

Teacher Education Portfolio

The portfolio instrument provides a framework for UVA EHD Teacher Education candidates and faculty to monitor and support candidates' growth and mastery of competencies across the trajectory of the candidate's experience in the program. The portfolio instrument measures candidates' development on competencies aligned to the Virginia Department of Education's [Uniform Performance Standards for Teachers](#) and the [InTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers](#). The portfolio is intended to supplement the internship evaluation, a clinically-based measure of candidates' performance administered at several points during the program. The portfolio is an opportunity for candidates to curate and reflect on artifacts from across the program demonstrating their professional growth prior to graduation.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

USE OF DATA	2
INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT	2
PILOT PROCESS	3
SCORING PROCEDURE	3
VALIDITY EVIDENCE	5
RELIABILITY EVIDENCE	5
CAEP CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF EPP-CREATED ASSESSMENTS	6
STANDARDS CROSSWALK	14
PORTFOLIO RUBRIC	16

USE OF DATA

The portfolio assessment is a summative assessment and occurs at the end of the candidates' experience in the program. Thus, data are indicative of mastery of competencies and skill developed and attained across the lifespan of a candidates' program. Data are used as an indicator of candidate performance and mastery. Data resulting from this assessment will also be used in a program evaluation context; data from this assessment along with others in the program (e.g., internship evaluation) will be examined regularly and holistically to interrogate program elements such as content, alignment to national and state standards, and clinical experiences, and to inform program improvement efforts as necessary. The Teacher Education Data Committee, program faculty, and clinical partners will periodically review data from this and other assessments, with this process led by the Director of Teacher Education. Additionally, candidates provide regular feedback on program experiences through end-of-program surveys, which includes feedback on program assessments.

Teacher candidates have access to their assessment results and faculty feedback through Canvas. In addition, faculty will meet with candidates as needed to discuss their work and, if necessary, revisions that must be made prior to successful completion of this degree requirement. Candidates will use the feedback on this assessment to help them set professional development goals for their first year in the classroom.

INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

In fall 2021, the Teacher Education office and program faculty identified a need to streamline the portfolio process across programs. In qualitative responses from candidates' end of program surveys, candidates identified multiple places during the Teacher Education program in which they completed a portfolio or parts of a portfolio, stating that assignments felt redundant. Candidates also reported differing experiences with portfolios with regard to comprehensiveness and utility across. Previously, individual programs implemented their own portfolio assignments with different requirements and scoring systems, making it difficult to benchmark student progress across endorsement areas. By creating a shared portfolio rubric, the faculty would be able to establish a common framework for the competencies candidates need to be able to demonstrate at the end of the program.

The Teacher Education office reviewed the portfolio rubrics already in use across all endorsement areas. Along with examples of validated instruments from peer programs, the current instruments were evaluated for content, alignment to standards, depth and breadth of requirements, scoring procedures, and use of data. Evaluators - including Teacher Education program coordinators, the Director of Teacher Education, and the Director of Assessment - identified common portfolio elements across these instruments and narrowed these elements down to essential components aligned to the Virginia and InTASC standards. The Director of Teacher Education and Director of Assessment then drafted a common portfolio rubric, including criteria and performance level descriptors. Program coordinators provided feedback on the draft, which the Directors integrated into further iterations of the rubric. Finally, the Director of Teacher Education shared the development process and a draft of the rubric with all Teacher Education faculty. Faculty

discussed the rubric and provided feedback that was used to develop a final rubric to be implemented in spring 2022. The Directors and program coordinators also outlined a pilot process, including administration and scoring procedures to examine and establish evidence of reliability, as well as a plan to establish evidence of content validity through a panel of content-area experts and practitioners. These processes are described below.

PILOT PROCESS

During the fall 2021 development process, the Teacher Education faculty developed a plan for piloting the portfolio instrument in spring 2022. All teacher candidates enrolled in the culminating student teaching and seminar courses completed the portfolio, and all program areas took part in the pilot. Faculty used the standardized rubric to score candidates' portfolios, including all required elements. Faculty have the flexibility to adapt the instructions for the portfolio to meet their disciplinary goals, but modifications must still ensure candidate success on the standardized rubric. A sample of portfolios were double-scored to establish evidence of reliability of scoring in the pilot semester. Following the pilot administration, the Director of Teacher Education will solicit feedback from faculty regarding the administration of the portfolio assessment, rubric criteria and performance levels, and scoring procedures. Following any revisions made to the portfolio assessment resulting from the pilot, the Director of Assessment will establish evidence of content validity through the Lawshe process, including ratings of relevance, importance, and clarity of rubric criteria from content-area experts and practitioners. This will conclude the pilot of the portfolio assessment, though Teacher Education and Assessment Office staff will monitor administration, scoring, and reliability evidence on an ongoing basis.

