PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Art

Task 3, Step 3, Textbox 3.3.2: Analyzing the Differentiated Instruction for Each of the Two Focus Students

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 3.3.2 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 3, Textbox 3.3.2

a. To what extent did each of the two Focus Students achieve the learning goal(s) of the lesson? Cite examples to support your analysis.

b. How did your differentiation of specific parts of the lesson help each of the two Focus Students meet the learning goal(s)? Cite examples to support your analysis.

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. Focus Student's 1 draft and their assessment demonstrated their understanding of the lesson. The answers to the assessment showed me they understood the concepts I wanted them to grasp, although we can improve the answers to in detai and depth.They were able to define classical architecture by at least one factor we discussed, they were able to identify, draw and rank by date the different orders and their capitals. Their draft was able to accomplish the 5 architectural details which was the goal for the class as a whole. They could have expanded on their design more, because they had extra time and seemed stuck after they completed the list I had written for them (the differentiation for the draft), however they accomplished enough be able to have a base to work off of next class, and seemed to be using the other packet that was given. When asked about what Order style he was using in his drafts he was correct able to identify the order as Ionic, when asked why he was able to point to the top of the column and hesitantly explained that the "uh.. capital? It has curls." He was able to remember that it was Ionic because it had a base. The differentiation of speaking the answers seemed to help, in comparison to his written answers. It seems clear now that while he is verbally efficient, his writing is something which he struggles with and doesn't depict his acquired knowledge. Their written answer to the classical architecture question was only a small piece of what they

were able to explain to me verbally and demonstrated that that differentiation helped them further meet the learning goal.

b. As I've previous discussed, Focus Student 2 was a high achiever who needed to be engaged. I wasn't too worried about them meeting the lesson goals, however I was worried about them being giving their full effort, which means I had personal goals to see what they would accomplish. Happily, they were able to reach the extended goals that I set for them. I wanted them to accomplish at least 8 architectural details, which they completed. Their draft including Corinthian columns, square windows, circular windows, a balcony, double doors, a roof, torches, and a front porch. My other goal for them is to answer the open-ended questions with full sentence and more than about five words, instead of restating the question and answering it with one word. This was also successful! I imagine it's in part due to the differentiation of extra challenge questions which kept the motivated, and paying attention to the initial lecture, and presentation. They were able to complete part of the challenge questions as well, which I purposefully made more difficult than I would've expected them to be able to accomplish. I was very impressed by their effort.

Refer to the [Task 3 Rubric](#) for Textbox 3.3.2 and ask yourself:

- What evidence does the candidate provide to show the extent to which each Focus Student achieved the learning goal(s), including the impact of the differentiation(s) planned for each student?
- Why is the analysis of the differentiated instruction clear?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. Do more demonstrations for them or show them more resources or of technology to make sure they understand. Give them more time to complete activity based on them not achieving the learning goals.

b. Regular curriculum goals and outcomes. Teacher anticipates responses to variety of focus students needs. Abilities Skills Challenges Behaviors

Refer to the [Task 3 Rubric](#) for Textbox 3.3.2 and ask yourself:

- What evidence does the candidate provide to show the extent to which each Focus Student achieved the learning goal(s), including the impact of the differentiation(s) planned for each student?
- Why is the analysis of the differentiated instruction limited?

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.