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Abstract

Preparing the next generation of teachers to prepare students for the 21st Century is a challenging endeavor. Teacher candidates need to possess critical thinking and evidence-based pedagogical skills. It is believed that teacher reflection is the cornerstone to making informed decisions and timely modifications to daily instruction (Cochran-Smith, & Zeichner, K. 2005, Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J., 2005 NBPTS, 2014; Schon, 1987;). What has been less examined is how an ePortfolio can be utilized as a tool to aid in the development of reflection among teacher candidates. This case study significantly contributes to our understanding of how to develop reflective practitioners.

The researcher evaluated how an elementary teacher education program ePortfolio project at one university aided in the development of reflective practice among teacher candidates. Fifteen ePortfolios were analyzed, along with supporting documents from the program. The researcher conducted a focus group with graduates of the program to further explore emerging themes about the project and the quality of teacher candidates’ reflections. Findings indicate that in order to improve teacher candidates’ reflective practices, project directors must view the ePortfolio holistically, as an ePortfolio Ecosystem. Threats and mutations to the original vision of the ePortfolio project were discovered. The researcher recommended a number of adaptations to be introduced in order for the ePortfolio Ecosystem to exist in homeostasis. These findings and recommendations are pertinent for all programs using an ePortfolio as a tool to help teacher candidates develop reflective practices.
Acknowledgments

While the last five and a half years have been challenging at times, I could not have made it through to the end without the encouragement and support I received from several individuals.

My advisor and dissertation chair, Dr. Linda Quinn, you have supported me and guided me throughout this program. I want to thank you for all the support and opportunities you have provided. My dissertation committee: Dr. Karen Grove, Dr. Lori Olafson, Dr. Katrina Liu, and Dr. Cathy Pohan. You all have made this study possible through your encouragement, valuable insight and expertise. Dr. Lori Olafson, you made it possible for me to meet this wonderful group of women in order to pursue my goal. A special thank you to Dr. Cathy Pohan, I am so grateful that you let me into your advanced practicum course in 2005 when I was earning my bachelors degree in teaching. Ever since then you have been my mentor, colleague, and friend. You are always there to be a sounding board for my thinking and you continue to push me to achieve my professional dreams. I would not be where I am today without you!

To my dear friend Marissa Owens, thank you for your encouragement, collaborative efforts, and unwavering support.

To my brother Omar Salinas, and my entire family I am blessed to have you supporting me and always cheering me on.

To my husband Jeff, thank you for believing in me. Your support, love and encouragement as well as your ability to take over all of my mom duties made this possible.

Last but not least my Olivia, you inspire me to be the best that I can be!
Dedication

I dedicate this work to my parents, Josie and Israel Salinas. You both have given me unwavering support and love my entire life, always believing I could achieve anything I set my mind to. You both are truly my best friends!

I also want to dedicate this work to Olivia and any future children I may have. I want you to know that whatever you wish to achieve is possible with hard work and perseverance.
# Table of Contents

Abstract ........................................................................................................ iii

Acknowledgements .................................................................................. iv

Dedication ..................................................................................................... v

List of Tables ............................................................................................... xi

List of Figures .............................................................................................. xii

Chapter 1: Introduction ............................................................................... 1
  Statement of the Problem ........................................................................ 3
  Purpose of the Study .............................................................................. 4
  Significance of the Study ....................................................................... 5
  Limitations and Propositions ................................................................ 5
    Limitations .......................................................................................... 5
    Delimitations ...................................................................................... 6
    Propositions ....................................................................................... 6

