

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 924

TM 035 228

AUTHOR Mushi, Selina L. P.
TITLE Teacher-Candidates' Overall Program Portfolio Scoring:
Systematic, Comprehensive and Hierarchical Evaluative
Measures of Excellence (TOPPS SCHEME).
PUB DATE 2003-00-00
NOTE 12p.
PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom (055)
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Portfolio Assessment; Portfolios (Background Materials);
*Preservice Teachers; *Scoring; Teacher Education; *Teacher
Evaluation

ABSTRACT

This document is a scoring guide that presents the Teacher-candidates' Overall Program Portfolio Scoring: Systematic, Comprehensive and Hierarchical Evaluative Measures of Excellence (TOPPS SCHEME) approach to scoring teacher candidates' program portfolios. The guide facilitates systematic, comprehensive, and hierarchical means of measuring and evaluating the overall performance excellence (knowledge, skills, and dispositions) of teacher candidates. The guide gives different elements of the portfolio different weights. Intra-rater and inter-rater reliability indices are used to indicate scorer agreement, and at least 95% scorer agreement is suggested. The scheme contains charts to evaluate portfolio elements, with summary computation and score interpretation pages to be completed when the rest of the scoring pages are finished. (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

Teacher-candidates' Overall Program Portfolio Scoring: Systematic, Comprehensive and Hierarchical Evaluative Measures of Excellence (TOPPS SCHEME)

Selina L. P. Mushi

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS
BEEN GRANTED BY

S.L.P. Mushi

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.

Minor changes have been made to
improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this
document do not necessarily represent
official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Teacher-candidates' Overall Program Portfolio Scoring: Systematic, Comprehensive and Hierarchical Evaluative Measures of Excellence (TOPPS SCHEME)

*Developed by Selina L. P. Mushi, Ph.D.,
Assistant Professor, Northeastern Illinois University*

Part 1: Introduction

The TOPPS SCHEME is a general guide that can be used by teacher preparation programs to score teacher candidates' program portfolios. This guide facilitates systematic, comprehensive and hierarchical means of measuring and evaluating overall teacher candidates' performance excellence (knowledge, skills and dispositions) achieved upon completion of the teacher preparation program, as demonstrated by the program portfolio. Using this guide will promote objectivity in scoring the different elements of the teacher candidate's portfolio, and in computing overall scores. Different elements of the portfolio are given different weights. Intra-rater (RR) and inter-rater (TR) reliability indices will be used to indicate scorer agreement. At least 95% scorer agreement is suggested. In using this TOPPS SCHEME pages 2 and 3 will be completed after all other pages have been completed.

NB: The TOPPS SCHEME can be modified to meet specific program needs.

3

This chart summarizes the contents of each page included in this scoring guide

Page	Rubric	Check if Completed	Date	Completed by: (Faculty Initials)
Page 2 of 10	Part 2A: Score Computations			
Page 3 of 10	Part 2B: Composite Score and Interpretation			
Page 4 of 10	Scoring Criteria for Preliminaries of the Product Portfolio			
Page 5 of 10	Scoring Criteria for Reflective Accounts: First Two Checkpoints in the Duration of the Program			
Page 6 of 10	Scoring Criteria for Reflective Accounts - Last Two Checkpoints in the Duration of the Program			
Page 7 of 10	Scoring Sheet for "Reflective Accounts at Checkpoints" in the duration of the program			
Page 8 of 10	Scoring Criteria for Overall "Knowledge", "Skills" and "Dispositions" Demonstrated in the Program Portfolio			
Page 9 of 10	Rating criteria for Interview with the Candidate			
Page 10 of 10	Faculty/Program Portfolio Scorers' Signatures			

Part 2A: Score Computations

Element	Page	Total Possible Score	Scorer One		Scorer Two		Inter-rater Reliability	Comments	Faculty Initials	Teacher Candidate's Initials
			Score	RR	Score	RR				
1 Preliminaries	4									
2 Reflective Accounts: First 2 Checkpoints in the Duration of the Program	5, 7									
3 Reflective Accounts: Last 2 checkpoints	6, 7									
4 Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions -	8									
5 Interviewing the Candidate	9									
6 Average Rating - Checkpoint 1	See SSC*									
7 Average Rating - Check point 2	See SSC									
8 Average Rating - Checkpoint 3	See SSC									
9 Average Rating - Checkpoint 4	See SSC									
OVERALL SCORING										

* → See specific scoring criteria and ratings for each checkpoint (pages 5, 6, 7)



