

PPAT® Assessment

Task 2 Assessment and Data Collection to Measure and Inform Student Learning

Rubric for Step 1: Planning the Assessment (textboxes 2.1.1, 2.1.2, and 2.1.3)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
A response at the 1 level	A response at the 2 level	A response at the 3 level	A response at the 4 level
provides <i>minimal</i> evidence that demonstrates the teacher	provides partial evidence that demonstrates the teacher	provides effective evidence that demonstrates the teacher	provides <i>consistent</i> evidence that demonstrates the teacher
candidate's ability to describe an assessment and identify	candidate's ability to describe an assessment and identify	candidate's ability to describe an assessment and identify	candidate's ability to describe an assessment and identify
how it aligns to the standards,	how it aligns to the standards,	how it aligns to the standards,	how it aligns to the standards,
learning goal(s), and student	learning goal(s), and student	learning goal(s), and student	learning goal(s), and student
learning goal(s), and student	learning goal(s), and student	learning goal(s), and student	learning goal(s), and student
establish a baseline for student	establish a baseline for student	establish a baseline for student	establish a baseline for student
growth; to describe the	growth; to describe the	growth; to describe the	growth; to describe the
rubric/scoring guide, its	rubric/scoring guide, its	rubric/scoring guide, its	rubric/scoring guide, its
alignment to the learning	alignment to the learning	alignment to the learning	alignment to the learning
goal(s), and the	goal(s), and the	goal(s), and the	goal(s), and the
communication of its use to	communication of its use to	communication of its use to	communication of its use to
students; to identify evidence	students; to identify evidence	students; to identify evidence	students; to identify evidence
of student learning using a	of student learning using a	of student learning using a	of student learning using a
data-collection method; to	data- collection method; to	data- collection method; to	data- collection method; to
identify learning activities and	identify learning activities and	identify learning activities and	identify learning activities and
student groupings to be used	student groupings to be used	student groupings to be used	student groupings to be used
during the assessment; to	during the assessment; to	during the assessment; to	during the assessment; to
identify materials, resources,	identify materials, resources,	identify materials, resources,	identify materials, resources,
and technology to be used	and technology to be used	and technology to be used	and technology to be used
during the assessment; to	during the assessment; to	during the assessment; to	during the assessment; to



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4		
identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs for whom the assessment will be modified; to use data to establish a baseline for measuring growth of these two Focus Students; and to modify the assessment based on the Focus Students' specific learning needs.	identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs for whom the assessment will be modified; to use data to establish a baseline for measuring growth of these two Focus Students; and to modify the assessment based on the Focus Students' specific learning needs.	identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs for whom the assessment will be modified; to use data to establish a baseline for measuring growth of these two Focus Students; and to modify the assessment based on the Focus Students' specific learning needs.	identify two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs for whom the assessment will be modified; to use data to establish a baseline for measuring growth of these two Focus Students; and to modify the assessment based on the Focus Students' specific learning needs.		
The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is minimal and/or ineffective throughout the response for Step 1. Evidence may also be missing.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is <i>limited</i> and/or <i>vague</i> throughout the response for Step 1.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is appropriate and connected throughout the response for Step 1.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is insightful and tightly connected throughout the response for Step 1.		
Comment of the Charact					

Score of 0 for Step 1

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered "Not Scoreable" because of insufficient evidence. A Zero is assigned to Step 1 for at least one of the following reasons.

- No written response is in any of the Task 2—Step 1 textboxes.
- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 2—Step 1.
- The artifact attachments contain only hyperlinks.
- None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 2 textboxes.
 - $\circ \quad \text{Representative pages of the selected assessment}$
 - o Representative pages of the baseline data for the whole class
 - o Representative page of the rubric or scoring guide
 - o Representative page of the baseline data for at least one Focus Student



Response for Textbox 2.1.1

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a disconnected assessment, with minimal description, based on its alignment with standards, learning goal(s), and student needs • irrelevant data used as a baseline for student growth and related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a loosely connected assessment, with partial description, based on its alignment with standards, learning goal(s), and student needs • sketchy data used as a baseline for student growth and related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • an appropriate assessment, with detailed description, based on its alignment with standards, learning goal(s), and student needs • appropriate data used as a baseline for student growth and related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a tightly connected assessment, with in-depth description, based on its alignment with standards, learning goal(s), and student needs • significant data used as a baseline for student growth and related to the learning goal(s) of the lesson
 selection of a rubric/scoring guide that is disconnected from the learning goal(s) and minimal communication of its use to students an illogical choice of and rationale for a data-collection method to show evidence of student learning 	 selection of a rubric/scoring guide that is loosely connected to the learning goal(s) and inconsistent communication of its use to students a vague choice of and rationale for a data-collection method to show evidence of student learning 	 selection of a rubric/scoring guide that is aligned to the learning goal(s) and appropriate communication of its use to students an effective choice of and rationale for a data-collection method to show evidence of student learning 	 selection of a rubric/scoring guide that is tightly connected to the learning goal(s) and insightful communication of its use to students a significant choice of and rationale for a data-collection method to show evidence of student learning



