

# **THE OKLAHOMA PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

**DEVELOPED BY  
THE BUROS CENTER FOR TESTING  
FOR  
THE OKLAHOMA COMMISSION FOR TEACHER PREPARATION**

© Oklahoma Commission For Teacher Preparation

# THE OKLAHOMA PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

## A Ten Step Overview

1. The Institution is notified of impending on-site visit six weeks in advance.
2. The Institution provides written documentation of unit and/or program philosophy statements, mission statements, conceptual framework(s), policy statements, portfolio requirements (content, scoring rubrics and review schedules) and a list of current, active candidates to the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation four weeks in advance.
  - A. The candidate listing must include each candidate's program and status in the program (1st year, 2nd year, etc.).
  - B. The listing must be sorted according to both program affiliation and the candidates' status in the program (1st year, 2nd year, etc.).
3. The Portfolio Review Team leader and other members of the Team as may be needed conduct **Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence Review)** of the Portfolio Assessment. This is done off-site and according to appropriate guidelines (Appendix A: Verification Checklist, Appendix B: Rubric Evaluation, and Appendix C: Congruence Evaluation).
  - A. The completed Verification Checklist, Rubric Evaluation, and Congruence Evaluation are copied and made available to the other members of the Portfolio Review Team.
  - B. A brief report is prepared to provide feedback to the Institution.
4. The Commission specifies a representative sample of candidate portfolios from the candidate list and provides the institution with a list of candidates whose portfolios are to be reviewed. This is to be done fifteen working days prior to the on-site visit.
  - A. Candidate portfolios to be reviewed are selected by the Commission (or the Portfolio Review Team leader) from the sorted candidate list provided by the institution.
  - B. Candidate portfolios are selected to represent programs within the institution and length of time in the program. The emphasis is on candidates who are in the late stages of their programs.
  - C. The total number of portfolios to be provided to reviewers by the institution will not exceed 100. Institutions with only a small number of candidates or programs may be required to provide substantially fewer portfolios.
5. The institution will collect the specified portfolios and provide a secure location for the Portfolio Review Team to examine them during **Stage 2 (Portfolio Review)**. This is performed on-site.
  - A. The on-site location for examination will be adequate in size to accommodate five members of the Portfolio Review Team at a common table, with room to move about and examine open portfolios.
  - B. The location must be securable, preferably with a lockable door.

6. The Head of the Teacher Preparation Unit (Dean or Department Head) will meet with the Portfolio Review Team on the first day of the on-site visit and provide an orientation to the program. In addition, the Unit Head may be asked to clarify or respond to questions about philosophy statements, mission statements, conceptual framework(s), policy statements, scoring rubrics, review schedules or other aspects related to the candidates' portfolios. The Unit Head may include other individuals in this meeting.
7. Portfolios are examined by the Portfolio Review Team so that they may gather information upon which to base expert judgments about the learning opportunities provided by the institution as reflected in the portfolios.
  - A. MEMBERS OF THE PORTFOLIO REVIEW TEAM ARE NOT MAKING JUDGMENTS ABOUT CANDIDATE PERFORMANCE.
  - B. The Portfolio Review Team makes judgments solely based on the portfolios and how they reflect the competencies approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education, Oklahoma state law, and assessment guidelines established by the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation.
8. Portfolio Review Team decisions concerning Stage 2 (Portfolio Review) are evaluated according to appropriate guidelines (Appendix D: Portfolio Review).
  - A. The Portfolio Review Team is expected to be able to give reasonable explanations of ratings.
  - B. The Portfolio Review Team will reach a consensus on ratings for the unit.
  - C. At the conclusion of Stage 2 (Portfolio Review), the Portfolio Review Team will meet with institutional representatives to review and discuss findings.
9. The Portfolio Review Team will score the **Comprehensive Institutional Portfolio Review** according to appropriate guidelines (Appendix E: Comprehensive Institutional Portfolio Review Guidelines).
10. A formal report will be provided to the institution within eight weeks following the on-site review. The report will include findings on all aspects of the review process, including judgments based on Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence Review), Stage 2 (Portfolio Review), and the Comprehensive Institutional Portfolio Review. The report will identify areas of concern as well as areas of strength when appropriate.

