Missouri Pre-Service Teacher Assessment (MoPTA)
Library of Examples – English Language Arts

Task 2, Step 2, Textbox 2.2.3: Analysis of the Assessment Data and Student Learning for the Two Focus Students

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.2.3 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 candidates to use to guarantee a successful score. Rather, they are examples that candidates can use for comparison purposes to see the kinds of evidence that they may need to add to their 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 2.2.3

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 the work samples and the baseline and graphic assessment data from each Focus Student to support your analysis.

b. Based on the assessment data, both baseline and graphic, what impact did your modification of this assessment have on the demonstration of learning from each of the two Focus Students? Cite evidence to support your analysis.

c. Describe how you shared the assessment data, both baseline and graphic, with both Focus Students to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s). Cite evidence to support your analysis.

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. Based on the baseline assessment over Shakespearean literary terminology and vocabulary given on February 11, Focus Student 1 received a score of 39.13 percent. This test was based on the student’s prior knowledge of the terminology they had learned last year when reading Romeo and Juliet in their freshman English course. After I gave the post-assessment on February 16th, Focus Student 1 scored a 69.57 percent, doubling his progress. The student chose to write out his response instead of taking the option to type out his responses. There were a few spelling errors, but the student showed growth when applying the concepts in a written response. Based on the baseline assessment over Shakespearean literary terminology and vocabulary given on February 11, Focus Student 2 received a score of 82.61 percent. This test was based on the student’s prior knowledge of the terminology they had learned last year when reading Romeo and Juliet in their freshman English course. After I gave the student the post-assessment on February 16,
Focus Student 2 scored 100.00 percent. In order to increase the rigor for this student, I modified the short essay question to have the student define Aristotle’s belief on tragedy as well as explain his tragic concepts and how they work together. The student answered all of the points asked in the prompted short essay question showing mastery of the concepts.

b. The baseline and post-assessment both contained matching portions. The instructional material stayed the same for both assessments; however, I added a short answer and short essay portion to the post-assessment. Because the format would be unfamiliar and the answer required more application than the matching part, I chose to modify the short essay section for both of my Focus Students. For Focus Student 1, I gave an explanation of the concept in the prompted question to not overwhelm the student with complex language before writing his response. I also gave the student the option to type out his response as opposed to writing it. This modification gave the student guided support, but still allowed him to think critically. The student also chose to write out his response which improves his writing and spelling skills through practice. For Focus Student 2, I modified the short essay portion by increasing the rigor of the question. The student was asked to define Aristotle’s belief on tragedy as well as his tragic concepts and how they work together. The modification helped the student use critical thinking in order to answer all of the points in the question. I was able to use extensions in the lessons and the assessment to challenge Focus Student 2 academically, and in turn, the student was able to show mastery of the concepts learned throughout the lessons.

c. I met with both Focus Students one-on-one after I received their test scores from both their baseline and post-assessment so I could share with them their growth throughout the assessment as well as their individual progress towards their learning goals. If I simply handed back their graded baseline and post-assessments, the Focus Students would be able to see their improvement by looking at the numbers. However, by meeting with the Focus Students one-on-one about their progress toward the learning goals, I can not only show their growth through numbers, we can talk about the concepts where they showed improvement and also discuss what concepts are still unclear. The knowledge I gain from these meetings can also help me plan the modifications for these two Focus Students for future assessments to help them reach their learning goals.

Refer to the Task 2 Rubric for Textbox 2.2.3 and ask yourself:

In the candidate’s response for each of the Focus Students, where is there evidence of the following?

- An analysis of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2 toward the learning goals
- Evidence cited from the students’ work samples and data 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 on the demonstration of learning
- Evidence cited 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 to understand progress toward the learning goals, with evidence to support the analysis
• The engagement of Focus Student 2 in reviewing the assessment results to understand progress toward the learning goals, with evidence to support the analysis

• Why is the candidate’s analysis substantive?

**Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level**

a. The second focus student improved greatly – 65 percent – and, thus, met the learning goal. However, the first focus student did not improve as much. This student increased 20 percent from the pre test score. Focus student one did well on the multiple choice section of the text, but struggled on the short answer portion of the text. Focus student 2 showed got grasp of the content on bother the multiple choice questions and even the short answer questions.

b. For student one, it seems that the modifications of the multiple choice questions were helpful as this student exceled on the area of multiple choice questions. Focus student two also seemed to be helped by the decreases amount of possible answers and by the use of language helps.

c. At the end of class, I communicated with each focus student individually. I showed focus student 1 both assessments. Then, we discussed if he thought the modifications were helpful and how we might work together to improve his score in the future. I also showed focus student 2 the assessments that he or she completed. We discussed if the modifications helped this student achieve this high score.

Refer to the **Task 2 Rubric** for Textbox 2.2.3 and ask yourself:

In the candidate’s response for each of the Focus Students, where is there evidence of the following?

• An analysis of the progress of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2 toward the learning goals

• Evidence cited from the students’ work samples and data 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 on the demonstration of learning

• Evidence cited 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 to understand progress toward the learning goals, with evidence to support the analysis

• The engagement of Focus Student 2 in reviewing the assessment results to understand progress toward the learning goals, with evidence to support the analysis

• 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.