ED 437 341   SP 038 879

AUTHOR   Fleming, Louise E.
TITLE   Portfolios in Teacher Education.
PUB DATE   1999-10-00
NOTE   11p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the
                Mid-Western Educational Research Association (Chicago, IL,
                October 13-16, 1999).
PUB TYPE   Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE   MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS   Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Higher
                Education; *Portfolio Assessment; Preservice Teacher
                Education; Reflective Teaching; *Student Teacher Evaluation;
                Student Teachers
IDENTIFIERS   Ashland University OH; Reflective Thinking

ABSTRACT
                In response to state licensure standards, Ashland
University, Ohio, revised its teacher education program. The faculty pondered
how to build in ways that would ensure students were making connections
between their courses and field experiences while simultaneously reflecting
on their own growth. Portfolios appeared to be the solution. The department's
academic standards committee explored the use of portfolios in undergraduate
teacher programs and found that they were being used successfully in other
teacher education programs. The group worked on a developmental (versus
evaluation) model that would encourage reflection, collaboration, and
self-evaluation. They determined that the portfolio would be developmental
for the first 3 years, and the senior portfolio would draw solely upon senior
experiences. The final draft incorporated both a developmental and evaluation
portfolio. It paralleled the Pathwise domains and the department's tenets.
The first level of the portfolio is general and reflective. The second level
is specific to a program. The third level focuses on area of concentration
and in the fourth level a student writes a section on his or her philosophy
on education along with a personal reflection about themselves and as a
future teacher. The program was flexible enough to allow department programs
to adapt the structure, implementation, and assessment to their own needs.
(SM)

Portfolios in Teacher Education

Louise E. Fleming

Ashland University

Presented at the Conference of Mid-Western Educational Research Association

October, 1999

2

Portfolios in Teacher Education

Our goal, as teacher educators, is for our students to become good teachers, but we often wonder if we are giving them the best foundation. Recently, to respond to state licensure standards, Ashland University teacher education faculty studied and revised our teacher education program. One of the questions we pondered was how to build in ways to ensure that students were making connections between their various courses and field experiences and that they were reflecting on their own growth.

Portfolios seemed to be an answer to this question. Our department academic standards committee was asked to explore the idea of using portfolios in our undergraduate teacher education program. We looked at some of the literature on portfolios and found that they were being used successfully in other teacher education programs, often to document student teaching (Borko, Michalec, Timmons, & Siddle,1997). We also found that they could be used to document growth in both a formative (developmental) and summative (evaluation) manner (Cole, 1992). Olson (1991) states that the purpose of the portfolio determines content; we therefore had to consider which use was most important to us.

Kaufman (1993) states that there are four basic assumptions associated with portfolios: The process is important; it should reflect growth; it should encourage reflection and collaboration; and it should include self-evaluation. All of these criteria were important to us as we considered using portfolios. We wanted to students to gain from the process of putting their portfolios together. We hoped the process would encourage students to self-assess, reflecting on their growth and making assumptions about what they had learned and what they needed to learn. We also wanted this experience to be a healthy experience which encouraged students to

3

communicate with faculty and other mentoring professionals. We hoped that such a process would help them to make connections between theory and practice, as stated by Borko et al. (1997), and would instill patterns of reflective practice. Finally, we agreed with Kaufman (1993) that a portfolio must reflect the goals of our program.

When our committee first began our discussions, several of the committee members were sure it could not be done. How would we store them, who would assess them, how would they be assessed were some of the questions that committee members asked. Our faculty are very busy with their teaching loads and committee work and would not have time to advise a number of students through a portfolio process. We also discussed the benefits and drawbacks of developmental vs evaluation portfolios.