# THE OKLAHOMA PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

## Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence Review)

Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence Review) consists of three steps. **Step A: Verification Checklist, Step B: Rubric Evaluation, and Step C: Congruence Evaluation.** All steps take place before the on-site visit of the Portfolio Review Team to the institution. Four weeks in advance of the on-site visit, the institution will provide written documentation of the following:

- philosophy statement(s)
- mission statement(s)
- conceptual framework(s)
- policy statement(s)
- institutional rubric(s) for scoring portfolios
- schedule(s) for portfolio evaluation
- a listing of the names of current, active candidates sorted by program and status in the program (1st year, 2nd year, etc.)

*NOTE: philosophy and mission statements may be embedded in the description of the conceptual framework*

### Step A: Verification Checklist

The verification checklist (Appendix A: Verification Checklist) confirms the existence of the following:

1. Unit and/or program philosophy, unit and/or program mission statement, and unit and/or program conceptual framework(s). If the unit has each of these components, it is not necessary that each program also have them. It may be that one or more of these components will exist at both the unit and program level, and the conceptual framework(s) may exist at only the program level. See *NOTE above*.
2. Institutional rubrics for portfolio scoring and the schedule used by the institution, unit, or program to examine and evaluate each candidate's portfolio. The rubrics and schedules may be developed and employed at either the unit or program level.
3. Portfolios for candidates at all stages of their program, from those candidates only recently admitted to teacher education programs to those who are in the final stages of their preparation.
4. Evidence that candidates have been provided, in writing, with required documentation. This includes the unit (or program) philosophy statement, mission statement, and conceptual framework(s). Candidates shall also be provided with the unit (or program) policy statement, portfolio content requirements, portfolio scoring rubrics, and schedule that will be used to evaluate the candidate portfolios.

Step A: Verification Checklist will be rated according to appropriate evaluation guidelines (Appendix A: Verification Checklist).

## Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence)

### Step B: Rubric Evaluation

The portfolio scoring rubric provided by the institution (unit or program) is evaluated to determine if the rubric reflects the competencies approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education. The rubric must address the following competencies:

- A. The teacher understands the central concepts and methods of inquiry of the subject matter discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
- B. The teacher understands how students learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and physical development at all grade levels including early childhood, elementary, middle level, and secondary.
- C. The teacher understands that students vary in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adaptable to individual differences of learners.
- D. The teacher understands curriculum integration processes and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills and effective use of technology.
- E. The teacher uses best practices related to motivation and behavior to create learning environments that encourage positive social interaction, self-motivation and active engagement in learning, thus, providing opportunities for success.
- F. The teacher develops knowledge of and uses a variety of effective communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
- G. The teacher plans instruction based upon curriculum goals, knowledge of the teaching/learning process, subject matter, students' abilities and differences, and the community; and adapts instruction based upon assessment and reflection.
- H. The teacher understands and uses a variety of assessment strategies to evaluate and modify the teaching/learning process ensuring the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.
- I. The teacher evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community), modifies those actions when needed, and actively seeks opportunities for continued professional growth.
- J. The teacher fosters positive interaction with school colleagues, parents/families, and organizations in the community to actively engage them in support of students' learning and well being.
- K. The teacher shall have an understanding of the importance of assisting students with career awareness and the application of career concepts to the academic curriculum.

- L. The teacher understands the process of continuous lifelong learning, the concept of making learning enjoyable, and the need for a willingness to change when the change leads to greater student learning and development
- M. The teacher understands the legal aspects of teaching including the rights of students and parents/families, as well as the legal rights and responsibilities of the teacher.
- N. The teacher understands, and is able to develop instructional strategies/plans based on the Oklahoma core curriculum.
- O. The teacher understands the State teacher evaluation process, “Oklahoma Criteria for Effective Teaching Performance,” and how to incorporate these criteria in designing instructional strategies.

Step B: Rubric Evaluation will evaluate to what extent a unit and/or program portfolio scoring rubric reflects the general competencies for teacher licensure and certification. (Appendix B: Rubric Evaluation).

