Measure 3 Candidate competency at completion

Portfolio 2021-2022

The portfolio measures candidates' development on competencies aligned to the [Virginia Uniform Performance Standards](#) (VUPS) and [InTASC](#) standards. The portfolio is a summative assessment and occurs at the end of the candidates' student teaching experience, although candidates use artifacts from across their time in the program to demonstrate each competency. The expectation is that candidates score a 3.0, the target rating of "Proficient," on the portfolio rubric.

The electronic professional portfolio provides a framework for Randolph College Teacher Education candidates and faculty to monitor and support candidates' growth and proficiency in the skills and disposition demonstrated throughout the program. The portfolio is a required component completed during the student teaching experience that provides substantial evidence of candidates' level of mastery related to the VUPS and InTASC standards.

Use of Data

The electronic portfolio supports candidates' documentation of their professional growth, and the intension was to supports the job search and interview process, however, candidates report no one reviews their portfolio as part of the interview process. Candidates choose their own artifacts of their teaching philosophy, resume, teaching reflections, sample lesson plans, student work samples, and sample teaching videos recorded during student teaching. The portfolio rubric requires candidates to tag artifacts with appropriate InTASC.

Instrument Development

In the spring of 2018, the faculty identified a need to review the portfolio grading rubric and develop a weighted scoring system to give credit to more complex areas and tasks. Candidates reported that many of the required components of the portfolio required more work compared to other components. For example, section II which is aligned to the InTASC standards and requires artifacts related to the learner and learning, learning differences, learning environments, content knowledge, application of content, assessment, planning and instruction and instructional strategies reflected important teaching requirements compare to organization of the portfolio, or supporting documents (resume, philosophy, reflections, and plans) and should be weighted differently.

Scoring Procedure

Each portfolio is scored by assigned faculty member using the EPP portfolio rubric. Scoring in section I includes the following scale: 1 = Unacceptable 2 = Incomplete 3 = Proficient or 4 = Exemplary. Section II includes a scoring system up to 4 points for each category; each category is weighted x2. Item 10 is weighted x1 = 60 total points in the final scoring. In this section candidates include artifacts that were graded or reviewed in an EDUC course. For each completer's portfolio the rubric percentage score was calculated.

Validity Evidence

Faculty members and Advisory Committee members reviewed the rubric criteria against the aligned standards. We reviewed relevance, importance in evaluating the criteria, and clarity of the rubric items. We recognize the need to apply a validity index and will use Lawshe's (1975) content validity method.

Reliability Evidence

All candidates enrolled in in student teaching and the corresponding reflective seminar submit an electronic portfolio. Faculty score each portfolio according to the scoring process outline in the sections above and use the standardized rubric.

2021-2022 Portfolio Performance

The target score for the portfolio rubric was set at 80%. The mean grade for the entire cohort was 91.2% with 67% of the candidates' scores 93% A. 89% of the cohort exceeded the target score. The portfolio grades for the cluster areas are reported below. Each licensure cluster area exceed the target score.

Table 1

Portfolio Performance Data for Licensure Categories 2021-2022

Licensure cluster area	n	Mean % Grade	STDEV
Elementary preK-6 (MAT)	3	95.2	4.8
Special Education K-12 (M.A.T.)	3	83.3	28.9*
Secondary Education (M.A.T.)	7	97.3	4.6

*Special Education STDEV reflects one student's grade who did not complete the portfolio in its entirety.

Comparing the 2021-2022 portfolio scores to the previous year 2020-2021, the licensure clusters for secondary education remained consistent with a mean of 97/3% in both cycles and special education K-12 decreased from a mean of 85% to 83.3%. Once again, a candidate who did not complete the portfolio and the score was considered an outlier. We will put into place deadlines throughout the semester for various components of the portfolio with faculty support in place if a candidate is struggling with one aspect. We noted both candidates who did not complete the portfolio accepted special education jobs on a provisional license and found the paper work required (IEP, eligibility meetings, and testing analysis) challenging. The elementary preK-6 licensure cluster increased slightly from 94.5% to 97.3%.

Conclusion

Disaggregated data related to the InTASC standards are not provided in this analysis due to the small sample size. Our goal was to gain an overall understanding of the sections of the portfolio in need of additional support.

Recognizing the sample size is small, there is little variation in candidates understanding of content knowledge, planning and instruction, and multimedia inclusion as seen reported in the SDEV. The SDEV for the teaching video was high because one candidate did not provide a video lesson for review. Application of content, assessment, and instructional strategies reflected higher standard deviations than we would like.

Improvement Strategies

We increased the number of practicum experiences for both elementary and secondary candidates. Beginning 2022-2023 elementary candidates were placed in 5 practicum placements compared to 4, and secondary candidates engaged in 3 practicum placements compared to1 in 2022. This increased time spent in supervised placements will provide additional exposure to modeling and mentoring from experienced classroom teachers. Candidates would benefit from an outline describing the steps in how to organize their portfolio, opportunities for candidates to share their portfolio entries with their clinical instructor and college supervisor during the development stage. This provide candidates feedback from their mentors and helps them see a direct connection to their current teaching assignment. Moreover, school division moved to a no videotaping in classrooms policy, which requires us to revise the required components of the portfolio. Candidates do question the purpose of the portfolio as hiring school divisions do not review the portfolios. We are exploring alternative authentic assignments that would serve the same purpose, and which candidates feel are beneficial to the transition from candidate to teacher. One idea is to have candidates create a LinkedIn Portfolio as a way to showcase their teaching skills. The portfolio could be a "featured" section in the LinkedIn profile. Candidates would add samples (octopusCRM as one possibility) of their work in the section so future employers who visit the profile can get a sense of candidates' practical performance in teaching.