SCORING PROCEDURE

For this assessment, candidates are required to submit a teaching philosophy and artifacts that provide evidence of mastery of competencies and skills related to the following categories:

- Philosophy of Teaching and Learning
- Instructional Planning
- Instructional Approaches
- Assessment Strategies
- Use of Assessment Data
- Instructional Technology Integration
- Classroom Community
- Classroom Management
- Collaboration and Collegiality

The scoring rubric for the portfolio assessment includes criteria aligned to InTASC standards and the Virginia Uniform Performance Standards. A crosswalk between the portfolio components and these standards is included in this guide. Performance levels are standardized throughout the rubric and include the following levels:

- Unacceptable (1)
- Developing (2)
- Proficient (target; 3)
- Exemplary (4)

Performance level descriptors are specific to each criterion and describe expected competency, skills, and performance at each level. A four-point scale is used to align with the scales used in the UVA Teacher Education internship evaluation and the Virginia Uniform Performance Standards. Candidates were required to re-submit portfolio sections with scores at or below the Developing (2) score during the spring 2022 pilot and ensure a rating that is at the appropriate InTASC progression level at the conclusion of student teaching.

In preparation for scoring, Teacher Education faculty met to discuss specific rubric components, definitions contained with those components, and examples of high-quality evidence that would be present to demonstrate proficiency. Sample discussion notes:

Prompts/Questions

1. Select evidence that demonstrates your proficiency using assessment data. You should ensure that whatever evidence you choose...

- Demonstrates your consistent, systematic, and strategic use of assessment data to make instructional decisions (ideally incorporating differentiation to meet learners' needs)
- Demonstrates your consistent use of assessment data to document and provide feedback on student learning

What would "count" as "evidence"?

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Demonstrating application of external data from research to address existing misconceptions in their lesson planning ● Memoing/reflections regarding the decision making processes which followed pre-assessments to build instructional plans based on that data—around a problematic area identified through assessment ● Artifact: Identification of students in tiers and the learning activities which will be applied in each tier to support students (e.g. tier I students supporting tier II or III with structured activities from the teacher) ● Evidence in lesson plans or narrative of how formative data were used to plan the next lesson ● Examples of feedback to students explicitly tied to data 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Focus on pre- and formative assessments (not just summative) – data need to be used to make decisions about instruction ● Candidates identify patterns in data ● Do we want to see the student work? Or just the patterns? Or a plan for what they are going to do (see graphic organizer from Tonya) ● Focus on the patterns – this allows them to be systematic ● WHOLE CLASS, Individual data ● What kinds of errors?
--	---

After candidates submitted their portfolios, faculty scored each portfolio according to the scoring process outlined above and using the standardized rubric. A sample of the portfolios submitted in spring 2022 were then double scored to investigate and develop evidence of inter-rater reliability. As noted below, validity and reliability data will be reviewed by the Data Committee in fall 2022 to address potential inter-rater reliability concerns and may result in revisions to the rubric, candidate instructions, or scorer training.

VALIDITY EVIDENCE

The portfolio assessment is aligned to InTASC and the Virginia Uniform Performance Standards. Item to InTASC standard alignment is found in the Standards Crosswalk of this document. As a follow-up to the spring 2022 pilot of this assessment, EHD will work through the Clinical Partners Groups to assemble a panel of content-area experts and practitioners to serve on a content validity panel using Lawshe's method. Panel members will rate the assessment rubric criteria against the overarching construct as defined by the aligned standards. Panel members will rate the criteria based on three elements: relevance to the overarching construct, importance in measuring the overarching construct, and clarity of the item. Panel members will also provide qualitative feedback, which will be used to revise criteria, as appropriate. Once complete, the results of the content validity panel will be added to this instrument guide, including the Content Validity Index.

