 3 achieved 45%, and Student 4 achieved 20% on the Student Benchmark Evaluation. For the Pre-test, of 15 possible points, Student 1 achieved 2 of the 15; Student 2 achieved 4 of the 15; Student 3 achieved 7 of the 15; and Student 4 achieved 3 of the 15 possible points. The pre-assessment was similar to the post-assessment however since we only focused on simple subject and simple predicate, I took a very small segment of the pre-assessment; I just took four question that pertained to the given topic and then added three of my question in the test.

c. For thirty minutes over the course of three days, students worked on the specific learning goals, and on the fourth day, they were tested over these goals. Every day there was a mini-lecture that went along with a worksheet. I graded these worksheets but also during the three days of instruction I let my students score themselves by using the four levels of understanding chart. The first level being I don't understand it, second being I need more practice, third being, I understand it and can do it by myself, and fourth being, I understand it and can explain it or teach it to someone else. The chart worked well, and I was able to assess them according to their work and how they felt they were doing. The rubric that I had created for the Post-assessment directly related to the learning goals. 1.) Was the student able to demonstrate that they had learned that every sentence has a subject and a predicate? 2.) Was the student able to identify the subject and predicate in a sentence? 3.) Was the student able to complete sentences by adding subject or predicate? 4.) Was the student able to compose an original sentence? By simply circling yes or no I was immediately able to see whether or not my students had met the learning objectives based on their answers.

d. For the pretest, each question was worth one point; there was a total of fifteen problems for fifteen points. The post-test was worth ten points, question 1,3,4,5,6 all were worth 1 point while question two was worth two points and question seven was worth three points all totaling up to 10 points. The data was collected by looking at the percent correct on the pre-test and comparing to the percent correct on the post-test. I did this by creating a bar graph.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.1.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's description of selecting the assessment, where is there evidence of the following?

- The standards, learning goals, and student needs

- The baseline date used
- The rubric or scoring guide and its alignment to the standards and learning goals
- Communication of the rubric to the students
- How the student learning will be collected
- The rationale for the data collection process

Why is the candidate's response detailed and tightly connected?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. The learning goals for this assessment are aligned with the math Common Core State Standards: K.OA.1 Represent addition with objects, fingers, mental images, drawings, sounds (e.g., claps), acting out situations, verbal explanations, expressions, or equations. I also incorporated a technology standard from the Essential State Standards: K.TT.1 Use technology tools and skills to reinforce classroom concepts, activities, and assessment. The standards selected and identified in my lesson and assessment will guide the planned learning activities and post-assessment by serving as the foundation from which the activities are built upon. Furthermore, the vocabulary, language, and goals that are embedded in the standards will be manifested consistently and explicitly throughout all planned activities and the post- assessment will encompass them all. The manner in which the learning goals for this lesson and assessment were selected reflects the needs of the students based on their IEP's, teacher observations, and pre-assessment data.

b. To establish a baseline for student growth as related to the learning goals of this lesson, I used the data collected from a research based progress monitoring platform.

c. The scoring guide selected to evaluate the assessment performance of my students correlates directly with the learning goals identified by the state common core standards. I ensured that the scoring guide and learning goals aligned by researching various guides until I found one that gauged student knowledge of the concepts by the state standards that the learning goals are based on. I will communicate the scoring guide and expectations with my students by conferencing with them and making them aware of how they will be assessed and graded.

d. To prove student learning I plan to collect data through informal means such as teacher observations, student interaction with content in a whole-class setting, and formal means such as post-assessment data/results.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.1.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's description of selecting the assessment, where is there evidence of the following?

- The standards, learning goals, and student needs
- The baseline date used
- The rubric or scoring guide and its alignment to the standards and learning goals
- Communication of the rubric to the students
- How the student learning will be collected
- The rationale for the data collection process

Why is the candidate's response partial?

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.