Chapter 2: Review of Literature and Research ............................................. 8
  Theoretical Framework .......................................................................... 8
    Stages of Learning ............................................................................ 10
    Levels of Reflection ......................................................................... 11
    Reflection and National Organizations ......................................... 12
  Critique of Reflection .......................................................................... 15
  Facilitation of Reflection in Teacher Education Programs .................. 16
    Journal Writing ................................................................................. 17
    Interpersonal Interaction .................................................................. 17
    Ethnography ...................................................................................... 18
    Portfolios ........................................................................................... 18
  EPortfolios in Teacher Education ....................................................... 20
  Teacher Candidate Reflection Through ePortfolios ............................ 21
Analysis II .........................................................................................................................48
  Descriptive writing.............................................................................................................48
  Descriptive reflection ........................................................................................................49
  Dialogic reflection ...........................................................................................................51
  Critical reflection ...........................................................................................................52

Focus Group .....................................................................................................................52
  Unclear Purpose ...............................................................................................................52
  Incohesive Process ..........................................................................................................53

Chapter 5: Introduction ....................................................................................................57

Research Question 1 .........................................................................................................57
  Analysis of Program Documents .........................................................................................57
    University and Department-level websites .......................................................................57
    Course Syllabi/Key Assignments .....................................................................................58
    Timing of ePortfolio construction ..................................................................................58
  Analysis of ePortfolios ....................................................................................................59
  Analysis of Focus Group Transcript ................................................................................61

Research Question 2 .........................................................................................................62
  Analysis of Program Documents .........................................................................................62
  Analysis of ePortfolios .....................................................................................................63
  Analysis of Focus Group Transcript ................................................................................66

Research Question 3 .........................................................................................................68
  Analysis of Focus Group Transcript ................................................................................68

Viewing the ePortfolio Holistically ..................................................................................68
  Program Vision ...............................................................................................................69
  Implementation Process ..................................................................................................70
  Supporting Documents ...................................................................................................70
  Technology ......................................................................................................................71
List of Tables

Table 1: Comparison of ePortfolio Assessment Types.......................................................23
Table 2: Criteria for Reflection Rubric.................................................................34
Table 3: Research Questions and Data Sources.........................................................37
Table 4: Types of Reflection: Lower and Higher Order Thinking.................................64
List of Figures

Figure 1: Kolb Learning Cycle.................................................................10
Figure 2: Sunshining Effect.................................................................27
Figure 3: Documents Evaluated..........................................................32
Figure 4: ePortfolio Ecosystem...........................................................69
Figure 5: Threats to the ePortfolio Ecosystem.......................................74
Chapter One

Introduction

Teacher expertise and effectiveness has profound effects on student achievement and the successful implementation of many educational interventions (Bembry, Jordan, Gomez, Anderson & Mendro, 1998; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). The goal of preparing highly qualified teachers took center stage in the mid-1900’s and then again with the implementation of the No Child Left Behind Act in 2001 (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Along with the globalization of the economy and concerns that the United States was losing its place as a leader in the industrialized world, the widening achievement gap among middle-class Anglos and students from other cultural, economic and linguistic groups, ignited demands for reforms in both teaching and teacher preparation. Pressure from the public and politicians resulted in new standards for the teaching profession, increased testing of teacher candidates, and higher accountability for institutions preparing teachers (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005).

With the advent of PreK-12 standards (e.g., Common Core Standards) teachers are now held accountable for student learning that will prepare them for college and/or the workplace (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Few education policy makers, practitioners or the general public would disagree that improving teacher quality is one of the most direct and promising strategies for improving public education outcomes in the United States and closing the achievement gap (Darling-Hammond, 2010).

In order for teacher preparation programs to produce highly qualified teachers, educational researchers must a) identify the attributes of an effective teacher and b) determine the best way to ensure these qualities are developed within teacher preparation programs and in
on-going professional development activities once teachers are in the classroom. A vast amount of literature examines the knowledge, skills, and dispositions characteristic of effective teachers (Cochran-Smith & Fries, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005, Darling-Hammond, 2010). Much of this research has led to the development of program learning outcomes, assessment strategies, and instructional activities. Preparing the next generation of teachers to prepare students for the 21st Century is a challenging endeavor, and it is important for teacher educators to determine how to best accomplish this goal.

