**Eastern Connecticut State University**

**Core II Portfolio**

**Part I: SRBI (RTI) Teaching and Learning**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this assignment is to apply principles of SRBI (RTI) to design, implement and evaluate the impact of an instructional intervention plan for an individual student or small group of students. Candidates will gather pre-assessment data specific to a content area and engage in an intentional data-based decision-making process to design appropriate instructional intervention. A post-assessment will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention. A focus will be on monitoring student learning and designing data –based instructional intervention.

**Guidelines for completion**: During clinical experiences, it is expected that teacher candidates will participate in data team meetings, whenever relevant and possible. For this particular assignment, candidates are expected to engage in the principles of the SRBI process related to one content area and with one to three students. The content of the lesson, types of assessments and appropriate interventions must be determined in close collaboration with the cooperating teacher and must closely align with the existing classroom curriculum and the needs of the students.

It is expected that candidates will engage in the following steps of the principles of the SRBI process:

1. Determination of relevant and appropriate pre-assessment data that adequately provides information on select students’ abilities and knowledge related to the chosen content area.
2. Analyses of data to determine students’ strengths, areas for improvement, (and if relevant) learning styles and needs. While candidates may gather data from the whole class, for the purposes of this assignment, they are expected to focus on one to three individual students.
3. Development of an instructional intervention plan that establishes appropriate goals and learning objectives for the select students based on the data analyses and clearly identifies differentiated instruction and interventions. Differentiation could include intentional strategies that flexibly scaffold and support the select students.
4. Gather post-assessment data on the selected content area related to the pre-assessment method(s).
5. Analyses of the post-assessment data and lesson assessment(s) to determine impact on students’ learning and growth, and effectiveness of the planned intervention. Candidates will determine if the designed intervention impacted student achievement within the lesson content.
6. Candidates are encouraged to use the pre- and post-analyses to design additional data-based interventions, but is not a requirement of this assignment.
7. Reflection on the principles of SRBI especially within the context of their own growth and development, highlighting challenges they faced and areas of strength and improvement.
8. Candidates will be expected to align their complete reflection on the SRBI process to Eastern’s Candidate Learning Outcomes (CLO), focusing specifically on the Learner and Learning (CLO Domain I: Intentional Teaching; CLO Domain II: Data Literacy; CLO Domain III: Cultural Competence; CLO Domain IV Professional Practice and Leadership).

**Finalizing and Submission:** You will submit your work on TK20. Your submission must include two parts: 1) Pre- and post-assessment data and analyses, 2) Lesson plan with differentiated learning objectives and interventions, 3) Reflective Summary. Before turning in your work, make sure to: 1) Include your name on all the documents, 2) Remove all identifiers about the school, the teacher and the students.

**Implementation Chart:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Physical Education** | **Early Childhood Education** | **Elementary Education** | **Secondary Education** |
| **Undergraduate** | HPE ? | ECE 460 | EDU ? | EDU ? |
| **Graduate** | n/a | ECE 516 | EDU ? | EDU ? |

**Responsibilities of Program Faculty:** Clinical faculty (e.g., University Supervisor and cooperating teacher) as well as faculty teaching the courses listed in the Implementation Chart (above) are responsible for providing guidance and feedback to candidates..

**Responsibilities of Candidates:** Candidates must follow the timeline established by their course instructor or university supervisor and submit all materials for this assignment in TK20. Non-submission will jeopardize successful completion of CORE II and one’s status in the teacher education program.

**Eastern Connecticut State University**

**Core II Portfolio**

**Part II: Classroom Management for Student Engagement & Learning**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this assignment is to demonstrate candidates’ ability to engage in and document intentional planning and teaching to ensure that students are continuously engaged in the teaching and learning process. The classroom management for student engagement and learning tasks (see attachment) are developmentally aligned with candidates’ progression within their teacher preparation program. They reflect core management responsibilities of teachers. Candidates will collaborate with their host teacher to select 2-3 tasks, appropriate for the students. They will design strategies for implementation, record the results of implementation, and reflect on the results. Candidates will be expected to align their reflection to Eastern’s Candidate Learning Outcomes (CLO).

**Selecting Task:** Each classroom management for student engagement and learning task is designed to complement specific clinical experiences in a progressive manner. When selecting tasks, candidates must review their prior Core(s) and experiences working with students, work collaboratively with the host teacher and must be prepared to justify their selections, bearing in mind the developmental levels of the students and the classroom context of learning.

