Summary of the Completer Portfolio Grades

Table 1. Summary of Completer Portfolio Grades by Licensure Areas
Data for completers from 2014-2015, 2015-2016, & 2016- 2017 CAEP 4.2

Licensure cluster area	N	Mean % Grade	STDEV
Elementary preK-6 (M.A.T. & undergrad)	15	92.8	8.65
Special Education K-12 (M.A.T. only)	16	92.6	8.36
Secondary Licensure (M.A.T. & undergrad)	16	95.0	11.25

Note: Missing scores for completers 47_2015 ELM, 58_2015_HHS

The electronic portfolio is a requirement for completing the Randolph College EPP. The candidates include artifacts of their philosophy of education, resume, reflections, sample lessons, student work samples along with short teaching videos. The portfolio development starts in the introductory education courses and continues through student teaching. Two faculty members evaluated the portfolios independently using a rubric and a percentage score was calculated. Years 2014-2015 and 2015-2016 used a portfolio rubric with a five point rating scale: 5 = Excellent; 4 = Good; 3 = Satisfactory; 2 = Marginal; 1 = Unsatisfactory. In year 2016-2017 we developed a new portfolio rubric with a section asking the candidates to tag artifacts with InTASC numbers. The rating scale was changed to a 4 point scale (per CAEP assessment review 2016). The rating scale for all sections was: as 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Incomplete 3 = Proficient or 4 = Exemplary. For each rubric a percentage score was calculated. The target score for both forms of the portfolio rubric was set at 80%.

Table 1 displays the cluster grades for elementary, special education, and secondary candidates. In each cluster area the target score of 80% was exceeded. For the secondary category, the standard deviation was 11.25. There were two candidates' final portfolio grades that were below 80% and the balance of the scores were 90% and above.

Interrater Reliability Results

The interrater reliability for 2014-2015 using two raters for the portfolio instrument (5 point rating scale) was calculated using Pearson r statistics. The results show a strong interrater reliability with r= .93. The mean difference in the portfolio grades was .22. A separate interrater reliability for 2015-2016 using two raters for the portfolio instrument (5 point rating scale). The Pearson r value was .81 indicating a strong correlation. The mean difference in the portfolio grades was .9.

The interrater reliability results for 2016-2017 using the revised portfolio instrument (4 point rating scale) with two raters revealed a Pearson r = .67 indicating a moderate correlation. The mean difference in portfolio grades was 2.3.

Based on the reported interrater reliability for years 2015 and 2016 using the 5 point Likert rating scale, there were strong correlations between the two raters. In 2017 the new portfolio grading rubric was used for the first time. The correction between the two raters was moderate. The new form was more detailed and the completers were required to use InTASC tagging to indicate how the artifacts matched the teaching performance skills. The new 2017 portfolio rubric had 108 points equaling the total score and some sections were weighed. It was determined that moving forward, the total points for the portfolio grading rubric be changed to 100 points and remove some of the weighing points on artifacts.