Teacher candidates need to possess critical thinking and evidence-based pedagogical skills. Equally important is the capacity to reflect on, evaluate, and adjust their teaching and lessons so that instruction continually improves (Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Several governing boards direct the preparation and development of teachers. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), through its Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC), sets the standards and performance expectations of curriculum in teacher education programs. Formally the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE), the Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) set minimum standards for teacher education programs in areas of candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions; program systems, unit evaluations; field experiences and clinical practice; diversity; faculty qualifications; and unit governance and resources in order to deem a program worthy of accreditation (CAEP 2016, NCATE, 2010). The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) also works to define the qualities and dispositions of accomplished teaching. These organizations are founded on the belief that higher standards for teachers will result in better learning for students.
Universities use a variety of practices in their teacher education programs to document the development of teacher knowledge, the application of skills to daily practice, and professional dispositions. One additional characteristic of accomplished teachers is the ability to reflect. NBPTS (2014) defines this as the ability for teachers “to think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.”

Statement of the Problem

It is believed that teacher reflection is the cornerstone to making informed decisions and timely modifications to daily instruction (Cochran-Smith, & Zeichner, K. 2005, Darling-Hammond, L. & Bransford, J., 2005 NBPTS, 2014; Schon, 1987). Rodgers, (2002) defined reflection as having the following criteria

a) meaning-making process that moves a learner from one experience into the next with a deeper understanding of its relationships with and connections to other experiences and ideas b) a systematic, rigorous, disciplined way of thinking, with its roots in scientific inquiry c) needs to happen in community, in interaction with others and d) requires attitudes that value the personal and intellectual growth of one-self and of others (p.845).

Hatton and Smith (1995) provided a framework for evaluating teacher candidates’ reflections, identifying four types of reflectivity: descriptive writing, descriptive reflection, dialogic reflection and critical reflection. What has been examined less is how teachers become reflective practitioners. There is a significant gap in the literature with regard to whether teacher candidates are improving their reflective skills while creating ePortfolios and specifically, the topics and/or issues with which teacher candidates are being asked to reflect on in their ePortfolios. Understanding the role of teacher reflection and how it becomes a normal part of
one’s daily practice will significantly contribute to our understanding of how to develop reflective practitioners.

**Purpose of the Study**

EPortfolios are currently implemented in teacher education programs to facilitate the development of reflection among teacher candidates and the process of becoming accomplished practitioners at the novice level. Through the use of ePortfolios, teacher candidates are able to a) develop professional beliefs, b) reflect on their teaching practices, and c) form a professional identity. The development of reflection facilitated through the creation of an ePortfolio is studied within the context in which teacher candidates are learning about teaching as a professional practice. A close examination of an ePortfolio project with its artifacts and reflective assignments; overall design, process and procedures for implementation and grading (e.g., feedback to candidates); and the teacher candidates who create the ePortfolios will give teacher educators a better understanding of how teacher candidates develop into reflective practitioners. Specifically, this study focuses on how teacher candidates reflect, the content of their reflections, and how the ePortfolio facilitates the reflective process. For the purpose of this study, reflection is defined as the ability to think critically, beyond a descriptive level, about one’s practice in order to improve student learning (Hatton & Smith, 1995; Schön, 1996). The university that is the focus of this case study utilizes the InTASC Standards (2013) to guide the development of their program and uses the ePortfolio as a means to document the development of reflection among teacher candidates. Using the frameworks of reflection provided by Rodgers (2002), as well as Hatton and Smith (1995), this study seeks to answer the following three questions:
1. In what ways are teacher candidates prompted to reflect on professional practices throughout their teacher preparation program?

