

## PPAT® Assessment

### Library of Examples – Math

#### 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

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

- The baseline data showed students prior knowledge of the material, with only 5.5% of students proficient on learning goals A & E, and 27.75% proficient on learning goal C. The data shows that only one student did not show growth, as they refused to complete the assessment, throwing it in the garbage, and therefore received a zero. On the post assessment, 61% of students were proficient on learning goals A & E, 39% proficient on learning goal B, 33.3% proficient on learning goal C, 77.75% proficient on learning goal D, and 66.75% proficient on learning goal F. The 39% proficiency rate for learning goal B (analyze key features of a graph) was expected, as this question required students to analyze and reason abstractly and was a challenging four-part problem. The 33% proficiency rate for learning goal C (add, subtract and multiply polynomials) was unforeseen, but mistakes were made using Pascal's Triangle and the Binomial Expansion Theorem. The data shows that 33% of the class made significant progress toward all learning goals; and 39% of students are approaching proficiency on at least 2 learning goals and are considered proficient on 3-4 learning goals.

- b. The collection process was efficient in that each assessment was easy to grade, based on the scoring guide. The assessment was able to determine students understanding of each topic individually. Because each question was aligned to a specific learning goal and CCSS, it was easy to measure growth on each specific target based on the desired proficiency scores. The post assessment accurately reflected the unit lessons and concepts taught in class and was an accurate measure of student growth and understanding. Data recording was simple through the use of spreadsheets to organize and analyze results.
- c. Students received both post assessments and pre-assessments back within one day after administering the quiz. We reviewed all answers as a class and identified and addressed major mistakes that were made on the assessment. Students were able to realize how much they had learned since completing the pre-assessment. I allowed them time to compare their answers from both assessments and recognize that they had successfully learned a substantial amount of material in the past three weeks. While some students have progress still to make, they were encouraged by the amount of progress they had made thus far. By showing students their growth and mistakes, we could collectively determine which topics we need to continue to practice and potentially re-teach.

**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. The pre-assessment displayed the general level of understanding that every student possessed. The post-assessment displays a huge growth in the levels of conceptual understanding and procedural skill to properly achieve all tasks required to divide integers and rational numbers.
- b. The data-collection process that I personally selected was very efficient. All students were present for the pre-assessment, and one student was absent for the lesson and post-assessment. The data-collection was reasonable and consistent in establishing each student's understanding of dividing integers and rational numbers. Recording the data and analyzing the data was a simple process. Using an electronic spreadsheet from Microsoft Excel 2010 was helpful in data organization.
- c. The pre- and post-assessments were handed back to all students to show their personal progress in regards to their learning goals. The students were held responsible for observing their work and progress toward the learning goals when the pre- and post-assessments were handed back.

**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.

Copyright © 2018 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.