RELIABILITY EVIDENCE

EHD piloted the portfolio assessment in spring 2022 with a sample of programs. Within these programs, all candidates enrolled in the internship and the corresponding seminar course submitted a portfolio. Faculty then scored each portfolio according to the scoring process outlined in the sections above and using the standardized rubric. A sample of the portfolios submitted in spring 2022 were then double scored to investigate and develop evidence of inter-rater reliability. The Director of Assessment calculated percent agreement and Cohen's kappa as indicators of reliability. Below are Cohen's weighted kappa for each of the double-scored portfolios during the spring 2022 pilot. Kappa values range from .582 to 1 during the pilot double-rating exercise. Items under .70 will be reviewed by the Data Committee in fall 2022 to address potential inter-rater reliability concerns and may result in revisions to the rubric or instructions. All values indicate moderate to near perfect agreement.

- Philosophy of Teaching and Learning: .776
- Instructional Planning: .951
- Instructional Approaches: .919
- Assessment Strategies: .727
- Use of Assessment Data: .773
- Instructional Technology Integration: .889
- Classroom Community: 1.00
- Classroom Management: .692
- Collaboration and Collegiality: .582

CAEP CRITERIA FOR EVALUATION OF EPP-CREATED ASSESSMENTS

Administration and Purpose	
Sufficiency Criteria	EPP Response
<p>The time/point at which the assessment is administered during the preparation program are explicit.</p>	<p>The portfolio assessment is a summative assessment and occurs at the end of the candidates' experience in the program. Thus, data are indicative of mastery of competencies and skill developed and attained across the lifespan of a candidates' program. The portfolio is introduced prior to the start of Internship II (student teaching) and the associated seminar. Candidates complete the portfolio during the final semester of the program.</p> <p>Teacher candidates have access to their assessment results and faculty feedback through Canvas. In addition, faculty will meet with candidates as needed to discuss their work and, if necessary, revisions that must be made prior to successful completion of this degree requirement.</p>
<p>The purpose of the assessment and its use in candidate monitoring or decisions on progression are specified and appropriate.</p>	<p>The portfolio assessment is a summative assessment and occurs at the end of the candidates' experience in the program. Thus, data are indicative of mastery of competencies and skill developed and attained across the lifespan of a candidates' program. Data are used as an indicator of candidate performance and mastery.</p> <p>Teacher candidates have access to their assessment results and faculty feedback through Canvas. In addition, faculty will meet with candidates as needed to discuss their work and, if necessary, revisions that must be made prior to successful completion of this degree requirement. Candidates will use the feedback on this assessment to help them set professional development goals for their first year in the classroom.</p> <p>Data resulting from this assessment will also be used in a program evaluation context; data from this assessment along with others in the program (e.g., internship evaluation) will be examined regularly and holistically to interrogate program elements such as content, alignment to national and state standards, and clinical experiences, and to inform program improvement efforts as necessary. The Teacher Education Data Committee, program faculty, and clinical partners will periodically review data from this and other assessments, with this process led by the Director of Teacher Education.</p>

<p>Instructions provided to candidates about what they are expected to do are informative and unambiguous.</p>	<p>Teacher candidates are provided clear directions for the completion of the portfolio. Faculty review the directions and rubric with candidates. In addition, faculty provide opportunities for candidates to submit draft sections of the portfolio throughout the culminating semester. This allows candidates to receive feedback aligned to the rubric and clarify expectations as needed.</p>
<p>The basis for judgment is made explicit to candidates.</p>	<p>Teacher candidates are provided clear directions for the completion of the portfolio. Faculty review the directions and rubric with candidates. In addition, faculty provide opportunities for candidates to submit draft sections of the portfolio throughout the culminating semester. This allows candidates to receive feedback aligned to the rubric and clarify expectations as needed.</p>
<p>Evaluation categories or assessment tasks are aligned with CAEP, InTASC, national/professional, and state standards.</p>	<p>UVA's EHD has developed an assessment map which articulates the alignment among key assessments and CAEP, InTASC, and state standards. The Standards Crosswalk demonstrates the alignment of individual items to standards.</p>