## **Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence)**

### **Step C: Congruence Evaluation**

The congruence evaluation is an assessment of the extent to which the various components of the portfolio process are internally consistent. For each unit or program, the philosophy statement, mission statement, conceptual framework(s), policy statements, and portfolio requirements (scoring rubrics and evaluation schedules) must be internally consistent. To the extent that they are consistent, higher ratings are assigned.

There are many ways that portfolios may be developed and evaluated. The Commission does not impose a particular strategy (e.g., portfolios could be illustrations of “best practice,” or of candidate growth) on Oklahoma’s teacher preparation institutions. Nor does it require that every program within an institution’s unit follow the same model. However, the Commission does require that within a unit or program, the philosophy, mission, policy, scoring rubrics, etc. are internally consistent. That is, it would be inconsistent for the philosophy to characterize the importance of growth of pre-service teachers across their program while the policies, criteria, etc., for evaluating candidate portfolios focus on best practice.

Step C: Congruence Evaluation will be rated by the Portfolio Review Team according to appropriate scoring guidelines (Appendix C: Congruence Evaluation).

# THE OKLAHOMA PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

## Stage 2 (Portfolio Review)

Stage Two (Portfolio Review) will take place on-site at the institution. In Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence Review), the Portfolio Review Team selected a representative sample of candidate portfolios. These portfolios will be collected by the institution and provided to the Portfolio Review Team. The Portfolio Review Team will examine the portfolios in a secure location provided by the institution. This on-site location for portfolio review will be adequate in size to accommodate five members of the Portfolio Review Team at a common table, with room to move about and examine open portfolios, and must be securable, preferably with a lockable door.

The Head of the Teacher Preparation Unit (Dean or Department Head) will meet with the Portfolio Review Team on the first day of the on-site visit and provide an orientation to the program. In addition, the Unit Head may be asked to clarify or respond to questions about philosophy statements, mission statements, conceptual framework(s), policy statements, portfolio scoring rubrics, schedules for evaluations or other aspects of the unit that are related to the candidates' portfolios. The Unit Head may include other individuals in this meeting.

The number of portfolios reviewed should be large enough so that the Portfolio Review Team is confident in making a global judgment, but not so large as to be overwhelming. One strategy would be for the Portfolio Review Team to select enough portfolios at first so that each team member has five portfolios to review. If problems are apparent, a second sample might be selected to verify reviewers' judgments based on the first reviewed portfolios. The process is continued until reviewers are satisfied that they have seen enough to make a judgment. Three iterations should be sufficient in most cases. It is emphasized that the Portfolio Review Team, as experts, should not be unduly restricted or prescribed in gathering information.

It is recommended that the institutions be notified of the strategies and criteria to be used in the review prior to the on-site visit. It is further recommended that the institution or program not be allowed to pre-select portfolios for review. Consideration should also be given as to some method to safeguard the portfolio author's identity. One way to accomplish this is for the reviewers to ask for twice as many (or more) portfolios than they anticipate reviewing so that institutions/programs will not know the identity of candidates whose portfolios were actually used in the review.

The Portfolio Review Team will examine the candidates' portfolios so that they may gather information upon which to base expert judgments about the learning opportunities provided by the institution as reflected in the portfolios. It is worth re-emphasizing that the purpose of the portfolio review is to assess the portfolios in terms of whether their contents allow for the assessment of learning experiences offered and not how the contents of the portfolios reflect the individual candidate's performance.

The portfolios will be reviewed according to appropriate guidelines (Appendix D: Portfolio Review Guidelines). The Portfolio Review Team will reach a consensus on evaluation decisions and is expected to provide reasonable explanations of those decisions. At the conclusion of Stage 2 (Portfolio Review), the Portfolio Review Team will meet with institutional representatives to review ratings and discuss findings.

# **THE OKLAHOMA PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT RUBRIC**

## **APPENDICES**



# APPENDIX A

## Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence Review)

### Step A: Verification Checklist

#### 1. Checklist

Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence Review) is completed off-site by the Portfolio Review Team leader and other members of the Team as may be needed. This checklist should be completed and used to assist in the decision-making about the teacher preparation unit's status regarding meeting the standards. A copy of the completed checklist may be made available to the institution.

