

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Social 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. Focus Student 1 showed strong evidence of achieving the learning goals of the lesson, both through in-class participation and the completion of performance tasks. To the former, though he was somewhat quiet during small-group document activities, Focus Student 1 had a strong presence in whole-class discussion, making comments regarding topics such as the instability experienced by France as a result of its recent revolution, and actively asking questions about those topics on which he required clarification, such as the purpose of canals. Nowhere was his participation more powerful than in discussion of social impact of industrialization. He readily took to discussing the modern wonders which resulted from this initially-painful process, and while he argued in defense of industrialization almost exclusively, our discussion nevertheless exposed him to the perspectives of those touched by the process in a negative way, and he appeared to appreciate the significance of these ideas.
- b. Focus Student 2, though somewhat less enthused over the course of early discussion, nevertheless participated substantively, and displayed a strong understanding of the factors which led Germany and France to state support of industrialization. Her enthusiasm peaked, however, with "The Urban Game" activity. She took to the task with gusto, and her group produced by far the most elaborately-drawn representation of an

industrializing town. Her participation in ensuing discussion of the pains associated with industrial development was excellent – she even brought up contemporary artistry as a skill confined to minor online retailers. Indeed, both Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2 performed very well on associated performance assessments, with both scoring an 85% on our essay assignment regarding British industrialization, and an 80% on the next class quiz. Though differentiation efforts clearly resulted in improvements in participation and greater depth of content understanding as indicated above, both Focus Students missed a question on our post-lesson quiz which was oriented towards the social impacts of industrialization – the very concept to which both efforts at differentiation had been oriented. While comforting that both students selected the second-best response of those listed (and, in Focus Student 2's case, wrote arguments for both answers on her quiz), this data nevertheless gives me a degree of pause.

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 overall learning goals will stay the same for both Focus Student 1 & 2; however there will be additional resources for their use. These resources are designed to help each student with their cognizant or physical handicaps.
- b. In order to help meet the student's physical needs, I plan on having a transcript of the video activity for this student to read in case he or she misses any vital information in order to fill out the assigned worksheet activity. This way, the student doesn't lose any context or take up extra class time in order to fill in the blanks provided to her/him by a lack of hearing. With Focus Student 2, I plan on providing an extra resource of key terms and their definitions in order to help further the learning process. This will hopefully help this student when it comes to identifying the five themes of geography.
- c. I will not change any of the previously mentioned materials or resources for these students, but will add some. For Focus Student 1, I plan on adding a transcript of the video watched in class while for Focus Student 2 I will add a term (with definition) handout.
- d. I will know that each Focus Student achieved their learning goals for the lesson based on the post-assessment score and an after class conference. It will also become evident when they see some of these questions on the unit test in about a week from today.

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.

Copyright © 2018 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
ETS, the ETS logo and PPAT are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service (ETS) in the United States and other countries.