Response for Textbox 2.1.2

	Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3 Score of 4
	esponse provides evidence that ncludes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following: Response provides evidence that includes the following:
•	an <i>irrelevant</i> selection of and rationale for the activities and student groupings used during the assessment	an uneven selection of and rationale for the activities and student groupings used during the assessment	 an appropriate selection of and rationale for the learning activities and student groupings used during the an insightful selection of and rationale for the activities and student groupings used during the assessment
•	an <i>illogical</i> selection of and rationale for materials, resources, and technology used during the assessment	an incomplete selection of and rationale for materials, resources, and technology used during the assessment	 a logical selection of and rationale for materials, resources, and technology used during the assessment an in-depth selection of and rationale for materials, resources, and technology used during the assessment



Response for Textbox 2.1.3

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
a misinformed identification and discussion of and rationale for selecting the two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs for whom the assessment would be modified	a limited identification and discussion of and rationale for selecting the two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs for whom the assessment would be modified	an appropriate identification and description of and rationale for selecting the two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs for whom the assessment would be modified	an extensive identification and discussion of and rationale for selecting the two Focus Students who reflect different learning needs for whom the assessment would be modified
an inappropriate choice of data to be used to establish a baseline for growth for each of the two Focus Students	 a cursory choice of data to be used to establish a baseline for growth for the each of the two Focus Students 	an informed choice of data to be used to establish a baseline for growth for each of the two Focus Students	a significant choice of data to be used to establish a baseline for growth for each of the two Focus Students
a misinformed choice of and rationale for modifications of the assessment for each of the two Focus Students based on their specific learning needs	a vague choice of and rationale for modifications of the assessment for each of the two Focus Students based on their specific learning needs	a logical choice of and rationale for modifications of the assessment for each of the two Focus Students based on their specific learning needs	an insightful choice of and rationale for modifications of the assessment for each of the two Focus Students based on their specific learning needs



Rubric for Step 2: Administering the Assessment and Analyzing the Data (textboxes 2.2.1 and 2.2.2)

A response at the 1 level provides <i>minimal</i> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze both baseline and graphic data to determine student progress toward the learning goal(s); to determine the efficiency of the data-collection process; to engage students in analyzing their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress made by the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s); to identify the impact, based on data, both baseline and graphic, that the modification(s) of this assessment had on the demonstration of learning from the two Focus Students; and to engage each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her assessment results to help understand progress toward the learning goal(s). A response at the 2 level provides <i>effective</i> evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze both baseline and graphic data to determine student progress toward the learning goal(s); to determine the efficiency of the data-collection process; to engage students in analyzing their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress made by the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s); to identify the impact, based on data, both baseline and graphic, that the modification(s) of this assessment had on the demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze both baseline and graphic data to determine student progress toward the learning goal(s); to determine the efficiency of the data-collection process; to engage students in analyzing their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress made by the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite	Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
	provides minimal evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze both baseline and graphic data to determine student progress toward the learning goal(s); to determine the efficiency of the data-collection process; to engage students in analyzing their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress made by the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s); to identify the impact, based on data, both baseline and graphic, that the modification(s) of this assessment had on the demonstration of learning from the two Focus Students; and to engage each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her assessment results to help understand progress toward	provides partial evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze both baseline and graphic data to determine student progress toward the learning goal(s); to determine the efficiency of the data-collection process; to engage students in analyzing their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress made by the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s); to identify the impact, based on data, both baseline and graphic, that the modification(s) of this assessment had on the demonstration of learning from the two Focus Students; and to engage each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her assessment results to help understand progress toward	provides effective evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze both baseline and graphic data to determine student progress toward the learning goal(s); to determine the efficiency of the data-collection process; to engage students in analyzing their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress made by the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s); to identify the impact, based on data, both baseline and graphic, that the modification(s) of this assessment had on the demonstration of learning from the two Focus Students; and to engage each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her assessment results to help understand progress toward	provides consistent evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to analyze both baseline and graphic data to determine student progress toward the learning goal(s); to determine the efficiency of the data-collection process; to engage students in analyzing their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s); to cite evidence of progress made by the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s); to identify the impact, based on data, both baseline and graphic, that the modification(s) of this assessment had on the demonstration of learning from the two Focus Students; and to engage each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her assessment results to help understand progress toward



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is minimal and/or ineffective throughout the response for Step 2. Evidence may also be missing.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is limited and/or vague throughout the response for Step 2.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is appropriate and connected throughout the response for Step 2.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is insightful and tightly connected throughout the response for Step 2.

