

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Spanish

Task 2, Step 1, Textbox 2.1.3: The Two Focus Students

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.1.3 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 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 2.1.3

- Choose and describe two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs and for whom you will need to modify the assessment. Provide a rationale for selecting each of the students. Refer to them as Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2 as you respond to the guiding prompts.
- What data did you use to establish a baseline for growth for these two Focus Students?
- Based on their specific learning needs, how will you modify the assessment for each of the two Focus Students? Provide a rationale for each decision.

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. Focus Student 1 (F.S. 1) is a 15 year old White male student. This student has an IEP and requires low levels of support and/or accommodations to reach proficiency. Focus Student 1 needs extended time on assessments, a seat near the front of the classroom, notes/study guides posted online, and the option to use text to speech. I selected this student as one of my Focus Students for this task because I know that with the necessary accommodations and modifications, this student will be able to surpass the proficiency level requirements. Regardless of his learning differences, he is highly motivated and excited to learn Spanish. I look forward to continuing to work with him and track his progress as a Spanish language learner. Focus Student 2 (F.S. 2) is a 14 year old White male student. This student has an IEP that focuses on literacy and numeracy. This student struggles with spelling, reading, and writing, all of which greatly impact his experience in our classroom. In his IEP plan, it is stated that F.S.1 is to have access to all study guides and class notes. He needs assignments and long texts to be read aloud to him through an audio software or by a teacher. This student is very bright and eager to learn every day. He stays engaged from bell to bell and asks great questions about the content we are learning. This student does well with pronouncing words in Spanish after I have said them aloud,

but struggles immensely to recognize those same words when he sees them on paper. I chose this student as one of my Focus Students because he has unique learning needs that must be met for him to accurately show me his abilities in the TL.

b. I used the data I collected from the pre-assessment in order to establish a baseline for growth for my Focus Students. Focus Student 1 received a score of 3 on the pre-assessment without any additional support. This student stayed fully focused the entire class period and tried very hard to use context clues to find out the meaning of some unfamiliar words. Focus Student 1 was reading aloud to himself quietly while working in order to sound out some of the words and through doing this he was able to identify several cognates. On previous formative assessments (as seen in the baseline data for this student) he has received scores of 3, 3.5, and 4. On previous assessments, this student has received a score of 2.5 and 3. Focus Student #1 is a dedicated student who strives to turn in his best work, even when the work is not graded. The goal of this student was to maintain an advanced level of proficiency in Interpretive Reading while reading a new story, and to be able to identify even more level 4 words than before. F.S. 2 received a score of 2 on the pre-assessment, and this student was not given any modifications or accommodations while completing the pre-assessment. I decided I wanted to see how the Focus Students would perform on the unmodified pre-assessment in order to determine where they might need more support and/or modifications to the actual assessment. F.S. 2 struggled with reading the text because this student has dyslexia and needs things to be read aloud for full comprehension. During work time, he asked me to read several sections of the practice assessment to him and told me that he would like to have someone read the 'real' assessment for him as well. He was still able to identify six of the fifteen words on the pre-assessment with limited assistance. These words were all high frequency level 3 words that we have used many times throughout the course of the semester. Focus Student 2 did not identify any level 4 words on the pre-assessment, as these words were unfamiliar and the student did not hear them read aloud in the context. On previous formative assessments, as seen in the baseline data, Focus Student 2 has scored a 3, 3, and 2. On assessments, he has scored a 2.5 and a 3. His goal for this assessment was to show growth and move from a 2 to a 3 in his Interpretive Reading proficiency score.

c. F.S. 1 was given a modified assessment. In this modification, there are eight level 4 words, ten level 3 words, and four level 2 words. The total number of words was modified by two (we removed two level 3 verbs: empieza = it begins, aprende = she learns). We also included an extended vocabulary key for this student. Student 1 took his assessment in the back room, which is a quiet alternate location. This accommodation was given to this student because their IEP requires them to have an alternate location for assessments completed in class. This student's IEP suggests that longer assessments be shortened, so we removed two of the level 3 questions but left the level 2 and level 4 questions to allow this student to show their advanced understanding of interpreting meaning. F.S. 2 was also given this modified version of the assessment, as their IEP aligns closely with that of F.S. 1. However, Focus Student 2 has dyslexia, which requires additional accommodations to the manner that the assessment is given. Focus Student 2 was taken to an individual room with an instructor where the whole assessment was read aloud to them several times so that they could hear each word being pronounced. When the student has to read assessments and tasks on his own, he often confuses words for other words because he pronounces the letters differently. This morphs the meaning of the words and makes interpreting very difficult. When the student needed a section or word repeated, the instructor read the word aloud again for him. We both modified the assessment

and provided accommodations to these students, and therefore their assessments were graded using the same proficiency scale as the rest of the class.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.1.3 and ask yourself:

In the candidate's description of administering the assessment, where is there evidence of the following?

- A description of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- The rationale for choosing Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- A baseline for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- The modifications of the assessment for each focus student based on each focus student's particular needs
- A rationale for the modifications chosen for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- Why is the candidate's analysis complete?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. Focus Student 1 is enrolled in Special Education with no specifics assigned. They do exhibit implications of dysgraphia and struggles to recall information regarding the vocabulary. Their needs call for one-on-one guidance.

Focus Student 2 is an ELL and exhibits great skill in the target language. However, English instruction is sometimes misunderstood and results in missing assignments or late work. This student requires one-on-one guidance and translated instructions.

b. I repurposed the class assignment to measure their ability to recall information regarding the vocabulary and to measure their learning needs. Both provided satisfactory results, which allowed me to progress to the next module; it also provided me with clues as to their individual needs as well.

c. Extra time was provided for Focus Student 1, and I remained with them for most of the time to guide them with the prompts. This student tends to get nervous and frazzled when under pressure; by providing them additional time, it allows them to slow down and focus on the task. For Focus Student 2, I gave the instructions slowly in English first to enhance comprehensibility, as well as provided spoken guidance in Spanish. This student does rather well on their own, they just need the instructor to slow down and assure that they have comprehended fully what is expected from them.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.1.3 and ask yourself:

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

- A description of Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- The rationale for choosing Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- A baseline for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- The modifications of the assessment for each focus student based on each focus student's particular needs
- A rationale for the modifications chosen for Focus Student 1 and Focus Student 2
- Why is the candidate's response tangential?

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 © 2023 by Educational Testing Service. All rights reserved.
ETS, the ETS logo and PPAT are registered trademarks of Educational Testing Service (ETS) in the United States and other countries.