

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Science

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

- Focus Student 1 was able to improve his ability to make a claim, he demonstrated growth in terms of reasoning and maintained his written responses' organization and flow. His grasp of the vocabulary had weakened and the evidence he provided in his work was more vague than specific. Overall, his ability to construct an explanation did improve by 10 percent. His baseline score was considered below the standard, but his Okra response met the standard in terms of his score. He was able to make the connection that populations increase much faster than the resources needed to support them. Focus Student 1 lost a majority of his points with the lack of details in his response. Focus Student 2 displayed regression rather than growth. Her baseline was incredibly detailed and met exceeded expectations, her response was considered advanced. Her Okra assessment proved to be less so, she fell below the standards. She was able to maintain her level of organization and flow, also her evidence and vocabulary have still met the standards. Her claim only partially answered the question and her reasoning was lacking,

she provided an adequate amount of evidence, but it related to a claim that only spoke to populations increasing, and not the effect of that increase. Focus Student 2 didn't understand the second half of task two in the assessment, this section provided the relevant evidence needed to completely answer the prompt.

- b. For Focus Student 1, I was able to discuss the developmental tasks with him before he tackled the main assessment. I also was able to better explain the prompt to him. He utilized the extended time and read the article associated with the assessment with his group. Focus Student 1 displayed measurable growth; being able to actively assist him with his developmental tasks, he didn't need me or my co-teacher during the actual assessment. During the baseline assessment, Focus Student 1 did not have the same access to teachers. He had less time to work on the developmental activities needed to complete the baseline assessment. Focus Student 2 worked with English speaking students for during the developmental activities prior to the assessment. She asked that I read the prompt out loud to assist with her understanding. Aside from that and answering some clarifying questions, she didn't utilize any of the other resources or option I suggested to her. She was determined to complete the activity in class along with her peers. Focus Student 2's claim was informed by the first half of the article, she pulled two quotes to include in her prompt, but her response contained little to no insight from her own thinking. She used evidence as reasoning. Focus Student 2 demonstrated a lack of understanding at the relatedness of population increases and interspecies competition. In her rush to complete the assessment, she was only able to partially respond to the prompt.
- c. Providing Focus Student 1 and 2 time in class to review their assessment results proved to be beneficial. Allowing them to compare their results with their baseline results and the assessments of the peers, contextualized their results for them. Understanding how they performed relative to past experiences and the experiences of others allowed them to understand where they fell in the spectrum of student performance. Providing Focus Student 1 with the opportunity to ask me questions about his results and giving verbal feedback assisted with his comprehension of his results. Telling him where he excelled and struggled gave him insight on which areas he needed to work on in terms of CER prompts. Focus Student 2 also received one-on-one counseling regarding her scores. She was able to ask questions and describe her concerns about the assessments, I pointed out parts of it where she consistently excelled and where she fell short.

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 that both focus student 1 and 2 have specific strengths and different learning needs. By analyzing their assessment, I was able to see what questions the two focus students struggled with. Focus student 1 had trouble answering the first two questions and did not write anything down. This is to be expected because the first two questions contain low frequency vocabulary words such as evolution and natural selection. Because student 1 did not understand the questions, she was unable to answer the questions. Focus student two was able to answer all questions but was very vague in his answers and did not entirely answer the question. Both students were not able to get full points but were still able to answer some of the questions.
- b. By modifying the language and going through the definitions of the vocab words, both focus students were better able to understand the questions and were able to improve their answers.
- c. I engaged the whole class in a review session on the assessment and went through what the rubric was and how they could improve their scores. I then allowed time for the students to add on to their answers. During this time, I personally interacted with focus student 1 and focus student 2 and answer their specific questions in regards to the vocab and how much detail is needed in the answers.

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.