2. What is the quality of teacher candidates’ reflections within the ePortfolio?

3. How did the experience of creating an ePortfolio aid teacher candidates in becoming reflective practitioners?

**Significance of the Study**

This study is significant as it seeks to highlight the importance of the role teacher education programs play in the development of reflective practitioners. Second, this study provides a perspective on the valuable connections between the theory and actual daily practice of reflective thinking in the field of teacher education. Third, this study furthers our understanding of how reflective thinking and practice develops within teacher candidates. Lastly, teacher education programs must have evidence that the ePortfolio project does indeed produce reflective practitioners. This study aims to evaluate the efficacy of the ePortfolio in producing reflection among novice practitioners.

**Limitations and Propositions**

**Limitations**

The results of this case study are limited to a sample of undergraduate teacher candidates, and situated within the context of an elementary teacher preparation program at one university. This study analyzes 15 students who created an ePortfolio at a large university in the Southwestern United States in the fall semester of 2014. The beliefs of professors/instructors in the teacher education program at this university have not been calibrated so it is unclear whether they share the same definition of reflection, which can make their assessment of the ePortfolio unreliable. Therefore, it is possible that each professor/instructor holds his/her own beliefs about
reflection and its development. This researcher’s beliefs about reflection may also influence the results of this study. Based on Rodgers’ (2002) definition of reflection, the researcher created a rubric that was used to analyze the ePortfolio artifacts and the content of reflections within the ePortfolios. A second analysis using Hatton and Smith’s (1995) framework was conducted to determine the type of reflection exhibited in the ePortfolios. Further, only the researcher analyzed the ePortfolios and created meaning from them.

**Delimitations**

The researcher has chosen to evaluate ePortfolios of students enrolled in the fall semester 2014 because of the ease of access to these students. These students participated in a course taught by the researcher, and they have maintained connections with the researcher through an online Facebook group. While artifacts in the ePortfolio are designed to display different domains of teacher development, for the purpose of this study, the researcher will focus on how the ePortfolio project aided in the development of reflection and reflective practitioners.

**Propositions**

The researcher hypothesizes that ePortfolios can be useful to aid teacher candidates’ development of reflective practice, and that ePortfolios are most powerful when the teacher educators implementing them are fully aware of their potential and have a united, vested interest in their use. All parties involved must view the ePortfolio as a beneficial project for their teacher candidates. The ePortfolio is most effective when used across a program and particularly in conjunction with teacher candidates’ practicum experiences. In order for an ePortfolio to be truly effective as a means to facilitate reflection within teacher candidates, it needs to provide opportunities to highlight the transformation of teacher candidates’ decision-making and developing skills. If the ultimate goal is to help teacher candidates develop into reflective
practitioners, candidates need the opportunity to make connections among learning theories, pedagogical practices, and their own beliefs about teaching. Through the careful selection of artifacts aligned to teaching domains and the candidates’ subsequent reflections, the ePortfolio should convey to the reader the instructional decisions that were made in the classroom and the rationale for those decisions.
Chapter 2

Review of Literature and Research

The job of a teacher is challenging and requires the ability to make important and rapid decisions about the welfare and educational learning of their students throughout the day. This is no easy task for a veteran teacher much less a teacher candidate that is new to the classroom. Reflection can help teacher candidates improve their skills and promote professional growth throughout their profession (Robichaux & Guarino, 2012). “In teaching, as in life, maximizing meaning from experiences requires reflection” (Costa & Kallick, 2000, p.60). In addition, reflection provides teacher candidates with an opportunity to; a) amplify the meaning of one’s work through the insights of others, b) apply meaning beyond the situation in which it was learned, and c) make a commitment to modifications, plans and experimentation, and d) to document learning and provide a rich base of shared knowledge (Costa & Kallick, 2000). The process of being a reflective practitioner facilitates responsiveness to the changing needs of students in the classroom; in essence, through reflection teachers become more effective (Rosen, 2008).

