

PPAT® Assessment

Library of Examples – Agriculture

Task 2, Step 1, Textbox 2.1.1: Selecting a Single Assessment

Below are two examples of written responses to Textbox 2.1.1 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 2.1.1

- Provide an in-depth description of the assessment. Provide a rationale for choosing or designing the assessment based on its alignment with the standards and learning goal(s) that meet the students' needs.
- What data did you use to establish a baseline for student growth related to this lesson's learning goal(s)?
- Describe the rubric or scoring guide you have selected or designed. How does it align to your learning goal(s)? How will you communicate its use to your students?
- What evidence of student learning do you plan to collect from the assessment? How will you collect the data? Provide a rationale for your data-collection process.

Example 1: Met/Exceeded Standards Level

a. This assessment will align with the Utah standards for Ag-Education. Strand 7 lists some standards that will directly relate to and align with the assessment: Standard 1: "Set up for SMAW operations on carbon steel", Standard 2: "Start and restart an arc and run a bead on carbon steel." Along with these standards, the assessment aligns with my individual classroom goals which are "Students will be able to demonstrate their ability to effectively run a bead using 6013 electrode on carbon steel". The assessment that I have chosen to give students is a physical weld test to be done in class. This weld tests requires that students set the welder to settings that will produce welds that are to industry standards. The weld that they will be required to complete will depend on how advanced they are in welding to begin with. To determine this, I used the baseline data that was gathered the first day that students went into the shop. The students will be split into 3 groups: below average, average, and advanced; based off of their pre assessment scores. Students who fell into the below average grouping will complete a basic stringer bead weld, students who are in the average grouping will complete a

butt weld, and the advanced students will complete a lap weld. All of these students will be graded in the same way, off of the same rubric. Each student will be graded off of the quality of the weld that they must complete. This assessment allows me as an instructor to differentiate in a way that ensures all students, below average and advanced alike, are continuing their skills and proving growth. The exam aligns with the standards, as well as the learning goals I have put into place, because all of these students have to complete a bead using 6013, and they will also have to set up the welder appropriately in order to get a weld that is acceptable for the assessment.

b. Baseline data was collected on the first day that students enter into the lab and begin welding. Every student in the class was asked to run a simple 6 inch bead using 6013 electrode. This bead was then evaluated using a "baseline data" rubric, which required that students ran a bead that was at least 6 inches long, that was consistent in shape, and had no undercut/burn-through. These welds and the scores they received are what I used to group my students into three different groupings: basic, intermediate, and advanced in their welding abilities. Prior to students welding for the first time, they were given necessary instructions on safety in the shop, and the basic principles of welding, as well as a demonstration that served as an example for students on how to properly set up a welder and run a bead. I will also mention that students were pre-assessed on their cognitive understanding of welding before we started that instruction, though that instruction addresses different standards and learning goals. That information that was gathered gave me a sense of where to start my instruction was found. Through that data, it was found that three-quarters of the class had little or no experience with welding. The results from the baseline data that will be used for the assessment at hand showed that 31% of students placed in the basic grouping (score of 0-3), 57% were placed in the intermediate grouping (score of 3.5-6.5), and only 10% scored in the advanced grouping (7-8). This baseline data will be used later to evaluate student growth when it is compared side by side with my assessment data.

c. Strand 7 standards 1 and 2 are blanket descriptions that broadly describe what students should be able to do. The same point could be made for my learning goals. However, the rubric that I will be using to grade the assessment outlines 4 main criteria that an acceptable weld should exhibit. The criteria listed are: Bead Width, Bead Shape, Weld Defects, and Start/Finish of weld. Each criterion is worth up to 2 points, making the total points available for the weld worth up to 8 points. To get two points in the bead width criteria, the weld must be the two electrodes being used throughout the entire bead. In the Bead Shape criteria, the bead shape should lack flaws including being too tall or too flat, or the edges of the weld not being flush with the base metal. Weld defects should not be present in the weld in order to get 2 points; defects that will look for would be excessive splatter, bead being nonuniform, or the weld ripples being long and pointed. Finally, to receive full points in the Start/Finish of Weld criteria, the weld must be the same width at the start as it is at the finish, with the crater filled in. These elements add up to make up the components of an effective weld, and if students can demonstrate that they can successfully create an effective weld they are completing both state standards and the learning goals that are in place.

d. Evidence of student learning that I intend to collect will be proof that students have learned how to, and can properly demonstrate their ability to run a bead using 6013, fulfilling the criteria that I have laid out in the rubric. So, if students score well (a B average) on their assessment, then it is safe for me to conclude that the students have learned what they needed to in order to be considered proficient in their ability to complete the task. Data will be collected by compiling assessment scores, and examining whether or not students successfully achieved the learning

goals. I believe this is the proper way to collect data because it is unlikely that students will be able to weld at home, so the assessment must be given in class. Along with that, having each student complete the assessment individually will allow me to evaluate each student's level of expertise and provide information to them immediately on how they can improve. Lastly, by using a rubric that aligns with the skill level of the student, I will be able to accurately track students knowledge and provide almost immediate feedback to students via the completed rubric, which will highlight their successes and their weak points in the assessment.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.1.1 and ask yourself:

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

- The standards, learning goals, and student needs
- The baseline date used
- The rubric or scoring guide and its alignment to the standards and learning goals
- Communication of the rubric to the students
- How the student learning will be collected
- The rationale for the data collection process
- Why is the candidate's response detailed and tightly connected?

Example 2: Did Not Meet/Partially Met Standards Level

a. The assessment given to the student was a formative assessment. This assessment was given to student at the end of a section out of a unit. This was a assessment that was given to make sure the students had an understanding of the effect of nutrients on plants before we moved any farther into this unit. The standard this aligns with is Identify the essential nutrients for plant growth and development and their major functions. This supports later information and it will be on the summative assessment so I wanted to make sure students understood what they learned. Instead of this being giving at a pre-assessment to find out what the students knew before this I asked them to write on a piece of paper what they knew about the soil nutrients and how they affected plants. There were a couple students that knew somethings that are required for the plant to survive. Although some could to me some nutrients no one could tell me what the plant does when it is missing the nutrients.

b. The data I used to establish a baseline for student growth related to this lesson learning goal is from the pre-assessment. After giving the pre-assessment I wanted to make sure the students understood what the plant needs and also what happens if the plant is lacking that. For the learning goal I want the students to be able to match at least three fourths of the matching correct. This learning goal is so that the students understand the importance of nutrients for plants. I used this pre-assessment because I did not expect many students to know this information so I did not want to give them a formal pre-assessment and stress them out then causing them to shut down.

c. The scoring guide that I have selected is an answer key with the correct answers. The correct matching number is paired with the number that it goes with to show the correct answers. This aligns with my learning goal because it has the student match the nutrient with the plant symptoms if the plant is lacking that nutrient. This is some bass information that the student needs for the rest of this class but will also need if they wish to take horticulture.

d. The evidence that I plan to collect from this assessment is if the student can correctly identify three fourths of the nutrient symptoms. This will be collected when grading the assessment. When looking at the scores of this assessment I will learn what students really excelled in this lesson and which ones are lacking the content knowledge. I will also be able to compare student's assessment to figure out which of the nutrients are confusing the students the most.

Refer to the [Task 2 Rubric](#) for Textbox 2.1.1 and ask yourself:

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

- The learning activities used during the administration of the assessment
- The rationale for the learning activities used
- The grouping of students during the administration of the assessment
- The rationale for the grouping of students
- The materials, resources, and technology used during the administration of the assessment
- The rationale for the materials, resources, and technology used
- Why is the candidate's response 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.