**Implementation Design:** Candidates will be expected to design their implementation strategy for each selected task without the assistance of the host teacher or university faculty. However, s/he may provide boundaries such as the instructional segment during which implementation is to occur or the group of students with whom to work. Candidates will identify the educational literature or theory used to inform his/her decision for implementation design. The candidate will also need to provide a detail account of the implementation steps. Additional s/he will need to provide a hypothesis of the anticipated outcomes of implementation.

**The Analytical Reflection:** The goal of the reflective analysis is to review and interpret the implementation of and outcomes the classroom management for student engagement and learning tasks. Candidates will elaborate on what they have learned about the process within the context of the Candidate Learning Outcomes, focusing specifically on the Learner and Learning (CLO Domain I: Intentional Teaching; CLO Domain II: Data Literacy; CLO Domain III: Cultural Competence; CLO Domain IV Professional Practice and Leadership).

Please structure your reflective commentary as responses to the following questions:

1. What evidence from prior practice informed the selection of each task? (CLO Domain II: Data Literacy)
2. How instrumental was collaborating with the host teacher on selecting each task? Elaborate. (CLO Domain IV: Professional Practice and Leadership).
3. What was the implementation design for each task? What research or theory (cite sources) was consulted to inform implementation? What was the intended outcome for each task? (CLO Domain I: Intentional Teaching)
4. What were the outcome(s) for each task? How did the outcome(s) compare to the intended outcome? What insights have you gained about classroom management for student engagement and learning and how might these influence your future teaching practices within your Eastern program, were you to work with a similar group of students? (CLO Domain I: Intentional Learning)

**Finalizing and Submission of Work:** You will submit your work on TK20. Your submission must include two parts: 1) Your classroom management for student engagement and learning design for each task and 2) the reflective analysis, as outlined above. Before turning in your work, make sure to: 1) Include your name on all the documents, 2) Remove all identifiers about the school, the teacher and the students. Estimated Length 2 pages.

**Implementation Chart**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **KPE** | **ECE** | **ELE** | **SEC** |
| **Undergraduate** | HPE ? | ECE 460 | EDU ? | EDU ? |
| **Graduate** | n/a | ECE 516 | EDU ? | EDU ? |

**Responsibilities of Program Faculty**: Clinical faculty (e.g., University Supervisor and host teacher) as well as faculty teaching the courses listed in the Implementation Chart (above) are responsible for providing timely feedback on candidates’ Classroom Management for Student Engagement and Learning in writing.

**Responsibilities of Candidates:** Candidates must follow the timeline established by their course instructor or university supervisor and submit all materials for this assignment in TK20. Non-submission will jeopardize successful completion of CORE II and one’s status in the teacher education program.

**Eastern Connecticut State University**

**Core II Portfolio**

**Part III: Looking Backwards and Looking Forward (LBLF)**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this assignment is further your reflective practice and to help you establish measurable learning and professional development goals during fieldwork, pre-student teaching and student teaching (i.e., clinical practice). This assignment will help you to engage in purposeful conversations with your cooperating teacher/mentor and university supervisor during your following clinical experiences. In addition, you will anchor your self-examination within the language of the Eastern Connecticut State University’s Candidate Learning Outcomes. The assignment, along with others, is designed to help you to more fully and coherently articulate your professional practice, as related to these outcomes.

This reflective assignment should be constructed in no more than one and one-half pages. It is to be competed in two parts: Looking Backwards: Reflective Practice and Looking Forward: Goal Setting. You must construct your work in a narrative format.

**Looking Backwards: Reflective Practice**

Review your previous CORE I assignments, particularly the goals you established for yourself during the LBLF process in Core I. Examine your experiences working with students. Consider their grade/functional levels and the content/disciplines for which you designed and implemented instruction. Consider the learning outcomes that resulted, the challenges you faced, and your core beliefs about teaching and learning. Afterwards, address the following questions.

1. Name and describe impacts you have had on P-12 students' learning and/or development (e.g. psychological, motor, sociological, executive function, self-efficacy, self-regulation, persistence).
2. Discuss ways in which you have used feedback from your teacher education program (e.g., faculty, cooperating teacher, university supervisor, course assessments) to improve your practice.
3. Identify a minimum of three standards of the Eastern Candidate Learning Outcomes that you view as your strongest attributes and discuss why. Identify the specific standards (not the domain) by name.
4. Reflect on your next phase of clinical practice. Discuss any issues of concern and explain why.

