PPAT® **Assessment**

Library of Examples – Math

Task 2, Step 3, Textbox 2.3.2: Reflecting on the Assessment for Each of the Two Focus Students

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.3.2 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 2.3.2

a. Choose one successful aspect of the assessment for either Focus Student. Provide a rationale for your choice.

b. How will your data analysis inform or guide future instruction for each of the two Focus Students?

c. What modifications would you make to the assessment for future use for each of the two Focus Students? Provide a rationale.

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. Focus student 1 was able to successfully describe the effects of a particular parameter change using academic vocabulary. Though she previously left this question blank on the pre-assessment, she correctly described the way that changing k in an equation changes the graph of that function. She wrote that "the equation went up (k) times." This description correctly identifies the type of movement that this parameter change has on the graph (vertical), and even explains that they value of k tells you how far up the function moves. The activities done in class that taught and reinforced how to describe parameter changes gave focus student 1 the language she needed to describe the change. Focus student 2 successfully transferred her knowledge of parameter changes effects on parent functions to two additional kinds of functions. She showed her understanding of the fact that these parameter changes always have the same effect no matter the parent function they are applied to.

b. Focus student 1 showed that she can graph a parameter-changed function, but her description of a parameter change was incomplete. A quick review of the entire effect that

each parameter change could have would benefit her. She was able to demonstrate her ability to graph linear and quadratic functions, so after a quick review of the parameter changes I think that she is ready to move on to learning more kinds of parent functions and translations. Focus student 2 has already demonstrated her knowledge of other types of parent functions with this assessment. In the future I will be sure to have extension activities that allow her to work with the material that she already knows in new and challenging ways. This will ensure that although she is ahead of many of the other students in the class she is always being challenged at the same level.

c. Focus student 1 would have benefited from the chance to demonstrate more fully her understanding of the parameter changes. Asking more questions that had her describe the effects of parameter changes would show more fully her understanding of each aspect of each parameter change. Providing her with the opportunity to graph the parent functions separately from the parameter-changed functions would also allow me to ensure that she could produce, and not just recognize, the graphs of linear and quadratic parent functions. For focus student 2 I would add questions that allow her to show her ability to apply each parameter change to each parent function. Providing this opportunity would show that she really could take the information that she already knows and apply it to new and different contexts. If she was successful with these questions I would be able to better know how to create extension activities for her for future lessons.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.3.2 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's reflection on the assessment for the focus students, where is there evidence of the following?

- A successful aspect of the assessment for one of the focus students and a rationale for the success

- Modifications to be made for future use in the choice of student activities and groupings and/or materials, resources, and technology for each Focus Student.

- How data analysis will inform or guide the next steps for teaching each of the focus students

Why is the candidate's reflection analytic?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. One successful aspect of the assessment for Focus Student 2 is the growth from the pre-test to the post-test. She went from getting zero points to getting nine, and she would have gotten more if she hadn't been confused on the layout of test. I know this as she had expressed the correct vocabulary during the lesson. I was pleasantly surprised by how well she did because of her constant negative attitude towards math. It is quite pleasingly to know that this student can grow so well in one class period.

b. For Focus Student 1, my data analysis will guide future instruction by needing to pay attention to how he feels during the lesson. He didn't grow as much he should have, so this tells me that the learning activity wasn't beneficial to him. So, during the learning activity I need to be attentive to how is he doing during the lesson to help him accomplish the learning goals. Now, for Focus Student 2, my data analysis will guide future instruction by telling me that the style of the lesson works for her. The lesson was collaborative and interactive. She responded well with this style as shown by her dramatic

growth in assessments. However, my data analysis for both Focus Students isn't as good as it could be due to my assessment not being designed in a cohesive manner.

c. The modifications that I would make for both Focus Students is the layout of the test. Some of the directions weren't clear enough for them, so they made mistakes they probably wouldn't have made otherwise. The questions would have been better if broken up in a clear and distinct way. Also, Focus Student 1 likes to take time to do things, so I would make sure he has plenty of time to finish or have him finish it after class. For Focus Student 2, I would make sure the test isn't that long as a lot of problems can get her confused.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.3.2 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's reflection on the assessment for the focus students, where is there evidence of the following?

- A successful aspect of the assessment for one of the focus students and a rationale for the success
- Modifications to be made for future use in the choice of student activities and groupings and/or materials, resources, and technology for each Focus Student.
- How data analysis will inform or guide the next steps for teaching each of the focus students

Why is the candidate's reflection incomplete?

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.