#### General Information

1. Name of Institution: \_\_\_\_\_
2. Name of teacher preparation unit: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of programs within the unit: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Attach listing of the names of each program.)
4. Number of certification areas represented within the unit: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Attach listing of the names of each certification area).

#### Verification of Documents

1. **It is required that there be a written philosophy statement, a mission statement, and conceptual framework(s)** for the entire teacher preparation unit (college, department, etc.) or for each program. It is acceptable that there be philosophy statements, mission statements, and conceptual framework(s) at both the unit and program level, but if there is no unit statement, then there must be a philosophy statement for each program. *NOTE: philosophy and mission statements may be embedded in the description of the conceptual framework.*

#### A. Philosophy: (please check appropriate box)

Unit philosophy statement available?  
YES NO

Program philosophy statement available for all programs?  
YES NO

\_\_\_\_\_ If no, for how many programs is a philosophy statement available?

(Note: if there is a unit statement, no program statement is necessary.)

**B. Mission Statement:** (please check appropriate box)

$\pi$   $\pi$  Unit mission statement available?  
YES NO

$\pi$   $\pi$  Program mission statement available for all programs?  
YES NO

\_\_\_\_\_ If no, for how many programs is a mission statement available?

(Note: if there is a unit statement, no program statement is necessary.)

**C. Conceptual framework(s):** (please check appropriate box)

$\pi$   $\pi$  Unit conceptual framework(s) available?  
YES NO

$\pi$   $\pi$  Program conceptual framework available for all programs?  
YES NO

\_\_\_\_\_ If no, for how many programs is a conceptual framework available?

(Note: if there is a unit conceptual framework, no program conceptual framework is necessary.)

**Requirements:** (please check appropriate box)

A philosophy statement, mission statement, and conceptual framework(s) are required at the unit level, the program level, or some combination at both levels.

*NOTE: philosophy and mission statements may be embedded in the description of the conceptual framework.*

Is requirement #1 met?

$\pi$  MET                       $\pi$  MET WITH WEAKNESS                       $\pi$  NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency (e.g., indicate what is missing and the names of the units/programs that do not have the required materials.) Use the space below to make comments and/or note deficiencies.

2. **It is required that there be a written portfolio philosophy statement, policy statement, scoring rubric, and a schedule for evaluating the candidate portfolios** for the entire teacher preparation unit (college, department, etc.) or for each program. All of these components **must** be in place at either the unit or program level.

**A. Portfolio Philosophy Statement:** (please check 4appropriate box)

$\pi$   $\pi$  Written unit portfolio philosophy statement available?  
YES NO

$\pi$   $\pi$  Written portfolio philosophy statement available for all programs?  
YES NO

\_\_\_\_\_ If no, for how many programs is a written philosophy statement available?

(Note: if there is a written unit philosophy statement, no written program philosophy statement is necessary.)

**B. Portfolio Policy Statement:** (please check 4appropriate box)

$\pi$   $\pi$  Written unit policy statement available?  
YES NO

$\pi$   $\pi$  Written program policy statement available for all programs?  
YES NO

\_\_\_\_\_ If no, for how many programs is a written policy statement available?

(Note: if there is a written unit policy statement, no written program policy statement is necessary.)

**C. Rubric for scoring portfolios:** (please check 4appropriate box)

$\pi$   $\pi$  Unit portfolio scoring rubric available?  
YES NO

$\pi$   $\pi$  Program portfolio scoring rubric available for all programs?  
YES NO

\_\_\_\_\_ If no, for how many programs is a portfolio scoring rubric available?

(Note: if there is a unit portfolio scoring rubric, no program portfolio scoring rubric is necessary.)

**D. Schedule for evaluating portfolios:** (please check appropriate box)

Unit schedule for scoring portfolios available?  
YES NO

Program schedule for evaluating portfolios available for all programs?  
YES NO

\_\_\_\_\_ If no, for how many programs is a schedule for evaluating portfolios available?

