

## PPAT® Assessment

### Library of Examples – Special Education

#### 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 scored a 1/12 or an 8% on the pre-assessment, this student's post assessment data showed that he made a 92% improvement after the lesson was taught. This score indicated that this student had very little understanding of fractions before this lesson was taught. The first learning goal of this lesson was for students to show a fraction as a quantity formed by 1 part when a whole is partitioned into equal parts. Focus student 1 had no problem with exhibiting his ability to correctly fill in all the blank fraction models corresponding with the fraction pies pictured above on the first portion of his assessment. For the second half of Focus Student 1's assessment, the student correctly matched all three equivalent fraction pie pairs which aligned directly with the second learning goal to match equivalent pairs. I also believe the Focus Student 1 showed progress toward the learning goal through the learning activity. Focus Student 1 was able to complete his own independent practice correctly after I modeled the activity and each student participated in a one-on-one guided practice using errorless learning strategies.

Focus Student 2 scored a 0/12 on the pre-assessment I gave prior to teaching the lesson. The post assessment data shows Focus Student 2 improved his score by 86% by scoring a 6/7. This student demonstrates evidence of proficiency of both learning goals for this lesson. The one question Focus Student 2 missed on the post assessment was the first question that addressed the first learning goal. This error seems to be a counting error because the student had no problem answering the other three similar questions with numbers of partitions less than 5. Based on the post assessment I believe this student understands the overall concept of the learning goal aligned with 3.NF.A.1. For the bottom half of the assessment where the student matched equivalent pairs using a connecting line the student answered the questions correctly indicating achievement of the second learning goal aligned with 3.NF.A.3.

- b. Based on the graphic representations of baseline and post assessment data the assessment modifications I gave Focus Student 1 emphasized the students' strength in a way that allowed him to reach his full potential and achieve both learning goals aligned with 3.NF.A.1 and 3.NF.A.3. The student answered all questions correctly and scored a 100% on the post assessment which represented a 92% improvement from the pretest score used as a baseline. I believe my setting and behavioral modifications positively impacted Focus Student 1's ability to focus on understanding and answering the questions on the post assessment. The time modification let the student know that he did not need to rush the assignment because he would be given extra time if needed to complete the assignment. For Focus Student 2, the baseline data and graphic representation of the post assessment data indicated that the student showed an 86% improvement from his pre-assessment score which was a 0%. The presentation modification I used for this student helped him understand the directions which is shown through his ability to complete 3 of the 4 of the questions related to the learning goal associated with 3.NF.A.1. The behavioral modifications I made for Focus Student 2 helped the student engaged in the activity without frustration. The provisional number line helped the student write the numbers correctly. Touch control/proximity seemed to positively impact the outcome of the student's assessment data because the student completed the assessment without time modifications because he was on task and in control of his body the majority of the time. Based on the comparison of the pretest and post assessment data for both focus students, the response modifications I implemented for both focus students assisted in the overall progress toward 3.NF.A.1 AND 3.NF.A.3.
- c. I engaged Focus Student 1 in analyzing his assessment result when I plan to conference with the student to share the graphic representation of the data from the post assessment. During this conference, the student will have the opportunity to see how they improved by using the skills they recently learned in previous lessons to read the bar graph and ask any questions they may have. Since the student scored a 100% on the post assessment, the student will not need to make any corrections to the post-assessment. For Focus Student 2, I plan to engage the student in the analysis on his post assessment results during the conference as well. Because this student scored an 86%, he may request clarification about the questions he did not receive credit for. I don't plan to show this student the entire graph with the rest of the class. Since this student is very aware of his challenges and can become easily discouraged and frustrated, I plan to make the focus of the conference about the improvement that the student made toward the learning goal rather than draw attention to errors he made or how his peers did.

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. Focus student 1 (IEP) is a visual learner; I know this because when I look at his assessment, I noticed that she wrote out each step just as I did when I was modeling the steps for what are some of the skills that I have to put down on my sheet. I could look at his assessment and see exactly what he did, which was copy me. Focus student 2 (IEP) is more of an auditory learner. He learns better when we talk about what is expected and areas that should be covered. While doing the pre assessment she made some errors because I did not discuss this assignment with her a lot. I wanted to see her knowledge before the post assessment to make sure she understands the process.
- b. The modifications that the students received during this pre-lesson and post-lesson seemed to have helped the two students complete the task. I gave the students both the same amount of time to complete the assessment which was more time than usual. For student one this allowed her to expand her knowledge and put more ideas and thoughts down on the sheet. For student two this modification I made for him was sitting in his general area and constantly redirecting him as well as checking for understanding. By checking for understanding this helped him gain a better sense of knowledge of the content. The modifications made sure that the students were able to complete the assessment.
- c. I handed back the pre and post assessment so they could compare and see their improvement; this engaged them in their learning. Both focus students were able to see where they started and how much they have grown. They were able to see that they did not know the steps as well during the pre-lesson and they knew the process needed to complete the post-lesson assessment correctly.

**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.