**Looking Forward: Goal Setting**

Construct two to three professional goals for your next field/clinical experience, anchored within your Looking Backwards: Reflective Practice exercise (above). Your goals should address specific teacher behaviors that you wish to change/develop. Each goal should have a clear outcome (e.g., Strengthen my classroom management skills; To increase my confidence for instructional delivery; To differentiate instruction for language learners).

Once you have established your clear, measurable goals, explain how each is aligned with a particular CT Common Core of Teaching indicator (not the domain). Lastly, establish one-three strategy(ies) to help you achieve each goal (e.g., Collaboratively design my first two mathematics lessons with Ms. Jones who uses experiential exercises; Construct a take-home instructional guide for each unit that includes family activities, reinforcing key unit concepts; Attend the fall Classroom Learning Environment workshop that many student teachers have recommended for better understanding of the use of emotional intelligence in the classroom).

**Finalizing and Submission of Work:** You will submit your work on TK20. Your submission must include two parts: 1) Looking Backwards: Reflective Practice and 2) Looking Forward: Goal Setting. Before turning in your work, make sure to: 1) Include your name on all the documents, 2) Remove all identifiers about the school, the teacher and the students.

**Implementation Chart:**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Program** | **Physical Education** | **Early Childhood Education** | **Elementary Education** | **Secondary Education** |
| **Undergraduate** | ? | ECE 460 | ? | ? |
| **Graduate** | n/a | ? | ? | ? |

**Responsibilities of Course Instructors:** Faculty teaching the courses listed in the Implementation Chart (above) are responsible for the timely implementation and collection of data related to this assessment. They are also responsible for evaluating students’ submission on TK20 using the rubric (below). If the course listed is a clinical experience, the university supervisor will take on the same responsibility.

**Responsibilities of Students:** Students must follow the timeline established by their course instructor or university supervisor and submit all materials for this assessment in TK20. They will not receive a passing grade for the course, should they not submit this assignment.

**Rubric for Evaluating Core II Portfolio**

**Part III: Looking Backwards Looking Forward**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Emerging**  **1** | **Proficient**  **2** | **Advanced**  **3** |
| Looking Backwards (LB): Reflective Practice; Looking Forward (LF): Goal Setting | LB reflection includes identification of the impact(s) on specific students or description of feedback received or identifies areas of concern.  LF reflection includes 0-1 professional goal related to teacher behaviors and 0-1 strategies to achieve these goals. | LB reflection includes identification of the impact(s) on specific students; description of feedback received; identification of areas of concern.  LF reflection includes 1-2 professional goals related to teacher behaviors; and describes some strategies to achieve these goals. | LB reflection includes clear and coherent identification and description of the impact(s) on specific students; description of ways in which feedback was utilized to improve their own practice; identification with rationale of areas of concern.  LF reflection includes clearly articulated 2-3 professional goals related to teacher behaviors; and describes clear, specific and relevant strategies to achieve these goals. |
| Alignment with Connecticut Common Core of Teaching (CCT) Indicators | LB and LF include identification of CCT domains aligned with candidates’ strongest attributes (LB) or professional goals (LF). | LB and LF include identification of specific CCT indicators aligned with candidates’ strongest attributes (LB) or professional goals (LF). | LB and LF include clear identification of specific CCT indicators aligned with candidates’ strongest attributes (LB) and professional goals (LF). |

Core II Portfolio Evaluation Rubric (Draft)