(Note: if there is a unit schedule for scoring portfolios, no program schedule for evaluating portfolios is necessary.)

**Requirements:** (please check appropriate box)

A written portfolio philosophy statement, a written policy, a scoring rubric, and a schedule for evaluating the candidate portfolios are required at either the unit level, the program level, or some combination at both levels.

Is requirement #2 met?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
MET	MET WITH WEAKNESS	NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency. Use the space below to make comments and/or note deficiencies.

3. **Evidence is available that candidates have been provided written documentation** of the unit or program philosophy statement, mission statement, conceptual frameworks, portfolio policy statement, rubric for scoring and schedule for when portfolios will be evaluated. (Please check 4appropriate box.)

Is requirement #3 met?

$\pi$	$\pi$	$\pi$
MET	MET WITH WEAKNESS	NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency. Use the space below to make comments and/or note deficiencies.

4. **The final requirement**, in terms of documentation, **is that there be a list of candidate names** and their **program affiliations** and their **status in the program** (1st year, 2nd year, etc.). (Please check 4appropriate box.)

$\pi$   $\pi$  Was a list of candidates in the teacher preparation program provided?  
YES NO

$\pi$   $\pi$  If yes, did the list indicate the candidate's program?  
YES NO

$\pi$   $\pi$  If yes, did the list indicate the candidate's program status  
YES NO (1st year, 2nd year, etc.)?

Is requirement #4 met?

$\pi$	$\pi$	$\pi$
MET	MET WITH WEAKNESS	NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency (e.g., indicate what is missing and the names of the units/programs that do not have the required materials.)

This checklist is an aid to ensure that all essential materials have been developed and have been shared with candidates. Deficiencies should be noted. The complete absence of any components at any level (unit or program) may be grounds for action by the OCTP.

Use the space below to make additional comments.

## Stage 1 (Verification/Congruency Review)

### Step A: Verification Checklist

#### 2. Verification Summary

For each of the components, indicate whether the requirement is Met, Met with weakness, or Not Met by transferring responses from section 1: Checklist. Thus, the outcome of the verification step is a set of four judgments. The judgments may be related to units, programs, or both within an institution depending on how each unit/program has configured the various components.

1. Unit/Program philosophy statement, mission statement, and conceptual framework(s)

Is this requirement met?

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

2. Portfolio philosophy, policy, institutional scoring rubric, and evaluation schedule

Is this requirement met?

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

3. Candidates are provided, in writing, the philosophy statement, unit mission statement, conceptual framework(s), policy statement, scoring rubric, and evaluation schedule

Is this requirement met?

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

4. List of candidate names, their program affiliation and status in the program (1st year, 2nd year, etc.)

Is this requirement met?

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------



## APPENDIX B

### Stage 1 (Verification/Congruency Review)

#### Step B: Rubric Evaluation

The portfolio scoring rubric provided by the institution (unit or program) is evaluated to determine if the rubric reflects the competencies approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education. The rubric must address the following competencies:

- A. The teacher understands the central concepts and methods of inquiry of the subject matter discipline(s) he or she teaches and can create learning experiences that make these aspects of subject matter meaningful for students.
- B. The teacher understands how students learn and develop, and can provide learning opportunities that support their intellectual, social and physical development at all grade levels including early childhood, elementary, middle level, and secondary.
- C. The teacher understands that students vary in their approaches to learning and creates instructional opportunities that are adaptable to individual differences of learners.
- D. The teacher understands curriculum integration processes and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage students' development of critical thinking, problem solving, and performance skills and effective use of technology.
- E. The teacher uses best practices related to motivation and behavior to create learning environments that encourage positive social interaction, self-motivation and active engagement in learning, thus, providing opportunities for success.
- F. The teacher develops knowledge of and uses a variety of effective communication techniques to foster active inquiry, collaboration, and supportive interaction in the classroom.
- G. The teacher plans instruction based upon curriculum goals, knowledge of the teaching/learning process, subject matter, students' abilities and differences, and the community; and adapts instruction based upon assessment and reflection.
- H. The teacher understands and uses a variety of assessment strategies to evaluate and modify the teaching/learning process ensuring the continuous intellectual, social and physical development of the learner.
- I. The teacher evaluates the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (students, parents, and other professionals in the learning community), modifies those actions when needed, and actively seeks opportunities for continued professional growth.
- J. The teacher fosters positive interaction with school colleagues, parents/families, and organizations in the community to actively engage them in support of students' learning and well being.

