

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Elementary Education

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. FS1 had the same learning goals as the rest of the class, but accommodations were made for her to help her in reaching those goals. FS1 was able to reach the learning goal of this lesson with these accommodations. In the pre-assessment FS1 was able to correctly answer 6/10 questions, and in the post-assessment she was able to answer 10/10 correctly. On her pre-assessment she was unable to determine the ones and tens places correctly on 4 questions to compare the two-digit numbers. It showed me she had an understanding but it was not consistent, so I needed to make sure her understanding was much more solid. FS2 also had the same learning goals as the rest of the class, but he had accommodations made to assist him in reaching the learning goals. FS2 was able to meet the learning goals easily with the accommodations that were made. In the pre-assessment FS2 was only able to answer 2/10 questions correctly, and in the post-assessment he was easily able to answer all 10 questions correctly. On his pre-assessment it showed me that he had no background knowledge or understanding of comparing numbers. I knew that I would need to make sure I explain what each symbol meant and how to use them properly.
- b. During the partner activity, FS1 was taken back to the teacher table and provided teacher support for any reading issues, base ten blocks, and the hundreds chart, and also was

given extended time to complete her activity. These accommodations assisted her in breaking down each number and comparing the blocks or the number on the hundreds chart. During the whole-group lesson, I called on her as well to answer a question and when she needed a little help, I used guiding questions to help her get to the answer. During the partner activity, FS2 was taken back to the teacher table and provided teacher support, base ten blocks, and extended time to complete the activity. These accommodations assisted him in breaking down each number into tens and ones to fully understand the number and compare the blocks. He was only given one problem at a time to help keep him from feeling overwhelmed. Both FS1 and FS2 were able to maintain a longer focus sitting at the teacher table, since distractions were minimized.

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. Focus student one did not meet the learning goal and will need more work with this concept. She is able to get the correct numerator for a few of them but it seems she isn't understanding that concept fully. She is not getting the correct denominator for any of the problems so that is another thing we need to recap and reteach. Focus student two met the learning goal and was able to answer almost all questions correctly. He used the around the world method so another step for him could be seeing if he can do them the other ways as well.
- b. I think that having the students in the separate room really helped with them not rushing. Focus student one's partner was not willing to help, which became an issue and I think it led to her not achieving the learning goal. This is not something that normally happens so it will be a challenge to catch her up with the content now.

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.