After we discussed why portfolios could not be done, we agreed to consider their implementation but without adding a lot of work to our faculty members. We read articles about portfolios to acquaint ourselves with background information and to agree on definitions of terms. I volunteered to rough out a draft for us to use for discussion. I chose a developmental model because I valued the reflection that it would engender. I also tried, as Kaufman (1993) suggests, to make sure that the portfolio paralleled the goals of our program. In order to prevent a lot of work for a few people, I noted the course in which each addition to the portfolio would be completed. I then gave my draft to a colleague for review. His thoughts were parallel to mine, and, because our students must take the Praxis series of assessment, he added the Praxis domains that each addition paralleled. He also suggested that we combine a developmental and evaluation model. The portfolio would be developmental for the first three years. The senior portfolio would draw on senior experiences, such as student teaching, but students may also use parts from

the developmental portfolio to include in the evaluation portfolio.

We presented this draft to the committee. Surprisingly, everyone accepted our general ideas, and as a committee we further edited the draft. Our department chair reviewed that draft and suggested that we note which of our department tenets each addition paralleled. Our committee approved it, and the final draft was presented to the entire department for approval. The next step is that each program team will modify the guidelines to suit their program and determine evaluation procedures. The modifications and evaluation procedures will then be submitted to our committee for approval.

Our final draft was successful for a number of reasons. One reason is that the process operates within our established structure. We indicated which course or field experience would be responsible to assign and to assess each piece. In most cases the assignment was already part of the course requirements, so little was added to our faculty in terms of load. Another reason for its success is that we incorporated both a developmental and an evaluation portfolio. The developmental begins in the freshman year and continues through the junior year. Its purpose is for the student to document what he or she learned and needed to learn and to provide a picture of growth. The developmental portfolio also provides evidence to the faculty of what the student has learned. The evaluation portfolio takes place during the senior year and is the one which will be assessed. It includes the students' student teaching experience and summarizes their growth throughout their program. Additionally, this portfolio may be used for seeking employment.

Another reason that our proposal was accepted is that we paralleled the Pathwise domains and our own department tenets. This is important for students, faculty members, and future employers to see the professionalism built into our program. Finally, the faculty accepted

the proposal because we allowed the program areas to adapt the structure, implementation, and assessment to their own needs. No one document could have been appropriate for all program areas, and the flexibility allows the faculty to determine what implementation and assessment will match with their requirements.

Often our incoming freshmen do not know if they want to teach. Others know they want to teach but do not know what area they want to teach. Therefore, the first level of the portfolio tends to be general and reflective, allowing the student to think about the field of education and his or her place in it. Beginning at the Sophomore level, the portfolio is specific to a program, adding lesson plans. We have a field experience at teach level, and each level of the portfolio asks the students to reflect on themselves as future teachers. Junior year is even more specifically program-related, adding a developed course, unit, lesson plans based on the unit, and assessment. At this level we also expect our students to be able to teach interdisciplinarily and to work with other teachers. In their portfolio they need to explain how these might happen. Also at this level, the students need to document what they are learning in their concentration areas. In the senior year we ask the students to write a philosophy of education and to reflect on themselves as humans and as future teachers. The specific documentation expected at the junior year continues, but the students are expected to include their student teaching.

Because many states are beginning to require portfolios to document growth of teachers as professionals, we believe it is beneficial for preservice professionals to begin thinking of themselves as developing professionals. We believe the model we have developed helps the preservice teacher to begin this process. We believe that this model also helps the student and the faculty to see evidence of growth in the student and the faculty to critique their programs and

their teaching. Finally, the evaluation portfolio is very useful in seeking employment. Such a model can also be useful when the student is an inservice teacher to document development for licensure, tenure, and renewal.

Works Cited

Borko, H., Michalec, P., Timmons, M., & Siddle, J. (1997). Student teaching portfolios: A tool for promoting reflective practice. <u>Journal of Teacher Education, 48,</u> 345-356,

Cole, D.J. (1992, Fall/Winter). The developing professional: Process and product portfolios. <u>Kappa Delta Pi Record,</u> 43-47.

Kaufman, J. (1993, March). <u>Student teaching portfolios: "It's all in the bag."</u> Paper presented an the meeting of West Virginia Association of Teacher Educators, Parkersburg, WV.