Content of Assessment	
Sufficiency Criteria	EPP Response
Indicators assess explicitly identified aspects of CAEP and InTASC standards, in addition to national, professional, or state standards.	UVA's EHD has developed an assessment map which articulates the alignment among key assessments and CAEP, InTASC, and state standards. The Standards Crosswalk demonstrates the alignment of individual items to standards.
Indicators reflect the degree of difficulty or level of effort described in the standards.	Rubric criteria are aligned to InTASC, CAEP, and state standards and appropriately reflect the level of analysis, skill, and mastery articulated in the standards. Rating levels within items reflect a progression of complexity across the rubric and aligned with expectations for candidates' progression across the program.
Indicators unambiguously describe the proficiencies to be evaluated.	<p>To develop the portfolio rubric, the Teacher Education office reviewed the portfolio rubrics already in use across all endorsement areas. Along with examples of validated instruments from peer programs, the current instruments were evaluated for content, alignment to standards, depth and breadth of requirements, scoring procedures, and use of data. Evaluators - including Teacher Education program coordinators, the Director of Teacher Education, and the Director of Assessment - identified common portfolio elements across these instruments and narrowed these elements down to essential components aligned to the Virginia and InTASC standards. The Directors then drafted a common portfolio rubric, including criteria and performance level descriptors. Program coordinators provided feedback on the draft, which the Directors integrated into further iterations of the rubric. Finally, the Director of Teacher Education shared the development process and a draft of the rubric with all Teacher Education faculty. Faculty discussed the rubric and provided feedback that was used to develop a final rubric to be implemented in spring 2022. Each round of revision included opportunities for stakeholders to assess the clarity and relevance of each item and rating levels within those items.</p> <p>As a follow-up to the spring 2022 pilot of this assessment, EHD will work through the Clinical Partners Groups to assemble a panel of content-area experts and practitioners to serve on a content validity panel using Lawshe's method. Panel members will rate the assessment rubric criteria against the overarching construct as defined by the aligned standards. Panel members will rate the criteria based on three elements: relevance to the overarching construct, importance in measuring the overarching construct, and clarity of the item. Panel members will also provide qualitative feedback, which will be used to revise criteria, as appropriate. Once complete, the</p>

	<p>results of the content validity panel will be added to this instrument guide, including the Content Validity Index.</p>
<p>When the standards being informed address higher level functioning, the indicators require higher levels of intellectual behavior (e.g., create, evaluate, analyze, and apply). For example, when a standard specifies that candidates' students "demonstrate" problem solving, then the indicator is specific to candidates' application of knowledge to solve problems."</p>	<p>UVA EHD has engaged stakeholder groups consisting of content area experts and practitioners to ensure that clinical assessment criteria are clear, relevant, and aligned to standards and competencies required for the position. Performance levels reflect appropriately increasing levels of analysis, competency, and skill.</p>
<p>Most indicators require observers to judge consequential attributes of candidate proficiencies in the standards.</p>	<p>As described above, the Directors have engaged stakeholder groups consisting of content area experts and practitioners to ensure assessment criteria are clear, relevant, and aligned to standards and competencies required for the position. Rubric criteria align to appropriate InTASC, CAEP, and state standards. As such, evaluators assess candidates relevant to consequential attributes for the profession. As a follow-up to the spring 2022 pilot of this assessment, EHD will work through the Clinical Partners Groups to assemble a panel of content-area experts and practitioners to serve on a content validity panel using Lawshe's method. Panel members will rate the assessment rubric criteria against the overarching construct as defined by the aligned standards. Panel members will rate the criteria based on three elements: relevance to the overarching construct, importance in measuring the overarching construct, and clarity of the item. Panel members will also provide qualitative feedback, which will be used to revise criteria, as appropriate. Once complete, the results of the content validity panel will be added to this instrument guide, including the Content Validity Index.</p>

Scoring	
Sufficiency Criteria	EPP Response
<p>The basis for judging candidate performance is well defined.</p>	<p>To develop the portfolio rubric, the Teacher Education office reviewed the portfolio rubrics already in use across all endorsement areas. Along with examples of validated instruments from peer programs, the current instruments were evaluated for content, alignment to standards, depth and breadth of requirements, scoring procedures, and use of data. Evaluators - including Teacher Education program coordinators, the Director of Teacher Education, and the Director of Assessment - identified common portfolio elements across these instruments and narrowed these elements down to essential components aligned to the Virginia and InTASC standards. The Directors then drafted a common portfolio rubric, including criteria and performance level descriptors. Program coordinators provided feedback on the draft, which the Directors integrated into further iterations of the rubric. Finally, the Director of Teacher Education shared the development process and a draft of the rubric with all Teacher Education faculty. Faculty discussed the rubric and provided feedback that was used to develop a final rubric to be implemented in spring 2022. Each round of revision included opportunities for stakeholders to assess the clarity and relevance of each item and rating levels within those items.</p> <p>In preparation for scoring, Teacher Education faculty met to discuss specific rubric components, definitions contained with those components, and examples of high-quality evidence that would be present to demonstrate proficiency.</p> <p>As a follow-up to the spring 2022 pilot of this assessment, EHD will work through the Clinical Partners Groups to assemble a panel of content-area experts and practitioners to serve on a content validity panel using Lawshe's method. Panel members will rate the assessment rubric criteria against the overarching construct as defined by the aligned standards. Panel members will rate the criteria based on three elements: relevance to the overarching construct, importance in measuring the overarching construct, and clarity of the item. Panel members will also provide qualitative feedback, which will be used to revise criteria, as appropriate. Once complete, the results of the content validity panel will be added to this instrument guide, including the Content Validity Index.</p>
<p>Each proficiency level descriptor (PLD) is qualitatively defined by</p>	<p>Through the process outlined above, program faculty ensure PLDs are qualitatively defined by specific criteria at each level that is aligned with indicators.</p>

