

## **IRA Assessment #1 – Exit Portfolio**

(IRA Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 3.1, 3.2, 3.3, 3.4, 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4, 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4)

### **Description of the Assessment:**

The Exit Portfolio review is the capstone experience and is a comprehensive evaluation that is completed once the candidate is enrolled in his/her last course in the M.Ed. in Reading Program. It is the culminating experience in the program and serves as the point of licensure for the State of Rhode Island. Candidates are required to present five artifacts that represent the five major areas of the 2003 IRA Standards.

Exit portfolios are expected to vary slightly among candidates. Since each candidate represents a unique background, it is expected that there may be variances in the artifacts submitted in the portfolio. The Reading faculty encourages this individuality as long as the majority of 2003 IRA Standards are addressed in a comprehensive and intelligent manner. IRA reviewers should be aware that candidates are not expected to address every Standard in their Exit Portfolio (Assessment #1). The complete list of Standards is listed so candidates recognize that they may choose from the complete array. Examination of over 100 candidates revealed that the average candidate linked their artifacts to between 14-16 of the nineteen Standards.

Potential candidates first learn about the portfolio when they make formal application for admission into the program. Applying candidates meet with an advisor where a comprehensive explanation of the program is laid out. In addition to paper credentials, candidates are required to sit for a formal interview. During the interview, a prepared list of questions are asked and scored with a rubric. Following the interview questions, candidates are given a Program Guide as well as a publication entitled *The Exit Portfolio: A Guide for Students*. This guide is also available on the M.Ed. in Reading website:

[http://www.ric.edu/elementaryEducation/readingProgram\\_med.php](http://www.ric.edu/elementaryEducation/readingProgram_med.php)

The advisor walks the student through the guide explaining each section. The *Guide* offers a comprehensive explanation for preparing the Exit Portfolio. Included in the *Guide* is a Question and Answer Section, the complete list of 2003 IRA Standards for Reading Specialists, a model of a sample submission from a previous candidate's portfolio, a section for short-term and long-term goals, and the Scoring Guide rubric for the portfolio. Candidates are informed that the role of the reading teacher is not simply as a special teacher of reading but in today's world, must also serve as the role of reading/literacy coach.

As candidates move through the program, they are to select five artifacts that represent the five major areas of the 2003 IRA Standards. An artifact must represent more than one of the Standards. Periodically, candidates may meet with their advisor to discuss the compilation of the portfolio. Approximately one year before the candidate is scheduled

to graduate, recent graduates of the program are invited back to campus to discuss their experiences in preparing the portfolio and their oral defense.

Once they are in their last course, each candidate meets with two faculty members and reviews the portfolio. This exit interview lasts for approximately two hours. During this period, candidates are asked to identify the salient sections of their portfolio and are questioned about their perceptions of the role of the reading teacher/coach. Once the interview is completed, the portfolio is independently read and scored by the two faculty members. Inter-rater reliability scores are computed for each team of readers. Inter-rater reliability coefficients using Cohen's Kappa have been in the .90 or higher region. Candidates who fail to score *Acceptable* or *Exemplary* on any one of the five Standards must redo that section of the portfolio. Portfolios are read twice per year: November and April.

### **Alignment of the Assessment with the 2003 IRA Standards:**

Since this is the assessment for licensure in the State of Rhode Island, candidates are to identify how all nineteen Standards align with their portfolio artifacts. Candidates are required to build a case for the Standards for each of their five artifacts. Thus, each artifact has multiple Standards linked to it. Each Standard that meets the "Acceptable" or "Exemplary" criteria is identified on the candidate's Scoring Guide.

### **Analysis of the Findings:**

Data for this Standard have been collected since the Spring 2005. To date, over 100 candidates have sat for the Portfolio Exit interview and have submitted portfolios to be scored. Refinement of the scoring procedures has occurred each year. We have learned that it is important to introduce candidates to the concept of the Exit Portfolio during their first course. Professors in each of our courses now stress the importance of building the portfolio from the early stages of candidate admission. As a result, our candidates continue to score highly on this assessment.

