PPAT® **Assessment**

Library of Examples – English Language Arts

Task 2, Step 2, Textbox 2.2.1: Analysis of the Assessment Data and Student Learning for the Whole Class

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 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 2.2.1

a. Based on your baseline data and the data shown in your graphic representation, analyze the assessment data to determine your students' progress toward the learning goal(s).

b. How efficient was the data-collection process that you selected? Cite examples to support your analysis.

c. Describe how you engaged students in analyzing their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s).

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. Based on the pre-assessment baseline data, 12 students met Objective 1and 17 did not; 9 students met Objective 2 and 20 did not; 8 students met Objective 3 and 21 did not; and 7 students met Objective 4 and 22 did not. According to the scoring system of novice, certified, and artisan, both the scores of artisan and certified signify the student has met the objective while novice signifies that the student has not yet met the objective. According to the post‗assessment data, 29 students met Objective 1and 1 did not; 29 students met Objective 2 and one did not; 27 met Objective 3 and 3 did not; and 29 students meet Objective 4 and 1 did not. Again, I classified students who received a score of certified or artisan as having met objective and students who received a score of novice as did not meet objective (see graphic representation). Within the groups who met the objectives, 4 students received a score of artisan for Objective 1; 4 students received a score of artisan for Objective 2; 6 students received a score of artisan for Objective 3; and 1 student received a score of artisan for Objective 4. For all of the objectives/learning goals, the majority of students progressed to meet the learning goals, with all but one student meeting the learning goal for Objectives 1, 2, and 4, and all but three students

meeting the learning goal for Objective 3. This progress is evident in Figures 1-4. Although few students received a score of artisan on the different objectives, the progress in achievement from novice to certified is of more significance because it shows that the student has gone from not meeting the objective to meeting the objective; a score of artisan merely indicates that the student has met the objective and gone beyond that, and the low number of students with artisan scores corresponds with my expectations. However, the number of students who received a score of artisan went up.

b. My data-collection process was relatively efficient given the descriptors I had laid out prior to the assessment for the categories of novice, certified, and artisan for each objective. Writing out the descriptors for each level of achievement allowed me to assess the students' responses more quickly and objectively. I added the number of students who received a score of novice, certified, or artisan for each objective and input them into a table to compare results pre-to-post-assessment and objective to objective. However, because I chose to do a disaggregated item-analysis, it was more tedious to score the student on each individual objective than it would have been to score the entire assessment in a cumulative way as novice, certified, or artisan, but I believe that using an item-analysis was a more accurate way of measuring the students' success and achievement.

c. Before handing back the students' rubrics with their scores for the different learning goals, I reviewed the rubric with the class, showing them the rubric before passing out their scores so they would focus on the different criteria and descriptors instead of being distracted by their scores. I also emphasized, as I always do before handing back an assessment, that the goal range was in the certified category and not artisan--because the target is always to meet the objective, not necessarily always to exceed it. I also noticed during my assessment of their responses that many of them failed to explain their answers on question 4, which was, I learned, a misunderstanding from a teacher who helped distribute the assessment and told them they didn't need to explain their answers for question 4. I didn't think that they should receive a score of novice because of a misunderstanding, so I allowed them to go back and explain their answers for question 4, before assessing it. I always tell my students that they may revise their work for me to re-assess until they meet an objective if they haven't met it yet. So, the students who did not meet one or more of the objectives are able to re-submit their work. Because of this, it's especially important that each student understands and analyzes their assessment results on the rubric and to identify what they didn't do in relation to what is required to receive a score of certified.

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?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. Based on my baseline data environment is very key for my class. I was able to have a wide range of environments through the course of one class. Whole group discussion was great for kids that need to get up and move to think. Having the opportunity to listen to music during individual work time helped a few kids really focus. Plus, with their headphones in it was able to create a very quiet environment for students that thrive in that situation and also allowing me to hear Focus Student 1 during scribbling.

b. I think my data collection process was ok. During online surveys are really easy to get data. However, for my baseline data it does not show the names of students unless I am on individual. Luckily I did the survey by class and could see the class results.

c. When look at the last data collected, the majority of students nailed the theme question asked. I think having I implemented a discussion about different types of commonly confused themes would have helped students answer that question better.

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 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.