Theoretical Framework

There is universal agreement that effective teachers reflect regularly and deeply on their practice (Jaeger, 2013). The seminal works of John Dewey, Donald Schön, and later David Kolb, are highly relevant and influential in teacher education practices today. John Dewey identified reflection as one of the modes of thought: “active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in light of the grounds that support it and the future conclusions to which it tends” (Dewey, 1933, p.7). Rodgers’ (2002) characterization of Dewey’s
four criteria for reflection helps define reflection in a more concrete way and helps frame the researchers’ theoretical stance in this study.

An expanded version of what was stated in chapter one, reflection, according to Rodgers (2002):

1. Is a meaning-making process that moves a learner from one experience into the next with a deeper understanding of its relationships with and connections to other experiences and ideas.

2. Is a systematic, rigorous, disciplined way of thinking, with its roots in scientific inquiry.

3. Needs to happen in community, in interaction with others.

4. Requires attitudes that value the personal and intellectual growth of one-self and of others (p. 845).

In an effort to further define reflection, Schön (1996) posits that reflection occurs when one takes their current knowledge and applies it to an experience working along side a more seasoned expert in the field. Schön also felt that reflective practice was a way for novices in a discipline to make connections between their own practices and those of more experienced practitioners (Ferraro, 2000). Donald Schön’s (1987) emphasis on reflection-in-action, reflection-for-action and reflection-on-action are informing teacher education programs today. Reflection in action requires making a decision on the spot to change what you are doing for a better result. Teachers do this in the classroom when they clearly see that students do not understand the context, and change their approach of teaching right then and there (on the spot/in the moment of reflection). Reflection for action is thinking about something that previously took place and determining what changes would lead to a better outcome, and then making those changes for a similar situation in the future (i.e., after-the fact reflection). Reflection-on-action,
takes place in the classroom when a teacher adjusts their lesson or teaching methods because of a similar instance where students did not grasp the concept.

**Stages of Learning**

After studying the work of important scholars such as John Dewey, Kurt Lewin, and Jean Piaget, David Kolb introduced a theory of learning in his seminal publication titled, *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development*, to help answer how an individual progresses through the stages of learning (1984). Kolb views learning as an integrated process with each stage being mutually supportive of and progressing into the next. In his theory, an individual engages in a cyclical, four-stage process that includes experience, reflection, conceptualization, and experimentation. It is possible for an individual to enter the cycle at any stage and follow it through its logical sequence (See figure 1).

Figure 1. Kolb learning cycle

![Kolb learning cycle diagram](image)

In the concrete experience stage, an individual has a new experience (e.g., teaching their first lesson). Then in the reflective observation stage, the individual might observe the new
experience and consider his/her understanding of this experience (e.g., being asked to reflect on the effectiveness of the lesson). Next, in abstract conceptualization, the individual’s previous reflection prompts a new idea (e.g., ways to improve their teaching). Finally, in active experimentation, the learner applies the new ideas into the world around them (e.g., the teacher candidate executes new techniques into their teaching).

Kolb (1984) felt that in order to change one’s experience, you must first have an experience. The experience is not changed into knowledge without careful reflection of the experience that took place. After one reflects upon the experience, the individual creates his or her own theory to explain the experience. Then, the learner should continue to test and experiment the proposed theory in new situations and future experiences. Although Kolb did not specifically describe teachers in the stages of his learning cycle, his theory applies to teacher development because it is critical for teacher candidates to go through these stages of learning to be effective teachers.

Kolb’s theory of learning provides a concrete foundation to help us understand how teacher candidates learn from experience as they develop and progress through stages. His theory gives light to the importance of reflective practice in this process. According to Kolb, (1984) the experiential learning cycle has a dynamic view of learning driven by the resolution of the dual dialectics of action/reflection and experience/abstraction (Kolb, Passarelli, & Sharma 2014). Without reflection, an individual would remain dormant in the cyclical process that Kolb has proposed; in essence learning would not take place.