Part 2B: Composite Score and Interpretation

Total Possible Score	Total Obtained Score	Scorer agreement (target is at least 95% agreement)	Adjusted/Score (if scorer agreement is lower than 95%)	Letter Grade 90% - 100% = A → Outstanding 80% - 89% = B → Adequate 70% - 79% = C → Emerging 60% - 69% = D → Unacceptable
<p><u>Overall Comments by Faculty/Improvement</u></p> <p>Faculty Name: _____ Signature _____ Date: _____</p>				
<p><u>Candidate's Comments</u></p> <p>Candidate's initials/signature _____ Date _____</p>				

Scoring Criteria for Preliminaries of the Program Portfolio

	Element	Weighting	Score		TR	Comments	Faculty Initials
			2	1			
			Clear evidence of candidate's careful consideration of:	Unclear/Lack of evidence of candidates careful consideration of:			
1	Presentation of the portfolio	Total 100%					
a	Quality of binder	0.5 (5%)					
b	Presentation of title	1 (10%)					
c	Candidate's name	0.5 (5%)					
d	Candidate's program	0.5 (5%)					
2.	Organization of the portfolio						
a	Table of contents	1.5 (15%)					
b	Dividers	1 (10%)					
c	Labeling of sections	2 (20%)					
3	Completeness and Timeliness						
a	Completeness of the Product Portfolio	2 (20%)					
b	Handing in the product portfolio	1 (10%)					
Sub-Total							

Scoring Criteria for Reflective Accounts: First Two Checkpoints in the Duration of the Program

(Use this rubric to complete Sub-Total Forms on pages 7)

	3	2	1
Factual information	Accurate, logical, applicable & appropriate	Accurate, considerably current, applicable	Inaccuracies, hardly applicable
Ability to synthesize	Well synthesized, logical flow, well concluded	Adequately synthesized, logical conclusion	Inadequate synthesis, no clear conclusion
Originality/Creativity	Original ideas, creative concepts, linked to experience	Some original ideas and concepts	Little or no originality in ideas or concepts
Relevance to program	Ideas and concepts reflect program objectives	Some ideas and concepts reflect program objectives	Hardly any ideas or concepts reflect program objectives
Quality of Writing	Ideas are well organized, well paraphrased, proper punctuation, minimal spelling and grammatical errors	Organized ideas, acceptable punctuation, some spelling and grammatical errors	Disorganized ideas, inappropriate punctuation, spelling and grammatical errors
Candidate Growth	Noticeable growth OR Candidate's performance is high and stable from previous checkpoint	Some improvement is noticeable from previous checkpoint	Hardly any improvement from previous checkpoint

Scoring Criteria for Reflective Accounts - Last Two Checkpoints in the Duration of the Program
(Use this rubric to complete Sub-Total Forms on pages 7)

	3 Outstanding	2 Satisfactory	1 Unsatisfactory
Factual information	Accurate, referenced, logical, current, applicable & appropriate	Accurate, some referencing, considerably current, applicable	Inaccuracies, hardly any referencing
Ability to synthesize	Well synthesized, coherent, logical flow, clear, well concluded	Adequately synthesized, some coherence, concluded	Little coherence, no clear conclusion
Originality/Creativity	Original ideas, creative concepts, evaluated & linked to experience,	Some original ideas and concepts, linked to experience	Little originality, unclear link to experience
Relevance to program	Many ideas and concepts reflect program objectives	Some of the ideas and concepts reflect program objectives	Very few ideas and concepts reflect program objectives
Quality of Writing	Use of professional concepts, ideas are well organized, well paragraphed, proper punctuation, minimal spelling and grammatical errors	Some professional concepts, organized ideas, acceptable punctuation, some spelling and grammatical errors	Few or no professional concepts or ideas, inappropriate punctuation, spelling and grammatical errors
Candidate Growth	Highly noticeable growth <u>or</u> candidate's performance is high and stable from previous check point	Some improvement is noticeable from previous checkpoint	Hardly any improvement from previous checkpoint

Scoring Sheet for "Reflective Accounts at Designated Checkpoints" in the duration of the program
 (Use rubric for different checkpoints on pages 5 and 6)