Olson, M.W. (1990). Portfolios: Education tools. <u>Reading Psychology: An International Quarterly, 12,</u> 73-80.

ASHLAND UNIVERSITY
College of Education
Portfolio Guide

Freshman Year

Portfolio Document	Course	Domain	Tenets
1. Personal Essay: Initiating a personal philosophy of education.	Ed. 130	D	Pre, 8
	Ed. 202	A/C	3
2. Case Study: Applying Learning to Teaching	Ed. 130	D	Pre,8
3. Journal			

Sophomore Year

Portfolio Document	Course	Domain	Tenets
1. Two lesson plans with reflection	Soph Fields	A/C	3,4,5,6,7
2. Include in lesson plans techniques to help children with exceptionalities.	Ed. 247	A/C	3
3. Philosophy of Teaching (rough draft)	Soph Fields	D	Pre,8
4. Journal	Soph Fields	D	Pre,8

Junior Year

Portfolio Document	Course	Domain	Tenets
1. Two lesson plans with reflection	Jr. Fields	A/C	1,3,4,5,6,7
2. Examples of developed course, unit and 2 lesson plans, each with specific assessment. One of these should reflect interdisciplinary material and explanation of how student might team with another teacher.	Methods	A/C	3,4,5,6,7
3. Concentration area documentation (e.g., photos, videos, diagrams, etc.)	Non-educ. classes	D	6
4. Journal	Jr. Fields	D	Pre,8

Senior Year Evaluation Portfolio

Portfolio Document	Course	Domain	Tenets
1. Autobiography of a developing philosophy of education.	Ed. 307/+	D	Pre,8
2. Examples of developed course, unit and 2 lesson plans, each with specific assessment. One of these should reflect interdisciplinary material and explanation of how student might team with another teacher.	St. Teach.	A/C	1,3,4,5, 6,7
3. Documentation of appropriate learning environment (e.g., photos, videos, diagrams, etc.)	St. Teach.	B	3
4. Concentration area documentation	Non-educ. classes	D	6

5. Reflection on developmental portfolio:
     1. how student has grown in the field of education.
     2. how student has been broadened by social, cultural and diverse experiences.
     3. how student envisions him/herself as a developing professional.
		D	Pre,8

Preparing Professional Educators

The Ashland University Education programs are based on foundations of education, current research, effective practice, and dynamic collaborative relationships among educators at all levels. The program is implemented through diverse classroom, field, and clinical experiences. The Ashland University Education faculty believe that a professional educator is a reflective practitioner who merges theory and practice in the following ways:

1. Works cooperatively and collaboratively with all members of the educational community

2. Communicates clearly and effectively through a variety of means

3. Demonstrates understanding of human development, cultural diversity, socio-economic influences and learning differences, thereby enabling all children to learn and contribute

4. Employs research in areas such as learning theory and instructional methodology

5. Uses a variety of appropriate assessment techniques to enhance learning

6. Masters appropriate disciplines so as to engage students in meaningful, active academic study

7. Integrates educational technology in teaching and learning process

8. Assumes the lifelong responsibility to grow academically, professionally, and personally

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC®

REPRODUCTION RELEASE
(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Portfolios in Teacher Education

Author(s): Louise E. Fleming

Corporate Source: Ashland University

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents	The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents
PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 1	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2A	PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY Sample TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) 2B
Level 1 ↑ [X]	Level 2A ↑ [ ]	Level 2B ↑ [ ]
Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.	Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only	Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here,→
please

Signature:

Organization/Address: 313 Bixler Hall Ashland University Ashland, OH 44805

Printed Name/Position/Title: Louise E. Fleming   Assoc. Prof. of Education

Telephone: 419 289 5347   FAX: 419 289 5398

E-Mail Address: lfleming@ashland.edu   Date: 1/12/00

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC Clearinghouse
AND TEACHER EDUCATION
1307 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 300
Washington, DC 20005-4701

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
1100 West Street, 2nd Floor
Laurel, Maryland 20707-3598

Telephone: 301-497-4080
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-953-0263
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 9/97)