<p>specific criteria aligned with indicators.</p>	
<p>PLDs represent a developmental sequence from level to level (providing raters with explicit guidelines to evaluate candidate performance and giving candidates explicit feedback on their performance).</p>	<p>UVA EHD has developed clear and explicit PLDs which qualitatively define performance and competency expectations at each level of performance. PLDs articulate a clear progression in expectations regarding skill and competency across criteria, and purposefully incorporate increasing levels of performance to reflect expectations of candidates. The language of the rubric is used to provide explicit feedback to candidates on their performance.</p>
<p>Feedback provided to candidates is actionable – it is directly related to the preparation program and can be used for program improvement as well as for feedback to the candidate.</p>	<p>The portfolio assessment is a summative assessment and occurs at the end of the candidates' experience in the program. Thus, data are indicative of mastery of competencies and skill developed and attained across the lifespan of a candidates' program. Data are used as an indicator of candidate performance and mastery.</p> <p>Teacher candidates have access to their assessment results and faculty feedback through Canvas. In addition, faculty will meet with candidates as needed to discuss their work and, if necessary, revisions that must be made prior to successful completion of this degree requirement. Candidates will use the feedback on this assessment to help them set professional development goals for their first year in the classroom.</p> <p>Data resulting from this assessment will also be used in a program evaluation context; data from this assessment along with others in the program (e.g., internship evaluation) will be examined regularly and holistically to interrogate program elements such as content, alignment to national and state standards, and clinical experiences, and to inform program improvement efforts as necessary. The Teacher Education Data Committee, program faculty, and clinical partners will periodically review data from this and other assessments, with this process led by the Director of Teacher Education.</p>
<p>Proficiency level attributes are defined in actionable, performance-based, or observable behavior terms. [NOTE: If a less actionable term is used such as "engaged," criteria are provided to define the use of the term in the context of the category or indicator.]</p>	<p>UVA EHD has developed clear and explicit PLDs which qualitatively define performance and competency expectations at each level of performance. PLDs articulate a clear progression in expectations regarding skill and competency across criteria, and purposefully incorporate increasing levels of performance to reflect expectations of candidates.</p>

Data Reliability	
Sufficiency Criteria	EPP Response
A description or plan is provided that details the type of reliability that is being investigated or has been established (e.g., inter-rater, internal consistency, consensus building activities with documentation) and the steps the EPP took to ensure the reliability of the data from the assessment.	A sample of pilot portfolios submitted in spring 2022 was double scored to investigate and develop evidence of inter-rater reliability. The Director of Assessment calculated appropriate reliability statistics as an indicator of reliability. Scores from the spring 2022 pilot are found in the Reliability Evidence section of this Instrument guide and are used to guide instructions, training, and revisions to the assessment.
Training of scorers and checking on inter-rater agreement and reliability are documented.	In fall 2022, the Teacher Education Data Committee will review items with lower reliability. After this review, exemplars and reliability data collected through the spring 2022 pilot process will be used to develop a comprehensive training process for this instrument.
The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing reliability.	Cohen's kappa is cited by CAEP as an acceptable indicator of inter-rater reliability.

