

Measure 3 Candidate competency at completion

Portfolio 2022-2023

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 intention was to support 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 members 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 student teaching and the corresponding reflective seminar submit an electronic portfolio. Faculty score each portfolio according to the scoring process outlined in the sections above and use the standardized rubric.

2022-2023 Portfolio Performance

The target score for the portfolio rubric was set at 80%. The mean grade for the entire cohort was 91.2% with 80% of the candidates' scores 93% A. 90% of the cohort exceeded the target score. The portfolio grades for the cluster areas are reported below. Each licensure cluster area exceeded the target score.

Table 1

Portfolio Performance Data for Licensure Categories 2022-2023

Licensure Cluster Area	n	Mean % Grade	STDEV
Special Education	4	85.5%	24.0
Elementary preK-6 (M.A.T)	4	88.9%	13.2
Secondary Education (M.A.T.)	12	94%	4.6

Comparing the 2022-2023 portfolio scores to the previous year 2021-2022, the licensure clusters for elementary education mean score increased by 5% and special education K-12 increased by 1.7%. A mean decrease from 97% to 94% was recorded for the secondary education cluster.

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

In discussions with colleagues at various institutions, we have contracted with the software company Watermark (<https://pages.watermarkinsights.com>) to manage evaluation instruments that were created in the checklist tracking system that includes the portfolio and a revised scoring rubric. The checklist tracking system was developed out of a need for organizing candidate progression in content knowledge, pedagogical knowledge and skills, dispositions, and professional responsibilities that are all reflected in a candidates' portfolio that we use to measure candidate competency.

We are continuing to explore alternative authentic assignments that would align with nTASC standards, 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.