PPAT® **Assessment**

Library of Examples – Science

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. Overall, the two focus students did very well on learning goal for the lesson. Focus student 1 scored an 8/12 possible points while focus student 2 scored an 11/12 on the exit slip assessment. If we look at Focus Student 1's work, we can see that the only question that she missed was applying Newton's 1st law to a real world example. This shows me two things – first, that this question was the one that I knew she was going to struggle with the most because while other students were able to see the motion of an object staying constant under a 0N net force, she had my differentiated real world examples. Secondly, this tells me that my differentiation for this student was not effective due to her still holding this major misconception that 0N net force equals no movement. So, in the terms of the learning goal, I would say that focus student 1 has not reached the learning goal yet, but given another 5 minutes at the beginning of the next class, she absolutely could. Focus Student 2 on the other hand did very well on their assessment. The only mistake that he made was that in question #4, he tried to quantify inertia while the question only asked for a conceptual understanding. However, focus student 2 correctly answered the Newton's 1st Law question on the assessment, meaning that he would fit under the category of having reached the learning goal for the lesson.

b. My differentiation for focus Student 1 was not effective in helping her understand and reach the learning goal, which I was worried about. Overall, it is very difficult to explain a visual concept such as motion in words and receive an accurate representation as to what the object is doing. So, in terms of differentiation with student one, we as teachers will have to try again to find a method that helps her understand the material. However, with focus student 2, it seems that the ability to keep him engaged in the lesson led to him having a greater understanding of the material, and being able to apply his knowledge to the learning goal. Overall, I believe that the over activity of student 2 was an effective differentiation for this particular lesson, leading to him meeting the learning goals for the end of the lesson.

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. The focus student 1 was able to see and make an inference. He was able to tell me characteristics that he would find in each rock. The focus student 2 wanted to take the 3 rocks she made in lab. So her group combined the 3 rocks together to see what happen so once they did and I made focus student 2 tell me about the heating and cooling process she saw take place throughout the entire lab since this the area where she struggles the most.

b. They were able to be more hands on one and get a better understanding of the lab. I will make sure that they understand the melting and cooling by having the document camera show on the board as I do the melting and cooling parts of the lab to see if they see why and how the rocks can be formed from that.

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.