The CORE I Portfolio Rubric uses a four-point rating scale: 1(underdeveloped), 2 (approaching expectations), 3 (meeting expectations), and 4 (exceeds expectation) to assess proficiency for each of the five indicators of a successful portfolio. The indicators are aligned with the Education EPP’s Candidate Learning Framework. In the event that any indicator is not scoreable, due to the absence of evidence or incomprehensibility of the submission, the portfolio will be considered unscoreable.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Guiding Questions/In-dicators** | **Underdeveloped**  **1** | **Approaching Expectations**  **2** | **Meets Expectations**  **3** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **4** |
| **Data Literacy** | No evidence that Data analysis supports individualized P-12 student support. | Data analysis supports individualized P-12 student support with significant inaccuracies.  **or-**  Data use demonstrates an emergent focus one or more of the Big Ideas of learning (acquisition, fluency, generalization, adaptation), matching the instructional needs of individual students. | Data analysis supports individualized P-12 student support with few inaccuracies.  **And-**  Data use demonstrates an emergent focus on two or more of the Big Ideas of learning (acquisition, fluency, generalization, adaptation), matching the instructional needs of individual students. | Data analysis demonstrates that individualized P-12 student support is trustworthy for addressing the unique needs of each scenario showcased.  **And-**  Data use demonstrates a clear focus on each of the Big Ideas of learning, matching the instructional needs of individual students. |
| Big ideas of Learning: Acquisition, fluency, generalization, and adaptation  *Source:* Haring, N.G., Lovitt, T.C., Eaton, M.D., & Hansen, C.L. (1978). The fourth R: Research in the classroom. Columbus, OH: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Co. |
| **Learner Diversity and Learning**  **IT 1** | The evidence does not address developmental variation of P-12 students in the classroom.  **Or-**  Comments do not suggest a recognition that learner differences create the need for supportive and individualized learning environments. | The evidence addresses developmental variation of P-12 students with significant inaccuracies.    **Or-**  The submissions attempt to connect learner differences in ability and culture to a recognition that learning environments must be supportive, yet conclusions are impractical. | The evidence addresses developmental variation of P-12 students with few inaccuracies.    **And-**  The submissions attempt to connect learner differences in ability and culture to a recognition that learning environments must be supportive, yet conclusions are somewhat practical. | The developmental variation noted by the candidate is provided and it especially focuses on the positive and unique characteristics of each student.  **And-**  The submissions insightfully connect learner differences in ability, social behavior and culture to a recognition that learning environments must be supportive, individualized and collaborative. Conclusions are highly practical. |
| **Content Knowledge and Teaching**  **IT 2** | Content knowledge is not noted by the candidate in his/her reflection.  **Or-**  Content knowledge and skills are highly underdeveloped. | Content knowledge is noted by the candidate in his/her reflection.  **Or-**  Content knowledge is somewhat inaccurate acceding to professional standards. | The reflection is accurate in terms of identifying how content knowledge is/ or might be used by the candidate.  **And-**  Examples are provided, as necessary. Limited evidence of how content knowledge impacts student impact is referenced. | The reflection is insightful in drawing connections between understanding of content and teaching effectiveness.  **And-**  Reflection provides examples of how content knowledge positively impacts student learning. |
| **Reflective practice**  **PPL 2** | Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented occurring during CORE II.  **Or-**  Viewpoints and interpretations are missing, inappropriate, and/or unsupported. Examples, when applicable, are not provided. | Response demonstrates a minimal reflection on, and personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies occurring during CORE II.  **Or-**  Viewpoints and interpretations are unsupported or supported with flawed arguments. Examples, when applicable, are not provided or are irrelevant to the assignment. | Response demonstrates a general reflection on, and personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies occurring during CORE II.  **And-**  Viewpoints and interpretations are supported. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable. | Response demonstrates an in-depth reflection on, and personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies occurring during CORE II. Viewpoints and interpretations are insightful and well supported.  **And-**  Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable. |
| **Evidence and Practice**  **DL 5** | Response shows no evidence for ideas presented and insights gained during CORE I.  **Or-**  No implications for the candidate’s overall teaching practice are presented, as applicable. | Response shows limited evidence for ideas presented and insights gained during CORE II, with incoherent progress made from CORE I.  **Or-**  Implications of these insights for the candidate’s overall teaching practice are presented but are not supported by evidence, as applicable. | Response shows a consistent pattern of evidence for ideas presented and insights gained during CORE II, with substantiated progress made from CORE I.  **And-**  The implications of these insights for the candidate’s overall teaching practice are somewhat practical, as applicable. | Response shows consistent pattern of evidence that synthesizes ideas presented and insights gained across COREs I and II.  **And-**  The implications of these insights for the candidate’s overall teaching practice are thoroughly detailed and highly practical, as applicable. |