Score of 0 for Step 2

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered "Not Scoreable" because of insufficient evidence. A Zero is assigned to Step 2 for at least one of the following reasons.

- No written response is in any of the Task 2—Step 2 textboxes.
- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 2—Step 2.
- The artifact attachments contain only hyperlinks.
- None of the following required artifacts are acceptable or attached to any of the Task 2 textboxes.
 - o Representative pages of a graphic representation (e.g., spreadsheet, pie chart, table) of the collected data
 - o A completed assessment from at least one Focus Student



Response for Textbox 2.2.1

	Score of 1		Score of 2		Score of 3		Score of 4
	Response provides evidence that ncludes the following:		esponse provides evidence that cludes the following:		esponse provides evidence that cludes the following:		sponse provides evidence that cludes the following:
•	a <i>minimal</i> analysis of all of the data to determine students' progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	a partial analysis of all of the data to determine students' progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	an <i>informed</i> analysis of both forms of data to determine students' progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	an extensive analysis of all of the data to determine students' progress toward the learning goal(s)
•	an <i>inappropriate</i> analysis of the efficiency of the data-collection process	•	a <i>partial</i> analysis of the efficiency of the data-collection process	•	an <i>appropriate</i> analysis of the efficiency of the data-collection process	•	a <i>thorough</i> analysis of the efficiency of the data-collection process
•	minimal engagement of students to analyze their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	limited engagement of students to analyze their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	effective engagement of students to analyze their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s)	•	significant engagement of students to analyze their own assessment results to help them understand their progress toward the learning goal(s)

Response for Textbox 2.2.2

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following: • little or no analysis of all the data to learn about the	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a partial analysis of all the data to learn about the progress of	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • an accurate analysis of all the data to learn about the	Response provides evidence that includes the following: • a thorough analysis of all the data to learn about the
progress of each of the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s)	each of the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s)	progress of each of the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s)	progress of each of the two Focus Students toward achieving the learning goal(s)



Score of 1		Score of 2		Score of 3		Score of 4
on data, both baseline and graphic, of the impact of the modification of the assessment for each Focus Student to be able to demonstrate learning, with minimal evidence	•	an incomplete analysis, based on data, both baseline and graphic, of the impact of the modification of the assessment for each Focus Student to be able to demonstrate learning, with weak evidence	•	an informed analysis, based on data, both baseline and graphic, of the impact of the modification of the assessment for each Focus Student to be able to demonstrate learning, with appropriate evidence supporting the analysis	•	an <i>in-depth</i> analysis, based on data, both baseline and graphic, of the impact of the modification of the assessment for each Focus Student to be able to demonstrate learning, with <i>thorough</i> evidence
 minimal engagement of each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her own assessment results to understand progress toward the learning goals, with inappropriate evidence to support the analysis 	•	cursory engagement of each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her own assessment results to understand progress toward the learning goals, with inconsistent evidence to support the analysis	•	effective engagement of each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her own assessment results to understand progress toward the learning goals, with appropriate evidence to support the analysis	•	extensive engagement of each of the two Focus Students in analyzing his or her own assessment results to understand progress toward the learning goals, with significant evidence to support the analysis



Rubric for Step 3: Reflecting (textboxes 2.3.1 and 2.3.2)

