

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Music

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

- I learned that Focus Student 1 had a 73% increase in comprehension of the unit material from the pre-assessment to the assessment. During the pre-assessment, FS1 could not complete a single part of the material given. Over the course of the unit, she became more responsive and actively engaged in learning the material. She still did not have the necessary background to complete the final assessment at an extremely high level, but her improvement both in attitude and quality of work improved drastically from the beginning of the unit. Focus Student 2 had a 58% increase in score between the pre-assessment and the assessment. Through the unit she became more confident in her knowledge of the content, and once she had mastered it, actually began helping Focus Student 1 with her work during class time.
- Based on the assessment data, the modifications I made to the assessment had a positive impact on both Focus Students' demonstration of knowledge. Focus Student 1 held her

own, and completed her exam with only minor mistakes in regards to key signatures, which was her biggest challenge to overcome in processing and applying new material. The exclusion of more challenging key signatures gave her a chance to apply her knowledge in a way that she was prepared to do. For example, three of the four sections related to seventh chords were perfect on her exam. She only made a minor error in regards to key signature within one seventh chord section. My modification for Focus Student 2 was successful in that she was more appropriately challenged for her current level of ability, by having to construct the seventh chords instead of just identifying them. The material was challenging enough for her that during the assessment, she approached me in order to make sure she was on the right track for a few of the test problems. That simple gesture indicated to me that the assessment material was still challenging enough to keep her engaged and interested in the content.

- c. In order to have the two focus students analyze their own assessment results, I had the entire class work as a group to give all of the right answers to the test problems. Under my supervision, they came and wrote all of the correct answers on the classroom white board. Each student had the opportunity to ask questions after every problem, and many did. This exercise gave them the opportunity to correct their own work to an extent, and understand where they went wrong on the assessment. They were also able to check their individual scores in relation to the class average. This gave the students another set of concrete feedback with which to gauge their own success.

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

- a. I learned overall from Focus student one that his detailing improved. I was very pleased at the use of added vocabulary. In the students first attempt in the pre-assessment his responses were short. The whole purpose of the assessment is for the kids to understand what they do right and wrong. By being short there is no way to fully assess the performance of the band. Being detailed was Focus student ones biggest problem, and he vastly improved on that. Focus student two never had a problem explaining what was going on, he just had a hard time hearing it.
- b. Having him listen to the recording with both headphones in his ear helped him identify his section and his individual performance better. I could tell that that modification was just

what Focus student two need to reach the learning goals that I set. Both students' scores improved, especially Focus student one who showed better understanding of the musical elements. I also showed both Focus students their pre-assessments and their assessments. From there we looked at both assessments and talked about the growth in each area. Both were able to see the significant growth they made. They saw that their understanding of the material wasn't strong but improved. I told both of the students that still work needed to be done and with that we will move forward.

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.