PPAT® Assessment
Library of Examples – Science
Task 4, Step 4, Textbox 4.4.2: Reflection on the Two Focus Students

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 4.4.2 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 Prompts for Task 4, Textbox 4.4.2

a. Based on the baseline data and student work samples, to what extent did each of the two Focus Students achieve the learning goal(s) of the lesson?

b. How will your analysis of the baseline data and student work samples guide planning for future lessons for each of the two Focus Students?

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. Based on the baseline data (Codon Chart practice opener from the previous lesson), both focus students were struggling with parts or completely did not understand/remember the process of protein synthesis given a DNA sequence to decode. Focus Student 1 only partially completed the Codon Chart opener and read the codon chart incorrectly to determine the amino acids. Focus Student 1 had to be retaught on how to read the codon chart correctly. Focus Student 1 struggled with focusing and staying engaged during the lesson. After personal and individualized attention and frequent stay on task reminders, Student 1 was able to demonstrate mastery of the learning goal. Student 1 was able to completely and correctly decode all six genes for the six traits of the first monster. Focus Student 2 was absent during the initial practice of decoding DNA sequences with the "Codon Chart Practice" (used as a baseline). Focus Student 2 did not have the needed practice and reminder of steps for reading the codon chart. Focus Student 2 did not start on the monster activity (main activity) for many minutes after the start of class. After some questions, I concluded it was because Focus Student 2 did not know what to do or even to first apply the prior knowledge of complementary base pairs to the DNA sequence. I realized that Focus Student 2 was so late to class that she missed the review
also. After individualized help to walk the process through, Student 2 was able to demonstrate mastery in the monster learning activity. Student 2 completely and accurately decoded all six genes for the six traits of the first monster. However, she did not create a drawing using the six traits. Many others like these focus students need tailored instruction to match their learning needs.

b. I learned that Focus Student 1 will continue to struggle with participation, motivation, and engagement. As a result, Focus Student 1 needs checks for understanding due to inattention. Student 2 will continue to struggle with time management and asking for help. Student 2 does not often ask for help even though she may need directions re-explained (with simple and short directions) due to her language barrier, simple confusion over vocabulary, or because she simply missed instruction and review. Focusing on a student's strengths and tailoring instruction for their weaknesses and taking the time to make sure they do not fall behind in class is important to a student’s development and success. For future classes, I will also look for novel ways to engage and to provide frequent stay on task reminders for Student 1. For Student 2, I will be especially aware when she has been absent or extremely tardy to class so I know I need to provide a review and check for understanding frequently. Even though both students achieved the same learning objective, they had different learning needs. The two Focus Students taught me that students may not always be following direct instruction and thus questioning them often to check for understanding is essential to good teaching.

Refer to the Task 4 Rubric for Textbox 4.4.2 and ask yourself:

- How does the candidate use each Focus Student’s work sample to indicate attainment of the learning goal(s) and to guide future planning?
- Why is the reflection effective?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. From the baseline data and the work sample from the focus students I can say that they both made progress towards the learning goal and that focus student 2 reached the goal fully. This is based on the comparison of the baseline data to the work samples. Focus student 1 showed significant growth in his score. Seeing how he was working I can also infer that the few points that he missed are from working too fast and making small mistakes that could easily be corrected. Focus student 2 demonstrated that he reached the goal in his work sample score and in his verbal explanations to me about the material.

b. Based on the data collect for both of the focus students I can better prepare for both of them. For focus student 1 I know I need to try to help him slow down on his work. This could mean making a differentiated assignment that is formatted for him so that he will take his time and show all that he really knows. For focus student 2 I will be able to help him go deeper with a differentiated assignment rather than an optional extra assignment. This will allow him to go further with the material.

Refer to the Task 4 Rubric for Textbox 4.4.2 and ask yourself:

- How does the candidate use each Focus Student’s work sample to indicate attainment of the learning goal(s) and to guide future planning?
- Why is the reflection ineffective?

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.