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
provides minimal evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify how the data analysis will inform or guide future instruction for the whole class; to identify modifications to the data-collection process for future use; to identify modifications to the assessment for future use; to identify a different assessment that would allow students to further demonstrate achievement of the learning goal(s); to identify one aspect of the assessment that was successful for either Focus Student; to identify how data analysis of this assessment will inform or guide the future instruction for each Focus Student; and to identify modification to the assessment for future use with the two	A response at the 2 level provides partial evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify how the data analysis will inform or guide future instruction for the whole class; to identify modifications to the data-collection process for future use; to identify modifications to the assessment for future use; to identify a different assessment that would allow students to further demonstrate achievement of the learning goal(s); to identify one aspect of the assessment that was successful for either Focus Student; to identify how data analysis of this assessment will inform or guide the future instruction for each Focus Student; and to identify modification to the assessment for future use with the two Focus Students.	A response at the 3 level provides effective evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify how the data analysis will inform or guide future instruction for the whole class; to identify modifications to the data-collection process for future use; to identify modifications to the assessment for future use; to identify a different assessment that would allow students to further demonstrate achievement of the learning goal(s); to identify one aspect of the assessment that was successful for either Focus Student; to identify how data analysis of this assessment will inform or guide the future instruction for each Focus Student; and to identify modification to the assessment for future use with the two Focus Students.	A response at the 4 level provides consistent evidence that demonstrates the teacher candidate's ability to identify how the data analysis will inform or guide future instruction for the whole class; to identify modifications to the data-collection process for future use; to identify modifications to the assessment for future use; to identify a different assessment that would allow students to further demonstrate achievement of the learning goal(s); to identify one aspect of the assessment that was successful for either Focus Student; to identify how data analysis of this assessment will inform or guide the future instruction for each Focus Student; and to identify modification to the assessment for future use with the two Focus Students.



Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
The preponderance of evidence for the 1-level criteria is minimal and/or ineffective throughout the response for Step 3. Evidence may also be missing.	The preponderance of evidence for the 2-level criteria is limited and/or vague throughout the response for Step 3.	The preponderance of evidence for the 3-level criteria is appropriate and connected throughout the response for Step 3.	The preponderance of evidence for the 4-level criteria is insightful and tightly connected throughout the response for Step 3.

Score of 0 for Step 3

If a Zero is assigned, the Step is considered "Not Scoreable" because of insufficient evidence. A Zero is assigned to Step 3 for at least one of the following reasons.

- No written response is in any of the Task 2—Step 3 textboxes.
- The written response does not address any of the guiding prompts for Task 2—Step 3.



Response for Textbox 2.3.

	Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3 Score of 4	
Response provides evidence that includes the following:		Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following: Response provides evide includes the following:	ence that
•	a <i>minimal</i> explanation of how the data analysis will inform or guide future instruction for the whole class	a cursory explanation of how the data analysis will inform or guide future instruction for the whole class	 an appropriate explanation of how the data analysis will inform or guide future instruction for the whole class an insightful explanation of how the data analysis inform or guide future instruction for the w 	is will re
•	ineffective identification of modifications to be made to the data-collection process for future use with minimal rationale	 partial identification of modifications to be made to the data-collection process for future use with a limited rationale 	 informed identification of modifications to be made to the data-collection process for future use with an appropriate rationale insightful identification modifications to be modifications. 	made to rocess for
•	an <i>inappropriate</i> choice of modifications to the assessment and rationale for this choice	a limited choice of modifications to the assessment and rationale for this choice	 an appropriate choice of modifications to the assessment and rationale for this choice a significant choice of modifications to the assessment and ratio this choice 	
•	an <i>illogical</i> alternative assessment to allow students to further demonstrate their achievement of the learning goal(s)	 a partial alternative assessment to allow students to further demonstrate their achievement of the learning goal(s) 	 a logical alternative assessment to allow students to further demonstrate their achievement of the learning goal(s) a significant alternation assessment to allow to further demonstration achievement of the learning goal(s) 	students ate their



Response for Textbox 2.3.

Score of 1	Score of 2	Score of 3	Score of 4
Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:	Response provides evidence that includes the following:
 a misinformed choice of and rationale for one successful aspect of the assessment for either Focus Students a minimal use of data analysis to inform or guide the next steps of instruction for each of the two Focus Students 	 a limited choice of and rationale for one successful aspect of the assessment for either Focus Student a tangential use of data analysis to inform or guide the next steps of instruction for each of the two Focus Students 	 an informed choice of and a rationale for one successful aspect of the assessment for either Focus Student an appropriate use of data analysis to inform or guide the next steps of instruction for each of the two Focus Students 	 a significant choice of and an in-depth rationale for one successful aspect of the assessment for either Focus Student a substantive use of data analysis to inform or guide the next steps of instruction for
a minimal identification of modifications to be made to the assessment for future use for each of the two Focus Students, with a minimal rationale	 a vague identification of modifications to be made to the assessment for future use for each of the two Focus Students, with a limited rationale 	a logical identification of modifications to be made to the assessment for future use for each of the two Focus Students, with an appropriate rationale	 each of the two Focus Students an insightful identification of modifications to be made to the assessment for future use for each of the two Focus Students, with a thorough rationale

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