

# ***PPAT* Presentation for IACTE Fall 2016**

**Kathy Pruner  
Client Relations Director, ETS  
October 27, 2016**



# PPAT Development

- National team of 26 educators from 17 states
- *Select* faculty and cooperating teachers
- Developed by and for practitioners
- Completed during clinical experience (Fall or Spring)
- Four tasks -- one formative, three summative
- Written responses to a series of prompts
- Sequential and developmental in approach
- Includes a professional growth plan
- Everything stored, submitted, and scored online
- Cost \$275

# Four Tasks

- Written responses to a series of prompts and submission of artifacts/evidence
  1. Knowledge of Students and Learning Environment
  2. Assessment/Data Collection to Measure Student Learning
  3. Designing Instruction for Student Learning
  4. Implementing/Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning (includes video)

# Task 1: Knowledge of Students and the Learning Environment

- Formative task, completed during the first weeks of clinical experience
- Focuses on candidates' demonstration of the knowledge and skills that pertain to understanding their assigned classroom
- Candidates provide evidence based on their students, the school and the community, and identify implications of these factors on instruction and student learning

# Task 1 Steps

Step 1	Knowledge of Students
Step 2	Resources and Procedures

Formative task is not scored by ETS. Can be scored by EPP.

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

Candidates demonstrate their understanding, analysis and application of assessment and data collection to measure and inform student learning.

Assessment must be:

- Connected to teaching strategies, activities, materials, and resources and plan for collection of resulting data
- Modified for two focus students

# Task 2 Steps

Step 1	Planning the Assessment
Step 2	Analyzing the Data
Step 3	Reflecting

Scoring: 0-4 points x 3 = 0-12 = max total of 12

## Task 3: Designing Instruction for Student Learning

- Candidates demonstrate their ability to develop instruction, including the use of technology, to facilitate student learning.
- Focus on instructional strategies
  - Connection to goals and previous learning
  - Differentiated instruction for two focus students
  - Adaptation of learning goals, technology, and resources
  - Method for evaluating impact on student achievement



# Task 3 Steps

Step 1	Planning the Lesson
Step 2	The Focus Students
Step 3	Analyzing the Lesson
Step 4	Reflecting

Scoring: 0-4 points x 4 = 0-16 = max total of 16

# Task 4: Implementing and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning

- Candidates demonstrate their ability to plan and implement a lesson using research-based instruction.
- Provide evidence that they are able to adjust instruction for the whole class as well as for individual students within the class.
- They also demonstrate an understanding of reflective practice
- A 15-minute video is required with this task
- Double-weighted

# Task 4 Steps

Step 1	Planning
Step 2	Implementing the Plan
Step 3	Student Work
Step 4	Reflecting

Scoring:  $0-4 \text{ points} \times 4 = 0-16 \times 2 = \text{max total of } 32$

# The Video

- Purpose is to provide a complete and authentic view of teaching practice
- Should convey to the raters teaching practice, decision-making, and relationship with students
- Candidates must cite examples from the video
- May be segmented but not edited
- Helps identify the strong aspects of practice as well as weaknesses

# Professional Growth Plan

- Created at the end of student teaching
- Requires reflection on multiple observations by faculty advisor and cooperating teacher
- May include student survey data
- Reveals areas of growth upon entering teaching
- Easily aligns with school-based teacher evaluation
- May be shared during job interview
- Is a professional learning tool, not scored

# Scoring

- Raters are faculty and teachers who meet criteria
- Raters matched to content and grade level
- May defer if not current on content or for other reason
- Task 1 is locally scored
- Tasks 2 - 4 are double-scored across field
- All raters calibrated regularly during scoring sessions

# Scoring

- Scoring is done at each step – planning, implementation, analysis, reflection, etc.
- Tasks 2-4 = 11 total steps
- Rubric range is 0-4
- 60 available points
- Total score = Task 2 + Task 3 + 2.0\*(Task 4)
  - Represents 20%, 26.7%, and 53.3% of 60 total points

Firstname Lastname

1 Main Street

City, State 12345

ETS ID# 1234567890

*Praxis*<sup>®</sup> Performance Assessment for Teachers

Submission Window: Fall 2014

Educator Preparation Program: University Name (1234)

Report Date: December 15, 2014

### Your Score Summary

Task	Date Submitted	Your Score
Task 2	October 1, 2014	12 <i>out of 12</i>
Task 3	October 18, 2014	12 <i>out of 16</i>
Task 4	December 2, 2014	26 <i>out of 32</i>

### Composite Score for All 3 Tasks

**Total Score**

**50** *out of 60*



**Step 1:**  
**Planning**  
**Assessment**

Your response at score level 4 on this step provides strong evidence of the selection of a significant assessment aligned to the standards, learning goals and students' needs. There is evidence of highly effective rationales for your choice of assessment. There is thorough evidence of differentiation/modification of the assessment for the whole class, or there is thorough evidence of why differentiation/modification was not needed. Also, there is evidence of the use of classroom factors to influence the decision of whether to differentiate/modify. You have provided a worthwhile rubric/scoring guide, and there is strong evidence of a plan to communicate it to students. There is insightful evidence of a plan to evaluate the extent of student learning, a method to collect data, and a rationale for the choice of that method. 2.1.1

There is strong evidence of a connection between teaching strategies and the assessment. You have provided an appropriate rationale to support your plan. The response provides thorough evidence of the choice of effective student activities and groupings, and you provide your reasons for you choosing them. There is evidence that you chose effective materials and resources, including technology, and there is a rationale for each of your choices. 2.1.2