### **Data Interpretation:**

Data collected from the Spring 2005 to Fall 2006 indicated that there was a need for more discrimination in each candidate's portfolio. Accordingly, the Reading faculty revised the Scoring Rubric and the Data Chart to better reflect the performance of our candidates on all nineteen of the IRA Standards. Beginning with the Spring 2007, an "Exemplary" category was included. In addition, a one-page cover sheet for the Scoring Guide was developed to enhance the tabulation of scores received on the Exit Portfolio. Assessment #1 has now been refined and does an improved job of screening our potential graduates. Approximately two-thirds of our candidates now score at the *Exemplary* level. Our exit interviews also demonstrate that our candidates have a clear understanding of the Standards and the field of Reading.

**SECTION IV - Assessment #1**  
**Revised – Fall 2009**

**Exit Portfolio**  
**Scoring Guide**

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Directions: Circle each Standard that has been addressed in the candidate’s portfolio. Score each subset of Standards using the three-point scale. Total scores and grade the candidate on the Overall Performance Assessment.

<b>Element</b>	<b>Unacceptable - 1</b>	<b>Acceptable - 2</b>	<b>Exemplary - 3</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>IRA Standards 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4</b>	The candidate demonstrates a weak or non-existent understanding of the theoretical underpinnings of the reading/writing process.	The candidates demonstrates knowledge of theoretical underpinnings of the reading/writing process	The candidate demonstrates exemplary understanding and knowledge related to the theoretical underpinnings of the reading/writing process.	
<b>IRA Standards 2.1, 2.2, 2.3</b>	The candidate does not demonstrate an understanding of instructional approaches and/or materials related to the reading/writing process and shows little or no ability to support teachers and paraprofessionals.	The candidate understands and can use a wide range of instructional approaches and materials to support the reading/writing process. In addition, the candidate demonstrates how they support teachers and paraprofessionals in the use of instructional materials and strategies.	The candidate possesses an exemplary understanding of instructional approaches and materials to support reading and writing and clearly illustrates how they would support classroom teachers and paraprofessionals in using materials and strategies to improve instruction.	
<b>IRA Standards 3.1, 3.2, 3.3,</b>	The candidate fails to demonstrate an understanding of	The candidate demonstrates an ability to use a variety of assessment	The candidate exemplifies the use of a variety of	

3.4	assessment instruments, test data, and/or offers weak recommendations for home and school. In addition, there is no evidence of support for teachers and paraprofessionals.	instruments, interpret test data, and offer recommendations and/ or plan instruction for home and school. The candidate clearly demonstrates how assessment strategies can be used for instruction by classroom teachers.	assessment instruments, correctly interprets test data, and offers exemplary recommendations for caregivers and teachers. The candidate clearly demonstrates, in an exemplary fashion, how classroom teachers can improve instruction by following assessment principles.	
<b>IRA Standards 4.1, 4.2, 4.3, 4.4</b>	The candidate offers no proof that he/she can create a literate environment to foster reading and writing. There is no mention of assisting classroom teachers or other audiences.	The candidate demonstrates the ability to create a literate environment to foster reading and writing. In addition, the candidate demonstrates how assessment can drive instruction for classroom teachers.	The candidate creates an exemplary literate environment that fosters reading and writing. In addition, there is clear evidence that assessment data is communicated to other audiences and can be used to improve instruction for all students.	
<b>IRA Standards 5.1, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4</b>	The candidate is unable to create a professional development plan for themselves or their peers and there is no mention of how teachers or other professionals can improve the educational environment.	The candidate demonstrates the ability to foster professional development within themselves as well as with their peers. There is a clear description of how a literate environment can be created with the help of teachers and other educators.	The candidate demonstrates the ability to create an exemplary professional learning environment for themselves as well as other professionals. The candidate also presents clear evidence that teachers are involved in creating a literate	

