

English Education Portfolio Rubric

Overview: This English Education Portfolio Rubric was developed by a Rubric Writing Team made up of faculty representatives across programs (i.e., early childhood, elementary, middle, secondary, K-12 specialties, special education), who regularly supervise students in Field Experience settings. This rubric is to be used over the course of the Early Field Experience and Student Teaching to guide and scaffold the students' efforts and professional development. The English Education Portfolio Rubric is used by cooperating teachers and university supervisors to rate teacher candidates and student teachers on English Education Portfolio Rubric evaluation categories based upon and tagged with INTASC standards as well as the respective SPA standards when applicable.

Ratings and Basis for Judgement: The rubrics differentiate between four levels of performance – *unsatisfactory, emerging, satisfactory, and proficient*. The performance indicators are based upon criteria and language found in the INTASC Model Core Teaching Standards and Learning Progressions for Teachers 1.0 (2013).¹ This release stipulates that the INTASC standards no longer apply to only “beginning” teachers, but are instead intended as “professional practice standards” (p. 6). Therefore, these standards and the associated learning progressions describe a teacher’s professional development throughout his or her career. We would not expect to see a large number of proficient ratings in early field experience. Rather, we, and our respective accrediting agencies and SPAs, would expect to see development across experiences with students earning more “emerging” ratings in earlier phases and progressing toward “satisfactory” or “proficient” in later phases. Furthermore, these ratings are based upon expectations for student teachers who are still in our programs and not for classroom teachers who have experience. Based upon this assumption, a Satisfactory rating is relatively high and one that most of our student teachers are expected to achieve by the completion of their student teaching. Ratings of Proficient should only be awarded to the few students who can consistently and independently demonstrate exemplary classroom performance per the rubric evaluation categories.

The rating levels *DO NOT translate into A – F grades*. Instead, the rubrics are designed to generate data that will reveal patterns of student performance at various stages of development across the learning progressions. These data are intended to guide continual improvement of our preparation of teachers. All candidates perform differently. However, it is expected that on most indicators, those in *early field experience typically would be rated at the Emerging level and progress to the Satisfactory level by the end of their student teaching experience*. *To reiterate*, ratings of Proficient should only be awarded for exemplary performance.

Validity and Reliability: This instrument was designed by the Rubric Writing Team, formed in Fall of 2014 to develop key assessments to be used across the teacher education programs, as required by our accrediting body, the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP). This team consists of an interdisciplinary faculty members within the School of Teacher Education and Leadership (STEL) and the Music Department, and three A&P Faculty members in the Dean’s Office. The Rubric Writing Team conducted exercises to establish validity and inter-rater reliability on all the instruments designed during this process. During the 2015-2016 Academic Year, these instruments were piloted. During the 2016-2017 Academic Year, the Lawshe method will be used to establish Content Validity and Internal Consistency Reliability (e.g., Cronbach’s alpha) analyses will be used to determine the reliability coefficient for each instrument. The results of this intended analysis and data will be used to inform revisions and administration of the instruments in the 2017-2018 Academic Year. The validity and reliability processes will be guided by the CAEP Instrument Rubric² and the CAEP Evidence Guide.

¹ http://www.ccsso.org/Documents/2013/2013_INTASC_Learning_Progressions_for_Teachers.pdf

² <http://caepnet.org/~media/Files/caep/accreditation-resources/caep-assessment-rubric-june2016.pdf?la=en>

**English Education Portfolio
Rubric**

Note:**I. LITERATURE, MULTIMEDIA, ADOLESCENT READERS**

Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes literature and multimedia texts as well as knowledge of the nature of adolescents as readers.

Literature, Multimedia, Adolescent Readers*

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Competent	Proficient	COMMENTS
<p>Candidates are knowledgeable about texts—print and non-print texts, media texts, classic texts and contemporary texts, including young adult—that represent a range of world literatures, historical traditions, genres, and the experiences of different genders, ethnicities, and social classes; they are able to use literary theories to interpret and critique a range of texts.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					

<p>Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents read texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
--	--	--	--	--	--

II. LANGUAGE, WRITING, ADOLESCENTS AS LANGUAGE USERS
Candidates demonstrate knowledge of English language arts subject matter content that specifically includes language and writing as well as knowledge of adolescents as language users

Language, Writing, Adolescents as Language Users*

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Competent	Proficient	COMMENTS
<p>Candidates can compose a range of formal and informal texts taking into consideration the interrelationships among form, audience, context, and purpose; candidates understand that writing is a recursive process; candidates can use contemporary technologies and/or digital media to compose multimodal discourse.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					

<p>Candidates know the conventions of English language as they relate to various rhetorical situations (grammar, usage, and mechanics); they understand the concept of dialect and are familiar with relevant grammar systems (e.g., descriptive and prescriptive); they understand principles of language acquisition; they recognize the influence of English language history on ELA content; and they understand the impact of language on society.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates are knowledgeable about how adolescents compose texts and make meaning through interaction with media environments.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					

III. CONTENT PEDAGOGY: PLANNING LITERATURE AND READING INSTRUCTION IN ELA

Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for reading and the study of literature to promote learning for all students.