| **Portfolio Completion**  **SEE PROPOSED OUTCOME FOR MEETING RESPONSBILILLITIES** | Portfolio submission excludes essential components and/or does not address the requirements indicated in the instructions.  **Or-**  Many parts of the portfolio are addressed minimally, inadequately, and/or not at all. | Portfolio submission is missing some components and/or does not fully meet the requirements indicated in the instructions.  **Or-**  Some questions or parts of the portfolio assignments are not addressed. Some required components are missing | Portfolio submission includes all components and meets all requirements indicated in the instructions. Each question or part of the portfolio assignments is addressed.  **And-**  All required and supporting components are included. | Portfolio submission includes all components and meets or exceeds all requirements indicated in the instructions. Each question or part of the portfolio assignment is addressed thoroughly.  **And-**  All required and complementary components are included. |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Guiding Questions/In-dicators** | **Underdeveloped**  **1** | **Approaching Expectations**  **2** | **Meets Expectations**  **3** | **Exceeds Expectations**  **4** |
| **Learner Diversity and Learning** | The reflection does not address developmental variation of P-12 students in the classroom  **Or-**  Comments do not suggest a recognition that learner differences create the need for supportive and individualized learning environments. | The reflection addresses developmental variation of P-12 students with significant inaccuracies.    **Or-**  The reflection attempts to connect learner differences in ability and culture to a recognition that learning environments must be supportive, yet conclusions are impractical. | The reflection addresses developmental variation of P-12 students with few inaccuracies.    **And-**  The reflection attempts to connect learner differences in ability and culture to a recognition that learning environments must be supportive, yet conclusions are somewhat practical. | A meaningful reflection of the developmental variation noted by the candidate is provided and it especially focuses on the positive and unique characteristics of each student.  **And-**  The reflection insightfully connects learner differences in ability, social behavior and culture to a recognition that learning environments must be supportive, individualized and collaborative. Conclusions are highly practical. |
| **Content Knowledge and Teaching** | Content knowledge is not noted by the candidate in his/her reflection.  **Or-**  Content knowledge and skills are highly underdeveloped. | Content knowledge is noted by the candidate in his/her reflection.  **Or-**  Content knowledge is somewhat inaccurate acceding to professional standards. | The reflection is accurate in terms of identifying how content knowledge is/ or might be used by the candidate.  **And-**  Examples are provided, as necessary. | The reflection is insightful in drawing connections between understanding of content and teaching effectiveness.  **And-**  Reflection provides examples of how content knowledge positively impacts student learning. |
| **Reflective practice** | Response demonstrates a lack of reflection on, or personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies presented occurring during CORE I.  **Or-**  Viewpoints and interpretations are missing, inappropriate, and/or unsupported. Examples, when applicable, are not provided. | Response demonstrates a minimal reflection on, and personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies occurring during CORE I.  **Or-**  Viewpoints and interpretations are unsupported or supported with flawed arguments. Examples, when applicable, are not provided or are irrelevant to the assignment. | Response demonstrates a general reflection on, and personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies occurring during CORE I.  **And-**  Viewpoints and interpretations are supported. Appropriate examples are provided, as applicable. | Response demonstrates an in-depth reflection on, and personalization of, the theories, concepts, and/or strategies occurring during CORE I. Viewpoints and interpretations are insightful and well supported.  **And-**  Clear, detailed examples are provided, as applicable. |
| **Evidence and Practice** | Response shows no evidence for ideas presented and insights gained during CORE I.  **Or-**  No implications for the candidate’s overall teaching practice are presented, as applicable. | Response shows limited evidence for ideas presented and insights gained during CORE.  **Or-**  Implications of these insights for the candidate’s overall teaching practice are presented but are not supported by evidence, as applicable. | Response shows a consistent pattern of evidence for ideas presented and insights gained during CORE I.  **And-**  The implications of these insights for the candidate’s overall teaching practice are somewhat practical, as applicable. | Response shows consistent pattern of evidence that synthesizes ideas presented and insights gained during CORE I.  **And-**  The implications of these insights for the candidate’s overall teaching practice are thoroughly detailed and highly practical, as applicable. |
| **Portfolio Completion** | Portfolio submission excludes essential components and/or does not address the requirements indicated in the instructions.  **Or-**  Many parts of the portfolio are addressed minimally, inadequately, and/or not at all. | Portfolio submission is missing some components and/or does not fully meet the requirements indicated in the instructions.  **Or-**  Some questions or parts of the portfolio assignments are not addressed. Some required components are missing | Portfolio submission includes all components and meets all requirements indicated in the instructions. Each question or part of the portfolio assignments is addressed.  **And-**  All required and supporting components are included. | Portfolio submission includes all components and meets or exceeds all requirements indicated in the instructions. Each question or part of the portfolio assignment is addressed thoroughly.  **And-**  All required and complementary components are included. |