Assessment #6: Student Teaching Portfolio Presentation

1. Assessment Description
At the end of student teaching, all candidates must create a professional portfolio to bring with them to interviews and to document the major work they have done during student teaching. They then must do a final, 15-minute portfolio presentation for a group of student teachers and their college supervisor. The portfolio is assessed according to the Danielson rubric used during student teaching so that all assessment instruments for the student teaching experience are coordinated. Candidates must complete the portfolio and do the presentation to pass ESEC 450 Seminar and thus complete the program. ELA candidates have been creating final portfolios and giving presentations for about a decade. However, previously, candidates were simply provided with feedback to help them to revise their portfolios for job interviews. This is the first year in which we actually conducted a formal assessment and collected data.

2. Alignment of Assessment with NCTE Standards
The following NCTE standards are addressed by this assessment:
- **Standard 1.4** is met in that the completion and presentation of the portfolio is the final benchmark of the program.
- Danielson Doman I on *Planning and Preparation* covers content knowledge of literature **(Standards 3.5.1-3),** teaching students to read and interpret texts **(Standards 3.3.1-2, 4.5, 4.8, and 4.9),** as well as writing and using language for communication **(3.2.3, 3.4.1-2, and 4.7)**. Through this extended 15-week field experience, candidates also show their ability to select resources **(Standard 4.1**), develop curriculum (**Standard 4.2**) within a cultural and social context **(Standard 2.5),** apply multiple teaching strategies **(Standard 4.3),** create an effective learning environment **(Standard 4.4),** and integrate the humanities into the daily lives of their students **(Standard 2.6).**
- Danielson Domain 3 on *Instruction* and Domain 2 on *Classroom Environment* cover the creation of an effective learning environment **(Standard 2.1),** classroom management issues **(Standard 2.3** and **4.2**), and student engagement (**Standard 3.1.2, 4.2, and 4.5**).
- Assessment issues **(Standard 2.3, 3.7.1, and 4.10)** are covered in *Instruction* and *Professional Responsibilities.*
- The *Professional Responsibilities* Domain also includes dealing with families **(Standard 4.10),** colleagues **(Standards 1.3, 2.3, and 4.3),** and plans for professional growth **(Standards 1.3 and 2.3).**

3. Data Findings
Candidates did an excellent job on the presentations, as would be expected at the end of their student teaching experience, with all of them achieving the highest score in almost 50% of the categories. They have had four months of daily practice in their oral presentation skills, in preparing subject matter for presentation, and in communicating that content effectively to an audience; they also know the content they are explaining well because they have already taught it.

Their presentations were assessed on how well they explained how they had represented each of the Danielson domains in their portfolio. So, when evidence was lacking, it was because the student teachers had not taken enough time to figure out how they could represent what they had done in the portfolio format. The three categories in which one or two candidates had difficulty with documentation were group work, classroom management, and use of space. They had not taken pictures of students working in groups or documented a group assignment to show their use of group work; they had not taken a picture of their working space or drawn a diagram of it; and/or they did not document their class rules or include a problem-solving email exchange with a parent about a difficult student. These areas were, therefore, lacking in any proof that the candidate had succeeded.

Two other areas of concern were in the grammar, with only 3 candidates providing clear evidence of their speaking and writing skills during the presentations. Also, there was a certain level of complaining that came through in their presentations about their cooperating teachers or their placement sites. These candidates received lower scores in the Professional Responsibilities category, where 3 were identified as not providing evidence of being cooperative and 2 of not responding well to feedback.

4. Evidence for Meeting Standards
Standard 1 Candidate Program Structure: The portfolio presentation is the final benchmark of program completion **(Standard 1.4).** This presentation marks the completion of the coursework within the Education Program of study (ESEC 450 Seminar) and demonstrates their ability to integrate ELA content with Danielson theory and theories of instruction learned in Methods **(Standard 1.1).** All candidates completed the portfolio and did a 15 minute presentation, thereby meeting the benchmark.

Standard 2 Candidate Attitudes**:** Within this extended field experience, student teachers have months in which to integrate the humanities into their students' lives **(Standard 2.6)** and to develop curriculum in response to social and cultural contexts **(Standard 2.5).** They used their assessment projects to document student learning **(Standards 2.3)** and the ways in which they had created an effective learning environment **(Standards 2.1),** including how they handled classroom management issues **(Standards 2.3).** All candidates had accomplished these goals.

Standard 3 Content Knowledge**:** The presentation must include an explanation of the content covered in units of instruction completed during student teaching. All candidates covered the reading and interpretation of literature **(Standards 3.3.1-2, 3.5)**, writing and language as communication **(Standard 3.2.3, 3.4),** and grammar **(Standards 3.1.6-7).** Candidates also had to demonstrate student learning **(Standard 3.3)**, and they all used their assessment **(Standards 3.7.1)** of student learning projects (see Assessment #5) to document this. By explaining and illustrating evidence in the portfolio during the presentation, candidates show that they have met these standards. They all spoke with confidence about the material they had taught, and in the two categories covering content, all candidates exceeded expectations except one who met them.

