

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – English Language Arts

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

- Both Focus Student 1 and 2 mastered learning goal number 2 by incorporating expanded CSET paragraphs to construct their argument. The students also showed proficiency with learning goal number 4, by structuring an argument that is appropriate to the task and audience. Focus Student 1's pre-assessment was disorganized, and not an actual argument, but rather a summary. In the post-assessment, Focus Student 1, does continue to add in some summarizing; however, she stays on-task, and focuses her argument utilizing relevant evidence to support her thesis and each individual claim. Focus Student 1 shows progress toward learning goal #1, by incorporating different elements of argument writing into her assessment. Specifically, she uses two types of evidence: quotations and paraphrasing. She also includes the persuasive technique of pathos in her introduction, attempting to make the audience feel pity for the villain. Focus Student 2's pre-assessment, was incomplete because he was overwhelmed and shut down. In the post-assessment, Focus Student 2, supplies an argument meeting learning

goals number 1, 2, and 4. For example, in his second paragraph, he incorporated evidence from multiple scenes in the play to support his claim (learning goal #2). Focus Student 2 demonstrated progress toward learning goal #1 by incorporating different elements of argument writing in his assessment; specifically, in his conclusion paragraph he includes opposing view-points. Both Focus Student's showed progress toward learning goal #3, evaluating the effectiveness of an argument, in the learning activities leading up to the pre-assessment. In class, both students participated in think-pair-shares, orally evaluating the "Villain Profiles." Both students were also able to write a CSET paragraph, individually evaluating the "Villain Profiles" argument, making sure to address the different elements of argument writing the author included.

- b. Focus Student 1 was given markers to color code her graphic organizer and color code her evidence in order to help assist her in organizing her response. This modification helped double the student's score in the analysis portion of the rubric. On the graphic representation, Focus Student 1 (number 9 on the chart) went from scoring a 3, to a 6 in the post-assessment. Modifying the assessment to help her organize the information, helped this student focus primarily on those features of the text that are most relevant to supporting her argument. Focus Student 2, was given each task of the assessment, one at a time. Modifying the assessment for this student helped triple his score in both the reading and analysis section of the rubric. On the graphic representation, Focus Student 2 (number 3 on the chart), scored a 2 during the pre-assessment in both reading and analysis, and on the post-assessment, he scored a 6 in both sections. This student easily becomes overwhelmed, and unable to complete a task. Modifying the assessment to one task at time, helped this student fully complete a task, for the first time in this class.
- c. After each student completed the pre-assessment, they were given their rubric, with their score highlighted. The student then analyzed the rubric, and set goals for their post-assessment. After the post-assessment, I returned both rubrics (pre-assessment and post-assessment), and their goal setting sheets from the pre-assessment. The students completed a reflection, comparing their two rubrics. I gave the two Focus Students a highlighter, and asked them to highlight the goals they met from their original goal setting sheet. This allowed both the focus students to see their own progress and growth during this assessment process. I conferenced with each focus student, and asked them to tell me how they believe they did or did not meet our learning goals. Both students felt they met the goals, at least "somewhat." Both students informed me they felt more confident in their post-assessment, and more prepared for the SAT. Focus Student 2, informed me, "It was cool to turn in something and really get better, and to see it."

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 substantive?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

- Overall, I learned that the Focus Students were both highly capable of accomplishing the goals I set before them. I don’t feel as though I was unjust in the day’s assignments and activities, especially since the majority of the class excelled in the poster project. I think that letting FS 1 work with vocabulary in front of him was very beneficial for him and I think letting FS 2 tutor her peers helped her learn more as well.
- The modifications were appropriate and I am glad I had the opportunity to make them. If they had not missed the previous lesson, I wouldn’t have had the chance to work one-on-one with them outside of class-time.
- I noticed that FS 1’s completed final assessment, which can be found here, was still quite lazy, though, and I was disappointed that he was unable to get his task done. I figure he didn’t take it home to do homework; if he did, he just didn’t do it. It looks like he finished his poster in the first five minutes of the next class. FS 2, however, had hers done by the end of the day, as she had finished it in another class. This is not unusual. Her poster/final assessment can be found here. Her poster is exceptionally creative, one of the most creative between all three classes, and she was the first to turn hers in. She has sloppy handwriting, and frankly I find it difficult but not impossible to read, but it is no sloppier than her usual handwriting so I decided not to deduct points, even though the rubric asks for legibility.

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 © 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.