

During the 2006-2007 academic year faculty undertook a comprehensive evaluation of the student teaching portfolio required of all preservice teachers. Data used in this evaluation included student program evaluations, student teaching portfolios developed since the last revision two years ago, and cooperating teacher evaluations. A summary of the changes made as a result of this analysis are provided below.

## Portfolio Changes 2006-2007

### Overall Changes:

- Faculty voted to eliminate general rationale statements.
- Faculty voted to standardize section headings and provide report headings to students in a word document.
- Faculty voted to have incoming core students purchase a student teaching handbook for orientation. The purpose is for current students begin thinking through the portfolio requirements before student teachings – see the big picture.

### Philosophy

- No changes – description and philosophies are aligning to standards

### Comprehensive Educational Assessment

- Evaluation of Current Portfolios
  - Students were not seeing the big picture of how assessment tied to the disability classification and IEP planning
  - Confusion over how to write up assessment report
  - Students were not connecting the function of standardized assessment in relation to CBA's in relation to the observation
  - Background information was unclear especially in regards to importance of student's race/culture, disability classification and current performance
  - Early Childhood and Severe students did not see a purpose behind doing an observation
- Changes
  - Articulated purpose of evaluation – it is now a theme throughout the section and ties the sections together
  - Clarified the role of the student teacher in terms of which tests to summarize and which tests to report on in detail
  - Restructured the observation. Made it relevant to program planning as well. Made it relevant to Early Childhood and Severe students
  - Added items regarding test validity (behavior and responses of student during assessment)
  - Took away requirement of IEP targeting 3 curriculum areas and instead have the student teacher justify the curriculum areas targeted in response to the assessment results.
  - Beefed up requirements for background/diversity information. Tied in prereferral interventions.
  - Added more examples for students of what is expected.

- Talked in meetings about how to change assessment courses in each program area. All areas are going to reference the portfolio requirements in their courses and are going to follow the same write up format.

### Instructional Planning

- Evaluation of Current Portfolios
  - Student teachers did a better job of describing the students
  - Student teachers addressed the effective teaching cycle
  - Early childhood – did not reference IFSP goal. The purpose was stated, but not tied to assessment/data. Unsure of how activities were linked to children. Unsure how the instruction was measured.
  - Composite majors did not follow format. The accommodations were generic. No corrective strategies were in place. No reference to reteaching.
  - Some student teachers did not understand the purpose of each piece of the effective teaching cycle.
  - Baseline data for severe was confusing. These students need to describe that what they did for baseline was different than intervention.
- Changes
  - For early childhood, referenced IFSP plans and gave examples that included embedded teaching opportunities.
  - Gave Mild/Moderate, Severe and ECH examples.
  - Used same report format as other sections.
  - Simplified to two lesson plans – no unit. Then added a scope and sequence (PLOP as it pertains to scope and sequence) to each lesson report for context.
  - Specified no scripted programs
  - Included two reports for lesson plan in scoring rubric.
  - Composite majors need to have a description of students, PLOP, and describe how to accommodate students. Data must address low performers – not just students with an IEP.
  - Composite majors – two daily lesson plan reports in SPED setting and one unit in ELED setting. The unit must address the scope and sequence as addressed above.
  - For dual majors with the SPED major – need to have two lesson plans for each program.

### Functional Behavior Assessment and Behavior Intervention Plan

- Evaluation of Current Portfolios
  - Behavior Definitions – most student teachers did an ok job. One composite major had a collection of separate behaviors
  - FBA – Hypotheses – most student teachers did an ok job. One portfolio instead of “Get attention/support/affection”, the hypothesis was labeled “to show feelings” suggesting a replacement behavior.
  - Justification of Hypothesis – 2/3 of the students did not provide data justifying the hypothesis
  - FBA – Intervention Recommendations are functionally equivalent. 2/3 of student teachers did ok. 1/3 there was no linkage between the hypothesis on function of problem behavior, replacement behavior AND intervention components.

