

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Early Childhood

Task 2, Step 2, Textbox 2.2.2: Analysis of the Assessment Data and Student Learning for Each of the Two Focus Students

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.2.2 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 2, Textbox 2.2.2

- a. What did you learn overall about the progress of each of the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s)? Cite evidence from each of the two Focus Students' completed assessment and any other related data to support your analysis.
- b. Based on the assessment data, both baseline and graphic, what impact did your modification(s) of the assessment have on the demonstration of learning from each of the two Focus Students? Cite examples to support your analysis.
- c. Describe how you engaged each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her own assessment results to help understand progress made toward the learning goal(s).

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

- a. Student 1 is one of the strongest readers in the class (reading at a 4th grade level right now) and performed the highest in the class for the end of Unit 1 ELA assessment (reading comprehension, vocabulary, writing). Throughout all the activities we did to build on previous writing skills, Student 1 proved to me that he had a strong understanding of development/evidence and organization, but he still needed work on writing an introduction and conclusion. I have noticed that he tends to rush through work. Student 1's score decreased from the baseline to the final. All scores were consistent except for his introduction, which decreased. Student 1's baseline was filled with information; however, it was all over the place. I worked with him a lot on building a plot and adding details to have it make more sense for the reader. His final assessment really lacked an introduction, and I noticed that in his writing in our end of Unit 1 final assessment, he also lacked an introduction. Because he performs so well on a majority of the assessments and assignments within the classroom, I tend to overlook him and focus on those who need

"more" help. This student will need to be pushed continuously and reminded to slow down and work hard in the future. I worked a lot with Student 2, on more than just writing. She has been struggling with reading, which I think directly relates to how well a child can write. If she cannot read the story we are focusing on in class, how is she expected to answer a question on it or respond to a prompt? At the end of Unit 1 assessment, she scored on the lower end of overall scores in the class (reading comprehension and vocabulary), but her writing score increased significantly on this. During the final assessment, I saw Student 2 using the resources she was given. I saw her organize her writing before she started by using the graphic organizer, and at the end, she used the checklist, while reading through her writing. Her overall score went from a 5 to 11! This student will continue to improve with someone supporting her.

- b. I modified the assessment for Student 1 by giving him the same graphic organizer and checklist throughout our time working on narratives. I gave him less prompting than other students during the assessments. I let him go off on his own and complete this, which I thought would be best for him because this is often what he does. I did not want him to lose his train of thought by waiting around for me to read the graphic organizer and checklist to the rest of the class who needs it. I realize now that I should have had him wait, as I feel as though he rushed. I do not feel as though he demonstrated what he truly knows on this assessment. Throughout our time working on narratives, he displayed an understanding of each of the components of writing one. He still showed that he is capable of doing this and performing well; however, I was expecting higher scores in each category for him. I could have done better in helping this student throughout the assessment, modification wise. For Student 2, I modified the assessment by reading the graphic organizer and checklist to her. I also gave her a lot of prompting. In doing this, I was assisting her to complete the task at hand to the best of her ability. It is important throughout the school day for me to give this student reminders as to what we are doing and what she needs to do next. I think this student's improved performance can be attributed to all the small group work. I have noticed that in large group settings, she seems to get lost and distracted. In small groups, she participates, asks questions, and helps others. She seems more confident in these settings. When she told me she was done the assessment, she asked me for the checklist because she wanted to make sure she did not forget anything. This moment to me proved she learned something. She knew her writing had to have certain components within it, and she wanted this list to check her own writing.
- c. For Student 1, I was able to challenge him to progress towards his learning goal. From the beginning, he was capable of creating many of the components of a narrative, as he showed in his baseline. We worked on rewriting his baseline and making it flow more. I showed him how I graded his initial writing, as I knew he would understand why he got the scores that he did. I was able to tell him from the baseline what I wanted him to improve upon. Closer to the end, I gave him a score I wanted him to reach, which was an 11. This was the lowest score to be considered meeting the standard. Showing him what I was expecting for the baseline and then why he got the score that he did for the final helped him analyze his progress. In including him as part of the assessment process, he was able to see his progress and where he still needs to work. For Student 2, I went about engaging her in a different manner than I did for Student 1. From the beginning, she showed limited knowledge of understanding the components of a narrative. During small groups, I worked with her on what the many parts were and how to put them all together

to create a narrative. Closer to the end, I told her that I wanted her to reach a score of 11. I did not show her how I scored her baseline because I knew it would not make much sense to her based on her knowledge of narratives. I was able to show her how I scored her final assessment, as I knew she now understood the components and what they meant. I wrote her numbers down in each category and explained to her how she improved. I told her that she improved and showed her how her numbers increased and in which categories, which helped her understand her overall progress.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.2.2 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's response, where is there evidence of the following?

- An analysis of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An example of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An analysis of the impact of the assessment modifications made for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An example of the impact of the assessment modifications made for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- The engagement of Focus Student 1 in reviewing the assessment results for understanding of his or her particular progress
- The engagement of Focus Student 2 in reviewing the assessment results for understanding of his or her particular progress

Why is the candidate's analysis substantive?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

- a. I learned that student 2 was more motivated with the learning goal. Student 1 has a harder time getting and staying motivated about learning since it is harder for her.
- b. I think the modifications had a positive impact on student 2. He felt like he was being challenged enough but was still able to complete the tasks at hand. The modifications had little impact on Student 1. Even with modifications she did not want to complete the tasks.
- c. I had the students "grade" their own work throughout the unit. This way students could recognize their own errors and have a chance to fix them.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.2.2 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's response, where is there evidence of the following?

- An analysis of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An example of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An analysis of the impact of the assessment modifications made for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- An example of the impact of the assessment modifications made for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- The engagement of Focus Student 1 in reviewing the assessment results for understanding of his or her particular progress

- The engagement of Focus Student 2 in reviewing the assessment results for understanding of his or her particular progress

Why is the candidate's analysis uneven?

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 © 2022 by ETS. All rights reserved.
ETS, the ETS logo and PPAT are registered trademarks of ETS in the United States and other countries.