

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. Students must complete the portfolio and do the presentation to pass ESEC 450 Student Teaching Seminar and thus complete the program.

2. Standards Met:

The assessment instrument aligns with the same standards as the Danielson rubric used for student teaching. Thus students cover the four domains of Danielson and a number of standards:

- **Standard 1.4** in that the completion and presentation of the portfolio is the final benchmark/gateway of the program.
- 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**).
- Instruction and 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
- Professional Responsibilities 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:

Students did an excellent job on the presentations, as would be expected at the end of their student teaching experience. They have had four months of daily practice on their oral presentation skills, on preparing subject matter for presentation, and on 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 students 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 struggling student. These areas were, therefore, lacking in any proof that the student teacher had succeeded.

Two other areas of concern were in the grammar used during the presentations and with a certain level of complaining that came through about cooperating teachers or the placement sites. These students received lower scores in the Speaking category and in Professional Responsibilities.

4. Evidence for Meeting Standards:

Program Standards: 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 Student Teaching Seminar) and demonstrates their ability to integrate ELA content with Danielson theory and theories of instruction learned in Methods (**Standard 1.1**). All students completed the portfolio and did a 15 minute presentation, thereby meeting the benchmark.

Content Standards: The presentation must include an explanation of the content covered in units of instruction completed during student teaching. All students covered the reading and interpretation of literature (**Standards 3.3.1-2, 3.5. 1-3, 4.5, 4.8, and 4.9**), writing and language as communication (**Standard 3.2.3, 3.4, and 4.7**), and grammar (**Standards 3.1.6-7**). 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 both categories covering content, all students exceeded expectations except one who met them.

ELA Standards: 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**). All candidates had accomplished these goals.

Student Learning Standards: Candidates also had to demonstrate student learning. (**Standard 3.3**). They all used their assessment (**Standards 2.3 and 3.7.1**) of student learning projects (see Assessment #5) to document student learning (**Standard 4.10**).

Instruction Standards: 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 2.1, 3.12, 4.2, 4.4, and 4.5**), including how they handled classroom management issues (**Standards 2.3 and 4.2**)

Professional Responsibility Standards: This category was the weakest in the presentations, although it had been one of the strongest in observations both during

Methods and Student Teaching. This 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, and 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 “outsiders” to the presentation so candidates would feel the formality a little more. They could still express concerns, but in a more professional manner. 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 the professional growth (**Standards 1.3 and 2.3**).

Overall: The presentations were very impressive. Every student had created a professional portfolio that was ready for review by a potential employer and presented and explained the contents in a professional way.

5. Assessment Tool:

Each candidate 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 college supervisor fills out the rubric on which this assessment is based. When standards are being met, they are bolded in the rubric.

Portfolio Rubric (Standard 1.1-4 Program Completion)

Ratings Indicator	Clear Evidence (3)	Some Evidence (2)	Evidence Lacking (1)
Planning/Preparation	# of Students		
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		