

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Business, Industrial, and/or Technical Education

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

- 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.
- 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.
- 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. While working with Focus Student 1 and 2 and analyzing their pre- and post-assessment, I learned that they had strengths and learning troubles alike. Focus student 1 made significant improvements, going from a 30% to 64% when looking at his overall grade. From not knowing much about safety, he showed some improvements, especially in the areas tools/equipment and shop safety. He went from about 20% to 80%, which is great, as these are two essential components in my class. Focus student 2 had Auto I in the previous year and could remember many of the safety components, hence a 90% on the pre-assessment. He scored comparatively (86%) on the post-assessment. The somewhat lower score is to contribute to the constructed response part. Since he is an ELL student, this shows me that this is an area I need to help him

with further, which also applies to Focus Student 1. Overall, Focus Student 2 did not have as much growth but showed consistency which is essential when it comes to safety knowledge.

b. Looking at the assessment data, the modifications of the assessment have helped focus student 1 complete the assessment easier and increased his safety knowledge. By going through the questions with the student, having reduced answers, reading the questions out loud if needed, using the key search terms overview, and giving individual help, focus student 1 grew by 34%. Focus student 2 stayed around 90%. From the modification, there is an impact on focus student 1's performance, not so much on focus student 2. I also should have given better direction on the modifications for the constructed response part, since both students did not do so good.

c. As a class, we went over the post- (initial safety) test, using highlighters to mark important words in the questions, talked about how to approach the questions, and then marked the correct answers if needed. While doing individual work, I talked with the students individually about their tests and questions. With focus student 1 I discussed areas that he needed to improve on, and what parts we can look at together, so he will ultimately achieve a 100% on the final safety test. By discussing his grade, we were able to find areas that need improved, and it involved the student in a growth plan to meet his new goals for the final safety test and class. We looked at the two areas he made the most improvements in (shop and equipment safety) and discussed how to apply his skills from that area to other, weaker areas. Since focus student 2 received a high grade (aprox. 90%) on both assessments, we discussed his grade and what small areas he needs to polish to get a 100% on the final safety test. Since he is an ELL student, we discussed terminology and other words that may not be quite clear. I also showed him the Spanish safety video in our online auto program, that he said he would watch to get a deeper understanding. Through this, focus student 2 had a tool to improve his knowledge on auto safety and ultimately meet the final goal of getting a 100% on the final safety test.

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 clear?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. Focus Student 1 (FS1) achieved what I expected which was wrong answers on more general science questions yet better than I believe they felt they would do. They also had good spelling and grammar on essay questions do to their interest in writing. Focus Student 2 (FS2) achieved

what I expected which was wrong answers on various questions and poor spelling and grammar on essay questions.

b. FS1 took more time on the pre-quiz than average, FS2 took less time than average. I do believe that FS2 didn't take the quiz too seriously due to them knowing it wouldn't affect their score. No modification ended up being utilized for the pre-quiz as all students finished the exam within the allotted time.

c. As the class continued and I started to teach them the content that was on the pre-quiz, I had them reflect on the content. This helped them to explain more what they did and didn't know. Once we reach the end of the unit and are preparing to retake the quiz, I will have them look at their specific results from the pre-quiz so they can see their growth from what they partially knew and didn't know before.

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.