- BIP objectives – everyone did fine
- BIP – Recording Procedures – 1/3 needs improvement. “frequency of completed assignments – not accuracy”, “frequency of quiet lips”
- BIP – Functional Equiv Interv Proc (Replacement AND Interv Conseq) – ½ there was no linkage
- BIP – Antecedent Procedures – 1/3 needs improvement – no mention or brief mentions without procedures
- BIP – Generalization and Maintenance – 1/3 needs improvement. G/M mentioned but no procedures for teaching, generalization procedures are described but for new behavior.
- BIP – results = 1/3 needs improvement – no data are described in BIP report
- BIP – graphing components – 1/3 need improvement – missing sections, no data showing replacement behavior, only the problem behavior
- Changes
  - Eliminated the BIP section
    - Time consuming
    - Labor intensive
    - Eliminates the time pressure – students do not have time to complete this section before the portfolio is due – especially students in two settings.
    - Needs are related to FBA not BIP
    - BIPS are conducted in two classes already
  - Embellish the FBA “Intervention Recommendations” component to include more specific BIP recommendations, i.e., antecedent procedures, consequence procedures, generalization procedures.
    - Fold these existing BIP components into FBA recommendations for future interventions, i.e., they will become recommended procedures, not implemented procedures.
    - Teacher can implement BIP if desired
    - Only loss is data on BIP effectiveness
    - Require the student to present data justifying the hypothesis regarding the selected function or functions of problem behavior. Current data from assessment do not support hypothesis
  - In intervention recommendations, require that students name and locate the level of the LRBI Level I or Level II procedure instead of merely indicating that it conforms to the USOE’s Policy. Portfolios currently contain only a canned statement. Recommendation will require students return to LRBI policy to find their recommended procedures.

#### Professional Interactions

- Part 1: Training
  - *Strengths:* All components clearly addressed
  - *Problem:* Format issues - A lot of the requirements are clumped together.
  - *Suggestions:* Revise the system of headings, i.e., one requirement per heading.
- Part 2: Consulting:

- *Strengths:* Components clearly address and demonstrate the substance of consultation
  - *Problem:* Outcomes of the consultation are not discussed, i.e., lacks documentation or documentation does not support evidence of consultation
  - *Suggestions:* (a) Barb & Pam will add criteria for each option; (b) Separate criteria – one bullet for description & one bullet for outcome; (c) Supervisor could give a broader range of ideas (d) change language to collaboration
- Part 3: Communication with Parents:
    - *Strengths:* Letters to parents
    - *Problem:* Providing specific rationale for each type of communication system used; outcomes of parent communication not described. No one did well. Stating the number of students served so that “documentation that all parents were contacted” could be verified. Confusion with logs.
    - *Suggestions:* Demonstrate a systematic way of interacting with parents. The system can be class wide or for an individual student. Outcomes need to be clearly articulated. Leave the log in and work on explanation.
  - Part 4: Demonstrate Cultural Competence
    - Changed headings but left component as is.
  - Part 5: Interview Outline
    - Changed headings but left component as is.
    - Added evaluation piece

### Assistive Technology

#### **Strengths**

1. Descriptions of their students were generally well done.
2. Descriptions of the technology programs and devices were generally complete

#### **Needs**

1. Assessment and rationale for a particular device/instructional program was weak across students
2. Data presentations – some had graphs; some did not; some graphs were poorly designed
3. Reflections – Few students based their evaluations on the data they collected and no students showed evidence of data-based decision making.

#### **Suggested Solutions/Modifications**

1. Assessment –
  - a. Tom is redeveloping his assessment unit this semester (5530)
  - b. Modify Assessment description in portfolio –
    - i. (4) Provide a description of the student’s AT needs
      - a. Describe the S’ AT needs and the problem the ST is trying to help overcome by using AT.

- b. Must provide information regarding how you decided to use this particular technology with this student (e.g., assessment, interview, other approaches).
  - 2. Graphs and interpretations
    - a. Supervisors must require graphic presentations and make sure they are labeled correctly
    - b. Modify description in portfolio
      - i. (7) Demonstration of the effectiveness of the device and training program:
        - a. Describe the data collection system designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the device and training program (include data sheets in the project report)
        - b. Create graphs of the data demonstrating the effectiveness of the device using MS Excel and paste the graphs into the project report.
        - c. Describe the data on the graphs.
3. Reflections
  - a. Modify description in portfolio
    - i. (8) Evaluate the effectiveness of the AT device/program for solving the problem described earlier
      - a. Based on the data presented describe the effectiveness of the AT device/program ((e.g., describe decrease in prompt levels or changes in student performance levels).
      - b. As needed, describe reteaching, changes/modifications in the device or program that may be needed to produce positive outcomes in student performance
4. Other suggested changes
  - a. Tom Higbee will match the student teaching criteria to the class project so students know the ST expectations.
  - b. Tom Higbee will provide faculty/supervisors with excellent projects from class for severe, mild/moderate and early childhood. Supervisors may share these models with students and use them to illustrate expectations.
  - c. As much as possible integrate technology applications into curriculum classes (e.g., exposure to Funnix and/or Head Sprout in Reading class; sample technology/AT applications in curriculum classes )