Checkpoint	Weight	Ratings			Rater 1	RR	Rater 2	RR	Recorded Score	TR	Candidate's Initials	Faculty Initials
		3	2	1								
Checkpoint One	100%											
Factual information	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Ability to synthesize	1 (10%)	3	2	1								
Originality/Creativity	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Relevance to program	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Quality of writing	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Candidate growth	1 (10%)	3	2	1								
Checkpoint Two	100%											
Factual information	1 (10%)	3	2	1								
Ability to synthesize	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Originality/Creativity	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Relevance to program	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Quality of writing	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Candidate growth	1 (10%)	3	2	1								
Checkpoint Three	100%											
Factual information	0.5 (5%)	1.5	1	0.5								
Ability to synthesize	2.5 (25%)	7.5	5	2.5								
Originality/Creativity	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Relevance to program	1 (10%)	3	2	1								
Quality of writing	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Candidate growth	2 (20%)	6	4	2								
Checkpoint Four	100%											
Factual information	0.5 (5%)	1.5	1	0.5								
Ability to synthesize	3 (30%)	9	6	3								
Originality/Creativity	1.5 (15%)	4.5	3	1.5								
Relevance to program	1 (10%)	3	2	1								
Quality of writing	1.5 (15%)	4.5	3	1.5								
Candidate growth	2.5 (25%)	7.5	5	2.5								
Overall Sub-Total for Reflective Accounts												

Scoring Criteria for Overall "Knowledge", "Skills" and "Dispositions" Demonstrated in the Program Portfolio

Teacher Candidate's Knowledge, Skills and Dispositions: As defined by Program, College of Education, ISBE, NCATE, Standards.

Criteria:

- 4: The Teacher Candidate meets, to an outstanding extent, 3-4 standards as aligned. (Estimate = Quartile 4) → Outstanding
- 3: The Teacher candidate meets, to an above average extent, 3-4 standards as aligned (Estimate = Quartile 3) → Satisfactory
- 2: The Teacher Candidate meets, to an average extent, 2-3 standards as aligned (Estimate = Quartile 2) → Emerging
- 1: The Teacher Candidate meets, to a below average extent, 1-2 standards as aligned. → (Estimate = Quartile 1) Unacceptable

Scoring Sheet

Program	Aligned Standards			Ratings (See rubric above)				Sub Totals	TR	Comments	Candidate's Initials	Faculty Initials
	College of Education.	ISBE	NCATE	4	3	2	1					
	1											
	2											
	3											
	4											
	5											
	6											
	7											
	8											
	9											
	10											
	11											
	12											
	13											
	14											
Sub-Total												



Scoring Criteria for Interview with the Candidate

4. Outstanding:
Teacher Candidate can clearly articulate most important learning experiences as represented in the product portfolio; has comprehensive understanding of his/her own growth in the duration of the program, and acknowledges need for improvement.
3. Satisfactory:
Teacher Candidate can articulate with some clarity some important learning experiences as represented in the product portfolio; has some understanding of his/her own growth in the duration of the program and acknowledges need for improvement
2. Emerging:
Teacher Candidate can articulate with some difficulty, some learning experiences as represented in the portfolio, has some understanding of his/her growth in the duration of the program, and/or has difficulty acknowledging need for improvement
1. Unacceptable
Teacher Candidate cannot articulate important learning experiences as represented in the product portfolio, has little or no understanding of his/her own growth in the duration of the program, and/or and has difficulty acknowledging need for improvement

	Interview Questions/Prompts	Rating				Sub-Total	Faculty Initials	Faculty Initials	Inter-Rater Reliability	Candidate's Initial
		4	3	2	1					
1	Tell us about your learning experiences represented in your portfolio									
2	Briefly discuss your growth in the duration of the program									
3	In what areas do you feel the need for improvement?									
4	Other qualities (faculty decide)									
Sub-Total										

Overall Comments:

Date Interviewed: _____



Faculty/Program Portfolio Scorers' Signatures

Names, dates and signatures of all faculty/instructors who participate in scoring the teacher candidate's program portfolio should be entered in the table provided below. Reasons such as unacceptable performance or incomplete scoring may prompt the need to score some elements of the program portfolio more than once. Each time scoring is done data should be entered.

	Date of scoring	Component Scored (Enter page number(s))	Faculty Complete Name(s)	Initials	Faculty Signature
1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					



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



REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

TM035228

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: TEACHER-CANDIDATES' OVERALL PROGRAM PORTFOLIO SCORING: SYSTEMATIC, COMPREHENSIVE AND HIERARCHICAL MEASURES OF EXCELLENCE (TOPPS SCHEME)	
Author(s): Selina L. P. Mushi	
Corporate Source: Northeastern Illinois 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



Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

Level 2A



Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

Level 2B



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:	Printed Name/Position/Title: Selina L. P. Mushi, Ph.D.,	
Organization/Address: Assistant Professor, Northeastern Illinois University 5500 N. St. Louis Avenue Chicago IL 60625	Telephone: (773) 442-5382	FAX: (773) 442-4900
	E-Mail Address: S-mushi@neiu.edu	Date: Sept 2, 2003

(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 ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND 1129 SHRIVER LAB COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701 ATTN: ACQUISITIONS
--

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
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700

e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: <http://ericfacility.org>