

During the 2008-2009 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.

#### Comprehensive Educational Assessment (Addresses CEC Standards 1,2,3,4,5,7,8,9,10)

The Undergraduate Committee decided to allow the entire portfolio to be written in first person instead of third person. Many journals are written now in first person and the committee wanted to have our students model current practice.

Most of the directions in this section were clear, however, supervisors did not hold student teachers to the written criteria. More training and supervision of supervisors will be provided.

In the relevant information from previous testing section, students did not consistently include the last four items and did not appear to reflect what the scores meant. Students are still not linking the assessment data with the observation targets. The handbook was rewritten in these sections to add clarity.

The standard of evidence for knowing how the measurement tool and procedure are sensitive to cultural/linguistic differences is not clear and needs to be operationalized. Dr. Duran will be asked to operationalize this section when she arrives this fall.

#### Instructional Planning (Addresses CEC Standards 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9)

Students had the outlined parts of the instructional planning portfolio sections but the committee felt that the handbook needed more detail so the students could better meet the intent of each section. For example, student teachers described their pupils, but the descriptions were generic labels and didn't indicate educational relevance. There was not enough information for the grader to determine if the accommodations and instructional strategies were appropriate for the students. Each of the following issues was addressed in the handbook by offering more specific directions.

- Description of Students Issues
  - Descriptions need to focus on issues relevant to the delivery of the lesson and on the educational impact of the disability
- Scope and Sequence Issues
  - Goals and objectives need to be written in correct format (regardless of how they are written in the classroom)
  - Sequence correctly
  - Targeted curriculum needs to be functional for the student
  - Need to replace PLOP with PLAAFP to reflect the change of terms in the law
- Lesson Plan Issues
  - Need sufficient information to determine what student teacher was doing and why
  - Need to address individual student needs
  - Need to be clear about how material is chunked
  - Phases of effective teaching cycle need to be cohesive

- Data Summary and Self Evaluation Issues
  - Visual presentation of the data needs to be accurate (need to include dates, need to include phase changes)
  - Written analysis of data needs to reflect instructional responses to the data
- Moved examples to the end of the section

Functional Behavioral Assessment (Addresses CEC Standards 1,2,4,5,7,8)

It was noted that there was an improvement in the FBA from the last review. There are clear mismatches of hypotheses and interventions. The committee recommended moving the replacement behavior name and definition after the hypothesis so that students do not name the replacement behavior before the assessment and hypothesis.

The committee recommended stronger training on functional assessment and function-based intervention for university supervisors.

Some of the rationale's focused on the writer's goal to pass student teaching, not to target student needs. A statement was added to students to make sure to focus on student's needs and potential to benefit from the FBA.

Students need to provide a rationale for assessment instruments/methods used. Statement was added to handbook to explain why you chose the assessment instrument/methods that you used.

Some students were discussing hypothesis rather than reporting on data collected so the overview direction was changed to address this issue.

A decision was made to make a stronger statement regarding the implementation of the behavior intervention program in the classroom. It also more strongly stated the need in include maintenance and generalization adequately.

The new LRBI (2009) guidelines were referenced.

Professional Interactions (Addresses CEC Standards 1,2,3,5,7,9, 10)

Overall, the student sections looked good. However, more detail was needed in some of the write-ups.

In the Training Professional or Other Staff section more detail was needed on the steps of the training program, feedback to the trainee, and evidence of successive training periods. More specific direction is being given to the student within the handbook description.

In the Collaboration with Teachers/Related Personnel students have not been providing a permanent product of their interactions. A record must now be provided.

The students were not evaluating the ease and usefulness of their communication system with parents and students and a description was added to the handbook prompting this more in-depth evaluation.

The committee suggested that the demonstrating cultural competence section could use a major revision. However, we just hired a new cultural diversity expert that will join our faculty in the fall. We will have her help us rework this section.

The committee also recommended adding a rationale to the Interview Outline requirement.

Assistive Technology (Addresses CEC Standards 4,5,6,7)

Most students did well on this section. A few minor clarifications were needed in the handbook to encourage better written reports.

For instance, when asked to provide physical or medical conditions that are relevant to the project, if students did not answer, does that mean that no conditions were present or that the student teacher didn't address them? Now the handbook states "if there are none, state this in your report."

The committee also wanted more information about why the student teacher selected the device and so added more clarification to the handbook in that area.

The committee felt that it was excessive to document consultation with teachers and/or other staff regarding unless it was a formal meeting. So the handbook now allows for supervisor discretion.

The committee also recommended changing the report to a narrative and not a bulleted report.