Data Validity	
Sufficiency Criteria	EPP Response
A description or plan is provided that details steps the EPP has taken or is taking to ensure the validity of the assessment and its use.	As a follow-up to the spring 2022 pilot of this assessment, EHD will work through the Clinical Partners Groups to assemble a panel of content-area experts and practitioners to serve on a content validity panel using Lawshe's method. Panel members will rate the assessment rubric criteria against the overarching construct as defined by the aligned standards. Panel members will rate the criteria based on three elements: relevance to the overarching construct, importance in measuring the overarching construct, and clarity of the item. Panel members will also provide qualitative feedback, which will be used to revise criteria, as appropriate. Once complete, the results of the content validity panel will be added to this instrument guide, including the Content Validity Index.
The plan details the types of validity that are under investigation or have been established (e.g., construct, content, concurrent, predictive) and how they were established.	Once complete, the results of the content validity panel (Lawshe) will be added to this instrument guide, including the Content Validity Index.
If the assessment is new or revised, a pilot was conducted.	UVA EHD piloted the portfolio assessment in spring 2022. Full implementation will take place beginning spring 2023 with three cycles collected by spring 2025.
The EPP details its current process or plans for analyzing and interpreting results from the assessment.	UVA EHD has developed this instrument guide detailing the plans for analyzing and interpreting results of this assessment.
The described steps meet accepted research standards for establishing the validity of the data from an assessment.	Lawshe's method is cited by CAEP as an acceptable method for establishing evidence of content validity. Lawshe protocol will take place in fall 2022 at the clinical partners meeting.

STANDARDS CROSSWALK

Rubric Item	Virginia Uniform Performance Standards	InTASC Standards	CAEP Standards
<p>Philosophy of Teaching and Learning: Through reflection, the candidate integrates personal experiences and competencies acquired through coursework and clinical experiences and the ways in which those factors interact with children’s backgrounds and inform instruction. Candidate considers racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds for both themselves and students and how these factor into their philosophy of teaching.</p>	<p>1: Professional Knowledge 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices 7: Professionalism</p>	<p>9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</p>	<p>R1.4 R3.3</p>
<p>Planning: The candidate establishes clear learning targets and develops unit and lesson plans that make clear what students will do during the lesson, how they will be assessed, and how the candidate will facilitate learning activities and transitions. The candidate plans proactively for cultural relevance and responsiveness to student diversity.</p>	<p>2: Instructional Planning</p>	<p>7: Planning for Instruction</p>	<p>R1.3 <i>R1.2 (apply content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences)</i> R3.3</p>
<p>Instructional Approaches: The candidate uses a variety of instructional approaches to support diverse learners in developing deep understanding of content. The candidate uses specific strategies to support students with disabilities, different cultural backgrounds, and different linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices</p>	<p>8: Instructional Strategies</p>	<p>R1.3 <i>R1.2 (apply content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences)</i> R3.3 (<i>impact on student learning</i>)</p>
<p>Assessment Strategies: The candidate uses a variety of assessment techniques that are aligned with learning goals, objectives, and the instruction offered to measure student understanding and progress</p>	<p>4: Assessment of and for Student Learning</p>	<p>6: Assessment</p>	<p>R1.3 R3.3 (<i>impact on student learning</i>)</p>

Rubric Item	Virginia Uniform Performance Standards	InTASC Standards	CAEP Standards
Use of Assessment Data: The candidate uses assessment data to make instructional decisions.	4: Assessment of and for Student Learning	6: Assessment	R1.3 R3.3 (<i>impact on student learning</i>)
Instructional Technology Integration: The candidate makes appropriate use of instructional and assistive technology to engage students, accommodate and provide access for diverse students, and support student learning.	3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	8: Instructional Strategies	R1.3 R3.3
Classroom Community: The candidate clearly articulates overarching ideas and approaches designed to foster and maintain an inclusive and equitable learning environment. Candidates demonstrate specific approaches that foster inclusivity in regard to cultural, linguistic, and learning differences.	3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	3: Learning Environments	R1.1 R3.3
Classroom Management: The candidate clearly and comprehensively articulates components of the overall management system, specific aspects of how the system will be implemented, and how the system will benefit students' academic and social development. The candidate demonstrates culturally responsive modes of classroom management.	2: Instructional Planning 3: Instructional Delivery 6: Culturally Responsive Teaching and Equitable Practices	3: Learning Environments	R1.1 R3.3
Collaboration and Collegiality: The candidate works in a collegial and collaborative manner with administrators, school and university personnel, and the community.	1: Professional Knowledge	10: Leadership and Collaboration	R1.4 R3.3

