

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Family and Consumer Science

Task 2, Step 2, Textbox 2.2.1: Analysis of the Assessment Data and Student Learning for the Whole Class

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.2.1 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 2.2.1

- a. Based on your baseline data and the data shown in your graphic representation, analyze the assessment data to determine your students' progress toward the learning goal(s).
- b. How efficient was the data-collection process that you selected? Cite examples to support your analysis.
- c. Describe how you engaged students in analyzing their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s).

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. Students were given a pre-assessment over kitchen safety, sanitation, measurements, and tools. Students who identified the correct answer of each question were given 1 point and if the answer was incorrect students did not receive any points for the question. However, for this particular assessment students' gradebooks reflect only 5 points. The purpose of this was so students' grades did not drop drastically. These points were given as participation points. Students' assessments were ranked for three different levels and also modified for one student due to his IEP. If students scored low on their pre-assessment (missed 20 or more question wrong) were given a modified "below-level" assessment, students with pre-assessments who scored 10-19 wrong were categorized as "on-level" and given an unmodified "on-level" assessment, and students with pre-assessments who did not miss more than 9 questions were categorized as "above level" and given modified "above-level" assessment. The below-level version of the hand-washing post assessment students had the list of steps and had to write them out in order on their poster, the measurement equivalent assessment students were given a list of equivalents and had to write them out on the poster. An "above-level" version of the hand washing assessment asked the students to write out the hand washing procedures and the

measurement equivalents assessment students were asked to write out the equivalents and draw pictures. The un-modified version of the hand washing assessment was identical task from the pre-assessment and the kitchen measurement equivalents assessment students were given the equivalents however had to match them correctly. The pre-assessment and two poster assessments were graded similarly however, points given were different. I graded both assessments with how well the students work and if they knew the content or not. For example, in the pre-assessment students had to number the handwashing step in order 1-5 whereas the poster assessment was similar, and students had to write them out in order after reviewing them in class. The artifact shows the classes results. Within this class there were 3 students (38%) who were below level on the pre-assessment, 5 students (62%) who were on level, and zero students who were above level. Following the lesson on Kitchen safety, sanitation, and measurements, based on the assessment results there were zero students who were below level, 2 students (25%) who were on level, and 6 (75%) student that was above level on the assessment using all three versions of the assessment (below-level, on-level, and above-level). Following the kitchen safety, sanitation, and measurement lesson and assessment there were 6 students, or 86% of the class, that was able to increase their scores into a higher category than the pre-assessment.

b. Data collection was efficient, and included grading of all assessments, giving the assessment the appropriate score, and recording the score within a chart. The assessment was able to determine students understanding of each topic individually. Because questions were aligned to a specific learning goal it was easy to measure growth on each topic and target. The post assessments reflected the unit lessons and topics taught in class and was an accurate way to measure student's growth and understanding.

c. Students received the pre-assessment back right away due to it being done online. Students could see which questions they answered correctly or incorrectly. Although the pre-assessment was not graded by what questions students got right or wrong but more based on how each student participated on it. The pre-assessment was an indication of prior knowledge and would be used later in the unit to see how they progressed. Students received their assessment back one day after completion. Students received the rubric back with notes on their posters and areas that I would like to see them to continue to learn and grow. The handwashing posters were hung around the room and in bathrooms and the measurement equivalent posters were hung in the FACS classroom.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.2.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's analysis of the assessment data and student learning for the whole class, where is there evidence of the following?

- A comparison of the baseline data and the assessment data
- An analysis of the students' progress toward the learning goals
- An analysis of the efficiency of the data-collection process
- Specific examples of the efficiency of the data-collection process
- Analysis by students of their assessments in relation to their progress toward the learning goals
- Why is the candidate's analysis complete?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

- a. Based on the graphic representation and baseline data, students showed great improvement. Every student increased their score. As you can see in my graphic representation, the class went from an average of 40% of students answering correctly to 91.56% of students answering correctly. The questions on the selected assessment was pulled from the learning goals of the lesson. The graphic representation helps me have a visual representation on what learning goals were met.
- b. Using a multiple choice test and answer key made the data collection process very efficient. As you can see on my baseline data and graphic representative of class data, The students scores on their pre-test are all recorded and compared to the number of correct answers that they had on their assessment.
- c. After taking the assessment, I had the students compare their pre-test with their assessment. I wanted them to have a visual representation of how their learning grew and could physically see how their learning goals were met.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.2.1 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's analysis of the assessment data and student learning for the whole class, where is there evidence of the following?

- A comparison of the baseline data and the assessment data
- An analysis of the students' progress toward the learning goals
- An analysis of the efficiency of the data-collection process
- Specific examples of the efficiency of the data-collection process
- Analysis by students of their assessments in relation to their progress toward the learning goals
- Why is the candidate's analysis 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.