Attachment: Executive Report of 2012 Portfolio Reading for Literacy Program

From 2010 to 2012 the current program director conducted informal readings of the professional portfolios turned in by graduates of the Literacy program. In early 2012 it was decided that a formal reading process was needed. A program completion rubric was created based upon the Nebraska Department of Education's revised Rule 24. This rubric is attached as supporting document A. The instructions for implementation of the rubric are given as supporting document B. Five current faculty members, all adjuncts, were recruited to act as readers on June 19, 2012 at our Fallbrook Center in Lincoln.

Portfolios were selected from students in the literacy cohorts that completed their program in 2010 and 2011. Six students were selected randomly from each cohort with the exception of four cohorts that only had fewer than six graduates. Ten cohorts were involved in this reading: five from the Reading program and five from the Reading and ESL program. Two cohorts attended classes in Lincoln (FB in designator), four classes in Omaha (OE or OW in designator) and four online (OL in designator). Each reader was responsible for two cohorts. The results of the scores are summarized in the tables below.

Table: Average Scores by Rubric Item by Cohort for Reading Cohorts

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
LMR FBSep09	1.17	2.83	3.33	2.50	2.17	2.67	2.60	2.33	5.00	1.67
LMR OESep09	3.67	3.00	4.83	4.67	5.00	5.17	5.33	5.33	5.33	5.17
LMR OLFeb10	3.00	4.20	4.20	3.50	4.50	4.50	3.83	3.33	5.00	4.60
LMR OLSep09	4.20	4.00	5.20	4.25	3.75	5.00	4.80	5.50	3.75	4.33
LMR OWSep09	3.60	4.17	4.33	4.00	4.20	4.50	4.50	4.67	4.40	5.50
Prog Average	3.13	3.64	4.38	3.78	3.92	4.37	4.21	4.23	4.70	4.25

Table: Average Scores by Rubric Item by Cohort for Reading and ESL Cohorts

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
LME FBSep09	3.67	Not rated	4.25	4.00	4.50	4.20	4.20	4.33	4.60	4.00
LME OESep09	1.00	Not rated	4.50	5.00	4.67	4.20	4.40	6.50	4.20	3.50
LME OL Feb10	6.00	4.00	3.50	4.25	4.50	3.75	4.00	3.67	3.75	2.67
LME OLSep09	3.67	4.40	3.80	4.00	3.40	4.40	4.00	5.40	3.80	3.80
LME OWSep09	0.33	3.00	3.83	3.50	3.17	4.00	3.67	4.00	4.17	3.50
Prog Average	2.93	3.80	3.98	4.15	4.05	4.11	4.05	4.78	4.10	3.49

These scores reflect both a moderate level of student success for the program and a need for a revision in our plan. First, we will consider the results. Second, we will consider the need for revisions to our portfolio assessment process.

The rubric used a scale from '1' to '9' with the following general categories: Minimal – 0 to 3.25, Basic – 3.25 to 5.5, Proficient – 5.5 to 7.75, and Advanced – 7.75 to 9. The averages per rubric item ranged from a low of 0.33 to 6.50. These are lower than we would expect. We believe the problem is a system problem rather than a student achievement problem. The students were asked to submit documents based on our institutional conceptual framework but the rubric was based on Rule 24. For this reason, we believe the scores reflect a need for a revision in our system.

Beginning immediately the University's conceptual framework and NDE's revised Rule 24 will be used to draft a new curriculum map for our program and courses. The draft will be shared with faculty in order to seek their input regarding the curriculum map and artifacts that will be used at the course and program levels to document student achievement. The program level artifacts will be assembled by each student in an online portfolio site. The existing rubric will be reconsidered based on the curriculum mapping and artifacts required. Revisions will be made, if needed. New students joining the program will be given information about this process as they enter the program. A transition plan will be created for existing students and they will be informed of changes to be made in their portfolios at this stage of their program.

We plan to continue using faculty as portfolio readers on an annual basis. As the process evolves we hope to read all portfolios submitted during the year.

When the data and rubrics are more closely matched with the standards we also plan to statistically check the reliability of the raters. For this reading the average item scores for each cohort were totaled giving a total composite score. The means (40.62 and 37.93) and standard deviations (8.39 and 2.95) were calculated for each set of five composite scores. We felt that the standard deviation of 2.95 was good for a composite involving ten items as it suggested a deviation of 0.3 points per item amongst the raters. The standard deviation of 8.39 wasn't quite as good. When we have more reliable data we will explore this concept in greater depth, possibly with other statistical procedures.

In conclusion, we learned more about our procedural shortcomings than our students exit knowledge and abilities. We need to correct those shortcomings so that future student assessments are more meaningful. The process of making those improvements will begin immediately.