PORTFOLIO RUBRIC
PORTFOLIO RUBRIC

	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Philosophy of Teaching and Learning: Through reflection, the candidate integrates personal experiences and competencies acquired through coursework and clinical experiences and the ways in which those factors interact with children's backgrounds and inform instruction. Candidate considers racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds for both themselves and students and how these factor into their philosophy of teaching.	Evidence demonstrates candidate's reflection on their background, knowledge and skills acquired during the program, and ways in which those factors inform their practice. Demonstrates consideration of racial, cultural, linguistic backgrounds for both the candidate and students and how these factor into the candidate's philosophy of teaching. Demonstrates capacity to critically analyze these factors as situated within the context of internal and external forces that influence schools and schooling.	Evidence demonstrates candidate's reflection on their background, knowledge, and skills acquired during the program, and ways in which those factors inform their practice. Demonstrates consideration of racial, cultural, linguistic backgrounds for both the candidate and students and how these factor into the candidate's philosophy of teaching.	Evidence provides a limited reflection on candidate's background, knowledge, and skills acquired in the program, and ways in which those factors inform their practice. Limited evidence candidate considers racial, cultural, linguistic backgrounds for both the candidate and students and how these factor into the candidate's philosophy of teaching.	Evidence does not demonstrate an integration of candidate's background, knowledge, and skills acquired during the program and how those factors influence their philosophy of teaching and learning. No evidence candidate considers racial, cultural, linguistic backgrounds for both the candidate and students and how these factor into the candidate's philosophy of teaching.
Planning: The candidate establishes clear learning targets and develops unit and lesson plans that make clear what students will do during the lesson, how they will be assessed, and how the candidate will facilitate learning activities and transitions. The candidate plans proactively for cultural relevance and responsiveness to student diversity.	Evidence includes learning targets that are both clear and actionable and uses them to guide the planning process. Unit and lesson plans are consistently clear across each element (lesson targets, tasks, assessments). Evidence of proactive and systematic planning for cultural relevance and responsiveness to student diversity. Evidence the candidate reflects on and assesses the effectiveness of each element (lesson targets, tasks, assessments) and revises as necessary.	Evidence includes learning targets that are both clear and actionable and uses them to guide the planning process. Unit and lesson plans are consistently clear across each element (lesson targets, tasks, assessments) and reflect developmental appropriateness and knowledge of students. Evidence of proactive planning for cultural relevance and responsiveness to student diversity.	Evidence includes learning targets, though at times they are unclear or not actionable. Unit and lesson plans are mostly clear, though some elements (lesson targets, tasks, assessments) may require more detail. Limited evidence of proactive planning for cultural relevance and responsiveness to student diversity.	Evidence does not include learning targets that are clear and actionable. Unit and lesson plans are unclear, with undefined lesson targets, tasks, and assessments. No evidence of proactive planning for cultural relevance and responsiveness to student diversity.

	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)
<p>Instructional Approaches: The candidate uses a variety of instructional approaches to support diverse learners in developing deep understanding of content. The candidate uses specific strategies to support students with disabilities, different cultural backgrounds, and different linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates the candidate uses appropriate approaches and resources to modify instruction to the needs of individuals and groups of learners and varies their role in the instructional process (e.g., instructor, facilitator, coach, audience) in relation to the content and purposes of instruction and the needs of diverse learners. Evidence demonstrates a systematic approach and specific strategies to support students with disabilities, different cultural backgrounds, and different linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates the candidate applies a range of appropriate approaches and resources to support individuals and groups of learners in developing a deep understanding of content. Evidence includes specific strategies to support students with disabilities, different cultural backgrounds, and different linguistic backgrounds.</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates the candidate uses a limited range of appropriate instructional approaches. Minimal evidence of differentiation and modification of instruction based on learners' needs.</p>	<p>Evidence does not demonstrate the candidate uses a variety of appropriate instructional approaches or that the candidate can modify or differentiate instruction based on learners' needs.</p>
<p>Assessment Strategies: The candidate uses a variety of assessment techniques that are aligned with learning goals, objectives, and the instruction offered to measure student understanding and progress.</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates consistent planning for and implementation of assessment techniques or approaches that reflect varied ongoing strategies, including student self-assessment and checking for student understanding and progress. Evidence demonstrates assessment techniques that are aligned with the identified learning targets and sensitive to the nature of instruction offered, thus providing actionable and meaningful feedback to students and the teacher for instructional planning and decision-making.</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates planning for and implementation of a limited number/type of assessment techniques or approaches for checking for student understanding and progress. Evidence demonstrates assessment techniques that are generally aligned with the identified learning targets and sensitive to the nature of instruction offered, providing data on student learning.</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates limited planning for or implementation of assessment techniques, typically only one type used when implemented, for checking for student understanding and progress. Evidence demonstrates assessment techniques that are not well aligned with the identified learning targets, or sensitive to the nature of instruction offered, thus limiting data on student learning.</p>	<p>Evidence demonstrates no planning for and implementation of assessment techniques for checking for student understanding and progress. Evidence demonstrates assessment techniques that are not aligned with the identified learning targets or sensitive to the nature of instruction offered, thus providing no data on student learning.</p>