			<u>educational environment.</u>	
<b>Self-Assessment</b>	Lack of focus, glib self assessment with little introspective thought.	Focused and adequate self assessment that describes the individual character strengths of the candidate.	Perceptive, insightful, and well-written self-assessment that relays the attributes of an educational leader.	
<b>Short-Term Goals</b>	Unachievable short-term goals and/or written in an unclear manner.	Achievable short-term goals written in a clear and coherent style.	Achievable short-term goals written in an exemplary fashion.	
<b>Long-Term Goals</b>	Unachievable long-term goals and/or written in an unclear manner.	Achievable long-term goals written in a clear and coherent style.	Achievable long-term goals written in an exemplary fashion.	
<b>Clearly established relationships between each piece of evidence and the IRA standard it meets</b>	Insufficient relationships established	Adequate relationships established	Very explicit relationships established.	
<b>Sufficient variety of evidence that reflects application and growth beyond a simple collection of materials</b>	Only a few different kinds of evidence presented.	A reasonable range of evidence types presented.	An exceptionally diverse range of evidence presented.	
<b>Sufficient</b>	Minimal evidence of application	Candidate demonstrates adequate	Candidate provides	

<b>depth of evidence that reflects a change in the candidate's knowledge, teaching, and disposition</b>	of concepts and best practices.	understanding of concepts within the evidence and show signs of applying these concepts in his/her professional life.	extensive evidence of using concepts to implement best practice in his/her professional life.	
<b>Articulate and insightful reflection upon the portfolio evidence</b>	Candidate reflection is limited to isolated ideas and activities with little or no mention of leadership capability.	Candidate articulates a clear understanding of literacy instruction and the links between theory and practice. In addition, the candidate identifies how teachers and other professionals can grow professionally.	Candidate articulates an understanding of beliefs and practices that demonstrates intelligent thought and action and describe how the they possesses the skills and talent of an educational leader.	
			<b>Total Score</b>	

**Overall Performance**

**Assessment:**

\_\_\_\_\_ ≤ 12  
**Unacceptable**

\_\_\_\_\_ 13-24  
**Acceptable**

\_\_\_\_\_ 25-36  
**Exemplary**

**Recommendation:**

**REVISION**

**PASS**

**PASS**

**Faculty member signature(s)** \_\_\_\_\_

**SECTION IV Assessment #1  
Rhode Island College  
M. Ed. Reading Program  
Exit Portfolio  
Data Chart**

IRA Standard Element	Semester/Year	% Unacceptable	% Acceptable	% Exemplary <i>(This is a new category added as of the Spring 2007)</i>	Number of Candidates
<i>Standard 1.1.</i> <b>Demonstrate knowledge of psychological, sociological, and linguistic foundations of reading and writing processes and instruction.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	57%	43%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	35%	65%	23
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	92%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	61%	100%		2
	Spring 2005		39%		21
			*Fall 2005 & Spring 2006 scoring reflects scoring improvements that better reflect a comprehensive understanding of the Standards.		
<i>Standard 1.2.</i> <b>Demonstrate knowledge of reading research and histories</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	38%	62%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	32%	68%	25

<b>of reading</b>	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	83%	17%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
	Spring 2005	33%	67%		21
<i>Standard 1.3.</i> <b>Demonstrate knowledge of language development and reading acquisition and the variations related to culture and linguistic diversity.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	38%	62%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	29%	71%	24
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	92%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	25%	75%		4
	Spring 2006	5%	95%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	61%	39%		21	
<i>Standard 1.4.</i> <b>Demonstrate knowledge of the major components of reading (phonemic awareness, word identification and phonics, vocabulary and background knowledge, fluency, comprehension strategies, and motivation) and how they are integrated in fluent reading.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	67%	33%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	29%	71%	24
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	83%	17%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	39%	61%		21	



<b>Standard 2.1. Use instructional grouping options (individual, small-group, whole class, and computer based) as appropriate for accomplishing given purposes.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	29%	71%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	17%	83%	23
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	92%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	25%	75%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	39%		61%		21
<b>Standard 2.2. Use a wide range of instructional practices, approaches, and methods, including technology-based practices, for learners at differing stages of development and from differing cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	19%	81%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	24%	76%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	83%	17%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	29%		71%		21
<b>Standard 2.3. Use a wide range of curriculum materials in effective reading instruction for learners at different stages of reading and writing development and from different cultural and linguistic backgrounds.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	29%	71%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	16%	84%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	100%	0%	12
	Fall 2006	33%*	67%*		4
	Spring 2006	5%	95%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	61%		39%		21