Standard 4 Candidate Pedagogy: Candidates also had to demonstrate that their students had learned. They all used their assessment of student learning projects (see Assessment 5) to document student learning **(Standard 4.10).** Candidates discussed their use of resources **(Standard 4.1),** the units they had developed **(Standard 4.2),** a variety of teaching strategies they had used **(Standard 4.3),** and the ways in which they had created an effective learning environment **(Standards 4.2, 4.4, and 4.5).** Most included how they handled classroom management issues **(Standards 4.2).** All candidates covered the reading and interpretation of literature **(Standards 4.5, 4.8, and 4.9)**, as well as the issue of writing and language as communication **(Standard 4.7).**

Among the four Danielson Domains, the candidates were weakest in the *Professional Responsibilities* category, although this had been one of the strongest categories on their observation assessment forms both during Methods and student teaching. The difference between their behavior at the presentations and in the field may be due to the set-up of the presentations. The candidates are reunited with their Methods colleagues for the first time in months; the only other person present (usually) is the college supervisor who has by this time become another colleague. The student teaching experience is "over" in the sense that they have already received their letters of recommendation and are usually job hunting. This promotes a very relaxed (perhaps too relaxed) atmosphere. And while the presentation is formal, the student teachers are all very comfortable with each other and most of them could easily spend hours talking about their portfolios and experiences. This level of comfort may have made some of them more lax about their speech **(Standard 3.1.7)** and less professional in the way they discussed their placement sites and cooperating teachers than was judged acceptable. Their attitude reflected a lack of cooperation with school colleagues **(Standards 1.3, 2.3, and 4.3)** and a sense that they were not as appreciative of the feedback they had received as they should have been **(Standard 1.3, 2.3).** A solution to this would be to invite 1-2 visitors to the presentation so candidates are more cognizant of the formality required for their presentations. However, it was clear that they had handled their professional responsibilities during student teaching very well. Their portfolios showed how they had cooperated with colleagues at the schools and with families **(Standard 4.10, 1.3, 2.3, and 4.3)**, and the portfolios themselves documented a clear record of their professional growth **(Standards 1.3 and 2.3).**

Overall: The presentations were very impressive. Every candidate had created a professional portfolio that was ready for review by a potential employer, and presented and explained the contents of the portfolio with clarity and depth.

5. Assessment Documentation

5a. Assessment Tool

All candidates must give a 15-minute portfolio presentation in which they explain what material they have included in their professional portfolio and why. The other candidates are allowed to ask questions and each completes a written critique of the portfolio. The candidate is encouraged to organize both the portfolio and the presentation in a way that reflects who they are professionally and captures their student teaching experience.

However they choose to structure the portfolio and the presentation, they are still responsible for covering the four Danielson Domains. The college supervisor fills out the rubric on which this assessment is based and provides this feedback to the candidates.

5b-c Scoring Guide and Data Table

Each Danielson subcategory was assessed in terms of whether candidates included an artifact of this category in their portfolio.
3 = Evidence was clear, present, and explained during the presentation
2 = Evidence could be seen in the portfolio but was not explained or was explained but no artifact was evident
1 = Little evidence was in the portfolio and the oral presentation was not sufficient to prove the standards were met

Portfolio Rubric (Standard 1.1-4 Program Completion)
NCTE standards met are listed in left column
N = 10 Numbers in columns reflect the number of candidates who received that particular rating

Ratings Indicator	Clear Evidence (3)	Some Evidence (2)	Evidence Lacking (1)
Planning/Preparation	**# of Candidates**		
Content Knowledge: Literature (**3.5.1-3**) Writing (**3.4.1-2, 3.2.3, 3.4.1-2**) Reading (**3.3.1-2**)	10		
Knowledge of Pedagogy (**4.1**)	10		
Knows Age Group (**2.1**)	9	1	
Knowledge of Students (**2.1**)	8	2	
Instructional Goals (**4.1**)	10		
Resources (**4.1**)	10		
Lesson Plans (**4.1**)	10		
Unit Plans (**4.1**)	10		
Assessment Matches Goals (**4.10**)	10		
Assessment Used for Planning (**4.10**)	10		
Reading Skills (**3.3**)	10		
Writing Skills (**3.1.7**)	10		
Classroom Environment			
Respect (**2.1**)	8	2	
Rapport (**2.1**)	8	2	
High Expectations (**2.1**)	8	2	
Group Work (**4.2**)	8		2
Transitions	9	1	
Procedures (**2.3, 4.2**)	10		
Classroom Management (**2.3, 4.2**)	8	1	1
Consistency (**2.3, 4.2**)	8	2	

Use of Space	8		2
Instruction			
Directions	10		
Speaking/Writing **(3.1.7)**	3	6	1
Discussion **(4.2)**	10		
Accurate Content: Literature **(3.5.1-3)** Writing **(3.4.1-2, 3.2.3, 3.4.1-2)**Reading **(3.3.1-2)**	9	1	
Student Engagement **(3.1.2, 4.2, 4.8)**	10		
Use of Material/Content Literature **(3.5.1-3)** Writing **(3.4.1-2, 3.2.3, 3.4.1-2)**Reading **(3.3.1-2)**	10		
Structure of Lesson	10		
Feedback **(2.3)**	10		
Flexibility	8	2	
Professional Responsibilities			
Motivation	8	2	
Enthusiasm	8	1	1
Reflection **(2.3, 3.7.1-2)**	7	3	
Documents Learning **(2.4, 4.10)**	9	1	
Responds to Feedback **(1.3, 2.3)**	7	1	2
Contact with Families **(4.10)**	7	2	1
Cooperation **(1.3, 2.3, 4.3)**	5	2	3
Punctual	9		1
Preparation	9	1	
Attendance	9	1	
Professional Appearance	10		