You provided thorough evidence about the two Focus Students with different learning needs and an explanation of why those students were chosen. Citing evidence, you made clear connections between each student's learning needs and the differentiation you made for each student's assessment. 2.1.3

4

**Step 2:**  
**Analysis of**  
**the Data**

Your response at score level 4 on this step provides strong evidence of the alignment of the rubric/scoring guide with the learning goals. There is evidence of an effective analysis of assessment data taken from the graphic representation you created; the analysis demonstrates the amount of student learning. There is also thorough evidence of student progress toward the learning goals. You provide highly effective evidence of sharing the data with the whole class to help them understand their progress toward the learning goals. 2.2.1

There is worthwhile evidence of modifications to the directions/format of the assessment with an effective rationale. There is also thorough evidence that modifications were made to the instructional strategies and choice of materials and resources, including technology, as a result of the assessment. 2.2.2

You provide strong evidence from both of the Focus Students' work samples and from your assessment data to support your analysis of the students' progress toward achieving the learning goals. There is thorough evidence of the analysis of the assessment data and/or observation of the impact the differentiation/modification had on the learning of each of the Focus Students. You provide thorough evidence of the sharing of the data with the Focus Students to help them understand their progress toward the learning goals. 2.2.3

4

# Resubmission

- Candidates may resubmit up to 3 tasks
- Ongoing feedback guides decision to resubmit
- Storing work samples create a library of artifacts and evidence to pull from
- One time resubmission for \$85 fee
- Final no-pass requires complete re-start
- Students may appeal a final no-pass

# Setting a Passing Score

- Multi-state standard-setting (June 2015)
- Student Teacher as Just Qualified Candidate (JQC)
- Cooperating teachers and supervising faculty
- Assessment-level passing score not task-level
- Process informed by pilot test results
- States set their own passing score (may consider portability)
- Recommended passing score 40/60

# The Submission Site

Home > My Assessments > Tasks

## My Praxis Performance Assessments Home

Jane Smith

ID: FBY78802 **1**

- Personal Information
- Change Password
- Security Question
- Background Information

My Resources **2**

- PPAT Candidate & Educator Handbook
- Submission System Users Guide
- Pilot Submission Schedule
- Task Requirements and Rubrics
- Task 1 Required forms
  - Contextual Factors Chart
  - Instructional and Support Resources Chart
- Ancillary Materials
- InTASC Model Core

My Assessments **3**

### Praxis Performance Assessment for Teachers

Tasks must be completed in the following order and submitted by 1:00 pm Eastern Time on the dates indicated in the chart below.

Task 1 must be submitted first

Tasks 2 and 3 must be submitted (in any order) after Task 1 but before Task 4

Task 4 must be submitted last

Task will be accessible based on the submission order above.

**4** To upload artifacts to support your task responses, go to "My Library of Artifacts" by selecting the "Upload/Manage My Artifacts" link below.

[Upload/Manage My Artifacts](#)

Task	Submission Due Date	Status	Last Saved
<a href="#">Task 1 Knowledge of Students and the Learning Environment</a>	October 1, 2014	READY	
<a href="#">Task 2 Assessment and Data Collection to Measure and Inform Student Learning</a>	October 29, 2014	READY	
<a href="#">Task 3 Designing Instruction for Student Learning</a>	October 29, 2014	READY	
<a href="#">Task 4: Implementing and Analyzing Instruction to Promote Student Learning</a>	November 26, 2014	READY	

# 2017 Deadlines

## Spring 2017

Deadline	Date
Registration Opens	July 6, 2016
Registration Closes	February 3, 2017
Reschedule Deadline	February 3, 2017
Cancellation Deadline	February 3, 2017
<b>Task Submission</b>	
Task Submission Opens	January 6, 2017
Task 1 Deadline	February 8, 2017
Task 2 Deadline	March 15, 2017
Task 3 Deadline	March 15, 2017
Task 4 Deadline	April 12, 2017
<b>Task Resubmission Window</b>	
Resubmission Registration Opens	May 3, 2017
Resubmission Registration Closes	May 23, 2017
Task Resubmission Deadline	May 24, 2017

# Ongoing Support

- 24/7 access to submission/authoring site
- Website – [www.ets.org/ppa/test-takers](http://www.ets.org/ppa/test-takers)
- Call Center (Mon–Fri, 8 a.m. – 6 p.m. ET)
- Email: [ppa@ets.org](mailto:ppa@ets.org)
- Technical support
- Support materials
- Student/Faculty Webinars

# Website

- [www.ets.org/ppat](http://www.ets.org/ppat)
- Resources and materials
- Creating and submitting tasks
- Task requirements and rubrics
- Understanding Scores
- Permissions
- Library of examples

# Resource Examples

- Educator Candidate and Educator Handbook
- PPAT Task 1 Handbook
- PPAT Reflective Practice Handbook
- Glossary of PPAT Common Terms
- Videos
- Daily Reflection Form
- Lesson Plan format
- Professional Growth Plan
- Permission Forms
- Submission/resubmission instructions
- Artifact details



# Discussion

- How does PPAT align with your coursework?
- How would you incorporate Task 1?
- What kind/level of feedback will you provide?  
(consistent across the program)
- How to infuse research-based instruction.
- Developing a framework for enhancing practice.
- Best ideas for providing awareness for cooperating teachers.

# Thank you!



**[www.ets.org/ppat](http://www.ets.org/ppat)**

**Email: [ppat@ets.org](mailto:ppat@ets.org)**

**Kathy Pruner: [kpruner@ets.org](mailto:kpruner@ets.org)**