Content Pedagogy: Planning Literature and Reading Instruction in ELA*

	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Competent	Proficient	COMMENTS
<p>Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences utilizing a range of different texts—across genres, periods, forms, authors, cultures, and various forms of media—and instructional strategies that are motivating and accessible to all students, including English language learners, students with special needs, students from diverse language and learning backgrounds, those designated as high achieving, and those at risk of failure.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates design a range of authentic assessments (e.g., formal and informal, formative and summative)</p>					

<p>of reading and literature that demonstrate an understanding of how learners develop and that address interpretive, critical, and evaluative abilities in reading, writing, speaking, listening, viewing, and presenting.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates plan standards-based, coherent and relevant learning experiences in reading that reflect knowledge of current theory and research about the teaching and learning of reading and that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and a variety of reading strategies.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates design or knowledgeably select appropriate reading assessments that inform instruction by providing data about student interests, reading</p>					

<p>proficiencies, and reading processes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates plan instruction that incorporates knowledge of language—structure, history, and conventions—to facilitate students’ comprehension and interpretation of print and non-print texts.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates plan instruction which, when appropriate, reflects curriculum integration and incorporates interdisciplinary teaching methods and materials.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					

IV. CONTENT PEDAGOGY: PLANNING COMPOSITION INSTRUCTION IN ELA					
<i>Candidates plan instruction and design assessments for composing texts (i.e., oral, written, and visual) to promote learning for all students.</i>					
Content Pedagogy: Planning Composition Instruction in ELA*					
	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Competent	Proficient	COMMENTS
<p>Candidates use their knowledge of theory, research, and practice in English Language Arts to plan standards- based, coherent and relevant composing experiences that utilize individual and collaborative approaches and contemporary technologies and reflect an understanding of writing processes and strategies in different genres for a variety of purposes and audiences.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates design a range of assessments for students that promote their development as writers, are appropriate to the writing task, and are consistent with current research and theory. Candidates are able to respond to student writing in process and to finished texts in ways that</p>					

<p>engage students' ideas and encourage their growth as writers over time.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates design instruction related to the strategic use of language conventions (grammar, usage, and mechanics) in the context of students' writing for different audiences, purposes, and modalities.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates design instruction that incorporates students' home and community languages to enable skillful control over their rhetorical choices and language practices for a variety of audiences and purposes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					

V. LEARNERS AND LEARNING: IMPLEMENTING ENGLISH LANGUAGE ARTS INSTRUCTION					
<i>Candidates plan, implement, assess, and reflect on research-based instruction that increases motivation and active student engagement, builds sustained learning of English language arts, and responds to diverse students' context-based needs.</i>					
Learners and Learning: Implementing English Language Arts Instruction*					
	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Competent	Proficient	COMMENTS
<p>Candidates plan and implement instruction based on ELA curricular requirements and standards, school and community contexts, and knowledge about students' linguistic and cultural backgrounds.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates use data about their students' individual differences, identities, and funds of knowledge for literacy learning to create inclusive learning environments that contextualize curriculum and instruction and help students participate actively in their own learning in ELA.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					

<p>Candidates differentiate instruction based on students' self-assessments and formal and informal assessments of learning in English language arts; candidates communicate with students about their performance in ways that actively involve them in their own learning.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates select, create, and use a variety of instructional strategies and teaching resources, including contemporary technologies and digital media, consistent with what is currently known about student learning in English Language Arts.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>PROFESSIONAL KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS</p>					

VI. Candidates demonstrate knowledge of how theories and research about social justice, diversity, equity, student identities, and schools as institutions can enhance students' opportunities to learn in English Language Arts.*					
	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Competent	Proficient	COMMENTS
<p>Candidates model literate and ethical practices in ELA teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
<p>Candidates engage in and reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> N/A</p>					
VII. Candidates are prepared to interact knowledgeably with students, families, and colleagues based on social needs and institutional roles, engage in leadership and/or collaborative roles in English Language Arts professional learning communities, and actively develop as professional educators.*					
	Unsatisfactory	Needs Improvement	Competent	Proficient	COMMENTS
<p>Candidates model literate and ethical practices in ELA teaching, and engage in/reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA.</p>					

<input type="checkbox"/> N/A					
Candidates engage in and reflect on a variety of experiences related to ELA that demonstrate understanding of and readiness for leadership, collaboration, ongoing professional development, and community engagement. <input type="checkbox"/> N/A					