<b>Standard 3.1. Use a wide range of assessment tools and practices that range from individual and group standardized tests to individual and group informal classroom assessment strategies, including technology-based assessment tools.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	38%	62%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	0%	100%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	24%	76%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	92%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	16%*	84%*		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	29%	71%		21	
<b>Standard 3.2 Place students along a developmental continuum and identify students' proficiencies and difficulties.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	38%	62%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	0%	100%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	17%	83%	24
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	92%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	76%	24%		21	
<b>Standard 3.3. Use assessment information to plan, evaluate, and revise effective instruction that meets the needs of all students including those at different developmental stages and those from diverse cultural and linguistic</b>	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	38%	62%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	0%	100%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	24%	76%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	92%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	12%*	88%*		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	52%	48%		21	

<b>backgrounds.</b>					
<i>Standard 3.4.</i> <b>Communicate results of assessments to specific individuals, (students, parents, caregivers, colleagues, administrators, policymakers, policy officials, community, etc.).</b>	Fall 2009	0%	66%	34%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	0%	100%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	20%	80%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	92%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	48%	52%		21	
<i>Standard 4.1. Use students' interests, reading abilities and backgrounds as foundations for the reading and writing program.</i>	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	0%	100%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	32%	68%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	100%	0%	12
	Fall 2006	17%*	83%*		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	67%	33%		21	
<i>Standard 4.2. Use a large supply of books, technology-based information, and non-print materials representing multiple levels, broad interests, cultures and linguistic backgrounds.</i>	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	38%	62%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	0%	100%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	48%	52%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	92%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	12%*	88%*		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	71%	29%		21	

<b>Standard 4.3. Model reading and writing enthusiastically as valued life-long activities.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	0%	100%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	24%	76%	12
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	4
	Spring 2007	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		2
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		21
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		
	Spring 2005	33%	67%		
<b>Standard 4.4. Motivate learners to be life-long readers.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	29%	71%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	0%	100%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	29%	71%	24
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	100%	0%	12
	Fall 2006	34%*	66%*		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
	Spring 2005	39%	61%		21
<b>Standard 5.1. Display dispositions related to reading and the teaching of reading.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	68%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	33%	58%	24
	Fall 2007	4%	38%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	17%	66%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	92%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
	Spring 2005	0%	100%		21
		61%	39%		

<i>Standard 5.2.</i> <b>Continue to pursue the development of professional knowledge and dispositions.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	4%	48%	48%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	92%	8%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
	Spring 2005	52%	48%		21
<i>Standard 5.3. Work with colleagues to observe, evaluate, and provide feedback on each other's practice.</i>	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	4%	44%	52%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	100%	0%	12
	Fall 2006	25%	75%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
	Spring 2005	61%	39%		21
<i>Standard 5.4.</i> <b>Participate in, initiate, implement, and evaluate professional development programs.</b>	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	4%	40%	56%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	100%	0%	12
	Fall 2006	13%*	87%*		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
	Spring 2005	57%	43%		21
Clearly established	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3

relationships between each piece of evidence and the IRA standard it meets	Spring 2009	0%	38%	62%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	40%	60%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	66%	17%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	100%	0%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
	Spring 2005	0%	100%		21
Sufficient variety of evidence that reflects application and growth beyond a simple collection of materials	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	0%	28%	72%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	0%	83%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	100%	0%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	0%	100%		21	
Sufficient depth of evidence that reflects a change in the candidate's knowledge, teaching and disposition	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	33%	67%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	33%	67%	3
	Spring 2008	4%	28%	68%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	0%	83%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	100%	0%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
Spring 2005	0%	100%		21	

Articulate and insightful reflection upon the portfolio evidence	Fall 2009	0%	34%	66%	3
	Spring 2009	0%	43%	57%	21
	Fall 2008	0%	0%	100%	3
	Spring 2008	8%	44%	48%	25
	Fall 2007	17%	0%	83%	6
	Spring 2007	0%	100%	0%	12
	Fall 2006	0%	100%		4
	Spring 2006	0%	100%		11
	Fall 2005	0%	100%		2
	Spring 2005	0%	100%		21