	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Use of Assessment Data: The candidate uses assessment data to make instructional decisions.	Evidence demonstrates the consistent, systematic, and strategic use of data to document student learning, thus providing actionable and meaningful feedback to the student and the teacher for instructional planning that is differentiated to meet the needs of learners.	Evidence demonstrates the use of data to document student learning, providing feedback to students and the teacher for instructional planning, which may or may not be differentiated.	Evidence demonstrates limited or inconsistent use of data to document learning and/or planning for instruction that is differentiated to meet the diverse needs of learners.	Evidence demonstrates no use of data to document learning and/or planning for instruction that is differentiated to meet the needs of learners.
Instructional Technology Integration: The candidate makes appropriate use of instructional and assistive technology to engage students, accommodate and provide access for diverse students, and support student learning.	Evidence demonstrates the use of instructional technology that is student-centered with frequent opportunities for students to interact with the technology in ways that enhance student learning. Technology is used to accommodate and provide access for diverse students and to support student learning. Evidence demonstrates candidate is familiar with multiple technologies and applications and can select from among them for a specific purpose and audience.	Evidence demonstrates the use of instructional technology that is student-centered with frequent opportunities for students to interact with the technology. Technology is used to accommodate and provide access for diverse students and to support student learning.	Evidence demonstrates the use of some instructional and assistive technology, but its use is teacher-centered with few opportunities for students to interact with the technology.	Evidence demonstrates no use of instructional and assistive technology.

	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Classroom Community: The candidate clearly articulates overarching ideas and approaches designed to foster and maintain an inclusive and equitable learning environment. Candidates demonstrate specific approaches that foster inclusivity in regard to cultural, linguistic, and learning differences.	Evidence demonstrates the clear and appropriate use and explanation of ideas and strategies which foster and maintain an inclusive and equitable learning environment. Evidence demonstrates candidate reflects upon and evaluates strategies and adjusts as necessary to maintain an equitable learning environment.	Evidence demonstrates the clear and appropriate use and explanation of ideas and strategies which foster and maintain an inclusive and equitable learning environment.	Evidence provides a limited explanation of overarching ideas and approaches designed to foster and maintain an inclusive and equitable learning environment.	Evidence does not include overarching ideas and approaches designed to foster and maintain an inclusive and equitable learning environment.
Classroom Management: The candidate clearly and comprehensively articulates components of the overall management system, specific aspects of how the system will be implemented, and how the system will benefit students' academic and social development. The candidates demonstrates culturally responsive modes of classroom management.	Evidence includes clear articulation of components of the overall management system, specific aspects of how the system will be implemented, and how the system will benefit students' academic and social development. Evidence demonstrates a culturally responsive approach to classroom management and shows reflections on aspects of existing classroom management systems that may be influenced by cultural biases. Evidence includes a plan for evaluating strategies and making adjustments.	Evidence includes clear articulation of components of the overall management system, specific aspects of how the system will be implemented, and how the system will benefit students' academic and social development. Evidence demonstrates a culturally responsive approach to classroom management.	Evidence demonstrates components of the overall management system but does not explain how the system will be implemented nor how it will benefit students' academic and social development.	Evidence does not demonstrate components of the overall management system.

	Exemplary (4)	Proficient (3)	Developing (2)	Unacceptable (1)
Collaboration and Collegiality: The candidate works in a collegial and collaborative manner with administrators, school and university personnel, and the community.	Evidence demonstrates collegial and collaborative work with a wide range of members of the school community. Evidence includes candidate participation in leadership roles or roles that connect members of the school community to foster student development and growth.	Evidence demonstrates collegial and collaborative work with a wide range of members of the school community.	Evidence demonstrates collegial and collaborative work with a limited range of members of the school community.	Evidence does not demonstrate collegial and collaborative work with school administrators, personnel, and community.