- K. The teacher shall have an understanding of the importance of assisting students with career awareness and the application of career concepts to the academic curriculum.
- L. The teacher understands the process of continuous lifelong learning, the concept of making learning enjoyable, and the need for a willingness to change when the change leads to greater student learning and development
- M. The teacher understands the legal aspects of teaching including the rights of students and parents/families, as well as the legal rights and responsibilities of the teacher.
- N. The teacher understands, and is able to develop instructional strategies/plans based on the Oklahoma core curriculum.
- O. The teacher understands the State teacher evaluation process, “Oklahoma Criteria for Effective Teaching Performance,” and how to incorporate these criteria in designing instructional strategies.

**Step B: Rubric Evaluation**

Portfolio rubrics must reflect these competencies.

Is this requirement met?

$\pi$   
MET

$\pi$   
MET WITH WEAKNESS

$\pi$   
NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency (e.g., indicate which competencies lack evidence or need additional development.)

# APPENDIX C

## Stage 1 (Verification/Congruence Review)

### Step C: Congruence Evaluation

The congruence evaluation is an assessment of the extent to which the various components of the portfolio process are internally consistent. For each unit or program, the philosophy statement, mission statement, conceptual framework(s), policy statements, and portfolio requirements (scoring rubrics and evaluation schedules) must be internally consistent. To the extent that they are consistent, higher ratings are assigned.

There are many ways that portfolios may be developed and evaluated. The Commission does not impose a particular strategy (e.g., portfolios could be illustrations of “best practice,” or of candidate growth) on Oklahoma’s teacher preparation institutions. Nor does it require that every program within an institution’s unit follow the same model. However, the Commission does require that within a unit or program, the philosophy, mission, policy, scoring rubrics, etc. are internally consistent. That is, it would be inconsistent for the philosophy to characterize the importance of growth of pre-service teachers across their program while the policies, criteria, etc., for evaluating candidate portfolios focus on best practice.

Rate each component for congruency:

**3 = Congruent** (Components are unambiguously consistent.)

**2 = Congruent with some inconsistency.**

**1 = Not Congruent** (Components are clearly inconsistent or contradictory)

## Congruence Rating Sheet

List all unique institutional areas (the unit and/or programs) that have all required components (philosophy statement, policy statement, and rubric); or if one component is intended to be common to all areas, then consider that component for all areas and indicate the congruence score for each component relationship. Use the scale on previous page.

Elements

Teacher Preparation Unit:

Portfolio philosophy ----- Portfolio policy

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio philosophy/policy ----- Portfolio rubric

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio philosophy/policy/rubric -----Unit philosophy/mission/framework

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Program: (List as many programs as necessary to include all programs within the unit that have unique components, i.e. philosophy, conceptual frameworks, etc.)

Program name:

Portfolio philosophy ----- Portfolio policy

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio philosophy/policy ----- Portfolio rubric

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio philosophy/policy/rubric -----Unit philosophy/mission/framework

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

## Congruence Rating Sheet (cont.)

Program: (List as many programs as necessary to include all programs within the unit that have unique components, i.e. philosophy, conceptual frameworks, etc. Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

Program name:

Portfolio philosophy ----- Portfolio policy

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio philosophy/policy ----- Portfolio rubric

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio philosophy/policy/rubric ----- Unit philosophy/mission/framework

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Program name:

Portfolio philosophy ----- Portfolio policy

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio philosophy/policy ----- Portfolio rubric

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

Portfolio philosophy/policy/rubric ----- Unit philosophy/mission/framework

Congruence rating: \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX D

### Stage 2 (Portfolio Review for Initial Programs)

#### Portfolio Review Guidelines

In applying the portfolio review guidelines, Portfolio Review Team members should take into account the candidates' status in the program (1st year, 2nd year, etc.). Portfolios of candidates who are in the early stages of a program may not reflect all characteristics. Recall that the purpose of this process is not to score the portfolios for individual candidates, but to examine a sample of candidate portfolios and assess, holistically, the extent to which the portfolios provide evidence that the requirements and institutional characteristics below are being met.

