

## PPAT® Assessment

### Library of Examples – Special Education

#### Task 3, Step 3, Textbox 3.3.1: Analyzing the Instruction for the Whole Class

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 3.3.1 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 3, Textbox 3.3.1

- a. To what extent did the lesson, including instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology, help to facilitate student learning? How does the evidence you collected support this finding?
- b. How did the students use the content presented to demonstrate meaningful learning? Provide specific examples from the lesson and from the student work to support your analysis.
- c. While you were teaching, what adjustments to the lesson did you implement for the whole class to better support student engagement and learning? Provide examples to support your decisions.
- d. What steps did you take to foster teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions? How did they impact student engagement and learning?
- e. What feedback did you provide during the lesson to facilitate student learning? What impact did the feedback have on student learning? Provide specific examples.

#### Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

- a. I used an instructional strategy of providing multiple models, guiding my students' practice, and then slowly fading support. The models were effective. I was able to observe my students gaining confidence in the skill during all of the learning activities. The students were able to attend to what I was doing. My observations and student progress support this finding as all students improved their scores in the post assessment and 2 students met the objective. The introduction worked well as a means of gaining attention and engagement in my students. One student was very engaged and enthusiastic during

this activity. My use of an interactive white board during this introduction enhanced the learning for the whole class. The materials I used were accessible to my students and were effective learning tools. The worksheets in the third learning activity allowed the students to work independently with the content and practice the new skill. I was able to model the first few questions and then allow the students to finish independently. My design worked well and met my students at their level. One resource that did not work well were the number lines. The students did not understand the concept of "more".. I could improve this by redesigning the number line to increase in size as the numbers go up in a wedge shape. I'd also ask them to describe what they were seeing and then help the students who are confused. This approach would be more useful for my students.

- b. The students had the opportunity to demonstrate learning during the activity during part 2 and part 3. Explicit instruction in part 2 provided each student with opportunities to show that they understood the concept I was teaching. As the students showed their ability in this part I increased the difficulty of the trials. For example, when students in group 1 showed that they could determine which number is more with single digit numbers, I began to use double digit numbers. I used the same procedure in group 2; slowly increasing the difficulty throughout the trials. Each student in group 1 had 10 opportunities to learn and practice. Each student in group 2 had 5 opportunities to learn and practice. Both groups either observed or participated in 20 trials overall. Part 3 provided each student with more opportunities. I helped each student through the first few questions. After observing competence, I allowed each student to finish their worksheet independently.
- c. As I was teaching the lesson, I maintained my level of enthusiasm. I passed this enthusiasm on to my students with a high degree of praise. Additionally, I related the concept of more to my students everyday life. For example, while working with a student in group 1, I related the concept of more to time. This student earns computer time before lunch. I made the connection between having more minutes on the computer. This made the numbers less abstract and engaged him in the content. The complexity of the questions also changed as I observed the students' performance. I rewarded correct answers with not only praise, but also harder questions. This increased the rigor and supported student learning.
- d. I showed as much enthusiasm for the learning and the content as possible. I enjoyed myself and my students noticed. I spent individual time with each student during the lesson. During this time, I praised each student for effort and for correct answers. These two strategies visibly increased the engagement level of my students. My students were very attentive during the lesson. The attention was a big factor in the results of my post assessment, as all my students showed progress and 2 students met the learning objective. The students did not work collaboratively in this lesson but did observe each other as they answered questions.
- e. During the lesson, I used social praise as a feedback tool and to reinforce correct answers by my students. A correct answer was met with a high-five or a pat on the shoulder. Incorrect answers were corrected. When correcting these answers, I showed each student why the answer was incorrect. For example, during explicit instruction, one student in group 1 thought 7 was more than 11. I directed him to the number line and showed him that 11 was further right. An alternative to this would have been to introduce manipulatives to show that one number had more. Another example was in group 2. A

student thought 2 was more than 5. I took the manipulative blocks and stacked them up. Then I showed the student that the group of 5 was higher than the group of 2. In both cases, the students produced more correct answers as the explicit instruction went on. I observed improvements as the students produced more correct answers after this feedback. For example, by the end of the 10 trials each, the students in group 1 were working with numbers up to 20. Group 2 did not show as much progress, but did improve during the lesson as a result of my feedback and error correction procedures.

**Refer to the [Task 3 Rubric](#) for Textbox 3.3.1 and ask yourself:**

What evidence does the candidate provide to show how each of the following impacted student engagement and learning?

- Instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology
- Students' use of content
- Adjustments made to the Lesson
- Teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions
- Feedback provided to students during the lesson

Why is the analysis of instruction for the whole class thorough?

**Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level**

- a. Both of my focus students achieved the learning goals to a very in-depth extent. By the time the lesson was completely finished, they could state the word very accurately and effectively without prompt. Both examples were relatively the same, we looked at a chart that showed three words and full sentences and the students had to recognize the sight word that was taught. Since the word was "has," the students might be shown "have, hat, and has" and they would point to the correct word. If it was a full sentence, the students might read "The dog has gone into the house," the students would read the sentence to the best of their ability and point out the sight word that was presented.
- b. The differentiation of the specific parts did not differentiate the lesson necessarily, but because their focuses and disabilities were different, the steps that I personally took to help them reach their learning goals helped the focus students meet them effectively. An example of this was while the other students in the first group were working, I had the focus student fidget with a "fidget ball," and it kept her interested until I got back around to her. While the other two students listened to the current student read, their focus stayed much more intact while one student worked.

**Refer to the [Task 3 Rubric](#) for Textbox 3.3.1 and ask yourself:**

What evidence does the candidate provide to show how each of the following impacted student engagement and learning?

- Instructional strategies, learning activities, materials, resources, and technology
- Students' use of content
- Adjustments made to the Lesson
- Teacher-to-student and student-to-student interactions
- Feedback provided to students during the lesson

Why is the analysis of instruction for the whole class 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.

Copyright © 2022 by ETS. All rights reserved.  
ETS, the ETS logo and PPAT are registered trademarks of ETS in the United States and other countries.