

Curriculum and Instruction Cohort 1

Portfolio Summary

The Lincoln and Omaha face-to-face cohorts which began the Curriculum and Instruction program in the Fall 2010 were the first group to complete the program during the summer of 2012. Submission of a professional development educational e-Portfolio is one of the program completion requirements.

The e-Portfolio is built around the 10 INTASC Teaching Standards, and each course in the program is aligned with one or more of these standards. An artifact representing the students' knowledge of, skills in or disposition toward a standard can be taken from each course to place in the portfolio, as well as any relevant artifacts from their ongoing teaching or professional development experiences.

The template for the e-Portfolio is located at <https://sites.google.com/site/barbperlewitz/>. A portfolio must include the students' philosophy of education and professional vita, and a written narrative for each standard that explains:

1. Why the standard is important for a teacher
2. What courses or experiences have contributed to their understanding of the standard?
3. A summary of the 2-3 quality artifacts included that demonstrate the student's knowledge or mastery of the standard

Upon submission of the e-Portfolio, students also submit a self-evaluation form (see attached rubric) to rate where they believe they fall on the scale in each standard, and the program director or designee also fills out the evaluation to share with the students along with comments on each standard to compare self-perception and program expectations.

Twenty two students completed this process during their capstone experience. The vast majority of students ranked their understanding of the standards in the high proficient to advanced rating (7-9). 15 of the 22 only submitted one artifact with each standard, 5 students submitted more than one artifact in at least half of the standards, and 2 students submitted at least 2 artifacts in each of the standards.

Curriculum and Instruction Cohort 1

Portfolio Summary

In the program director's evaluation, more than one artifact was required in a standard to move to the advanced rating of 9. A single artifact is insufficient evidence to determine a rating of advanced

Comparing the two evaluations, it is clear that some students lacked self-confidence in the artifacts and narrative they provided to only give themselves a minimal or basic rating, whereas the evaluator did not. This was brought to their attention in the written comments. Students seemed to be more likely to rate themselves advanced with a score of 9 (42/22) in some standards. The other noticeable difference was in the rating of 7 (high proficient) where the evaluator ranked more in this category 110 to 69.

The standards 3 out of 22 students (14%) self-identified as being less than proficient in were 1, 2, 3, 5, 7 and 9

There was no standard identified where students actually performed below the expected level which is an indicator that the standards are well distributed throughout the program, and the program and course learning outcomes have been met.