The evaluations are professional judgments about the extent to which the institution provides candidates with specific opportunities and that these opportunities are reflective of program quality.

If, in the judgment of the reviewer completing the review, adequate evidence for a listed component is reflected in the portfolios reviewed, then the reviewer should indicate that the component is **Met**. If the reviewer is satisfied that some evidence of the component is reflected in the portfolios, but believes that there are weaknesses or a need for further evidence, then the reviewer should indicate that the component is **Met with weakness**. If the reviewer finds that the portfolios reviewed do not reflect compliance with the component, then the reviewer should indicate that the component is **Not Met**.

Each Portfolio Review Team member should complete this scoring guide independently, then a consensus score for each of the nine components should be developed by the Portfolio Review Team leader for submission to the Commission and to the institution's teacher preparation unit.

## The Nine Components for Portfolio Review:

Portfolios reflect opportunities for

- 1) Candidates to meet the competencies approved by the Oklahoma State Board of Education.

$\pi$	$\pi$	$\pi$
MET	MET WITH WEAKNESS	NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 2) Candidates to begin portfolio development early in their programs.

$\pi$	$\pi$	$\pi$
MET	MET WITH WEAKNESS	NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 3) Candidates to relate and apply principles and theories to actual practice.

$\pi$	$\pi$	$\pi$
MET	MET WITH WEAKNESS	NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 4) Candidates to observe and practice in a variety of communities, e.g., with students who are from different age groups, are culturally diverse, and represent exceptional populations, etc..

$\pi$	$\pi$	$\pi$
MET	MET WITH WEAKNESS	NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 5) Candidates to observe and practice in a variety of school settings.

$\pi$	$\pi$	$\pi$
MET	MET WITH WEAKNESS	NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 6) Candidates to interact with a variety of teaching styles in the program and in school settings.

$\pi$	$\pi$	$\pi$
MET	MET WITH WEAKNESS	NOT MET

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 7) Candidates to receive peer and faculty feedback on their teaching simulations and field performances during the program.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 8) Candidates to have involvement with parents, families, and communities.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 9) Candidates to exhibit effective teaching in a given school setting.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

Additional comments regarding overall rating of the unit based on the on-site portfolio review process.

## APPENDIX E

### Stage Two (Portfolio Review for Advanced Programs)

#### The Seven Components for Advanced Portfolio Review:

Portfolios reflect opportunities for

- 2) Candidates to meet the competencies of their respective learned society.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 2) Candidates to begin portfolio development early in their program.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 3) Candidates to relate and apply principles and theories to actual practice.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 5) Candidates to demonstrate involvement in state, regional, or national professional organizations.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 5) Candidates to demonstrate exposure to and interaction with students from different communities, including students who are from different age groups, are culturally diverse, and represent exceptional populations.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 6) Candidates to demonstrate exposure to or knowledge of current research, theories, and best practices in their appropriate field.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

- 7) Candidates to receive feedback on their internship, practicum, or observation experiences from a variety of sources.

$\pi$ MET	$\pi$ MET WITH WEAKNESS	$\pi$ NOT MET
--------------	----------------------------	------------------

If not fully met, indicate the nature of the deficiency.

## APPENDIX F

### Comprehensive Institutional Portfolio Review

#### Comprehensive Evaluation Guidelines

An institution will receive a comprehensive evaluation reflecting general compliance in all stages of the portfolio assessment review based on the following rubric:

**Met:** All requirements related to the portfolio review were met.

**Met with needed improvement:** Requirements were substantially met, but the review team found areas where improvements are recommended.

**Not met:** Deficiencies are so severe that remediation is required.

In the space below, indicate the evaluation and rationale for that judgment. Address strengths and deficiencies specifically. These comments will be incorporated in to the formal report due to the institution eight weeks after the site visit.