Levels of Reflection

Within the current literature base, several frameworks have been put forth to describe different levels of reflection. In 1977, van Manen, defined three levels of reflection. Technical
**rationality** refers to the ability to connect theory to practice. The second level, *practical reflection*, takes the first level one step further by considering the context of the educational experience to make practical choices. The third level, critical *reflection*, takes into consideration both moral and ethical criteria to guide ones’ decision-making. A five-level, developmental hierarchical framework proposed by Valli (1997) which argues that reflective thinking moves from the lowest level of technical reflection, to reflection-in and on-action, to deliberative reflection, to personal reflection, and on to the highest level, critical reflection. After studying the reflective writing tasks of teacher education students, Hatton and Smith (1995) identified four types of reflectivity: descriptive writing, descriptive reflection, dialogic reflection and critical reflection. At the lowest level of descriptive writing, the student merely describes an event with factual information. Descriptive reflection takes it a step further, describes the event or situation while also presenting a rationale or justification for one’s actions or decisions. In dialogic reflection, the individual demonstrates the ability to self analyze, while taking a step back to evaluate or critique the situation, using qualities of judgment and considering alternative viewpoints. Critical reflection involves “the awareness of social, historical and or political context of the events and or actions and influence of these context” (Hatton & Smith, 1995, p. 48). Collectively, the works of Dewey (1933), Schön (1987), and Kolb (1984), along with the more current research findings on reflection provide a framework for this study.

**Reflection and National Organizations**

Preparing the next generation of teachers is a challenging endeavor so it is important for teacher educators to determine how to best accomplish this goal. Teacher candidates need to possess critical thinking and evidence-based pedagogical skills. Equally important is the capacity to reflect on, evaluate, and adjust their lessons so that instruction continually improves
(Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005). Several governing boards direct the preparation and development of teachers. The Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) through its Interstate Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (InTASC) sets the standards and performance expectations of curriculum in teacher education programs. The National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) was formed in 1954, and was responsible for maintaining the highest quality teacher preparation programs. NCATE was made up of teachers, teacher educators, content specialists and policyholders. For a teacher candidate to reach the level of “acceptable” NCATE believed the candidate should be able to apply the professional and pedagogical knowledge and skills delineated in the professional, state, and institutional standards (NCATE Unit Standards, 2008). The teacher candidate should consider the school, family, and community contexts in which they work, as well as the prior experience of students to develop meaningful learning experiences (NCATE Unit Standards, 2008).

Teacher Education Accreditation Council (TEAC) and NCATE formed to make The Council for Accreditation of Educator Preparation (CAEP) who sets minimum standards for teacher education programs in areas of candidate knowledge, skills, and professional dispositions; program systems and unit evaluation; field experiences and clinical practice; diversity; faculty qualifications; and unit governance and resources in order to deem a program worthy of accreditation (CAEP, 2015).

The National Board of Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) identifies Five Core Propositions for excellence in teaching:

1. Teachers are committed to students and their learning.
2. Teachers know the subjects they teach and how to teach those subjects to students.
3. Teachers are responsible for managing and monitoring student learning.
4. Teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience.

5. Teachers are members of learning communities (NBPTS, 2014).

A closer consideration of the fourth proposition, “teachers think systematically about their practice and learn from experience”, suggests that reflection is a key attribute of a highly qualified teacher. According to the NBPTS (2014), accomplished teachers critically examine their practice on a regular basis to deepen their knowledge of teaching, expand their repertoire of skills, and incorporate new strategies and understanding of student learning into their practice (NBPTS, 2014). Imel (1992) argues, “reflective practice involves thinking about and critically analyzing ones’ actions with the goal of improving ones professional practice” (p.2). In other words, teachers must regularly think about what they are doing in the classroom, articulate why they are doing it, and evaluate if what they are doing is meeting the diverse needs of their students. It is imperative that teacher candidates are given the opportunity to learn how to be reflective practitioners because it helps them become better teachers. Teacher education programs see the need for reflection and try to ensure that their teacher candidates learn this necessary skill.

One of the main goals of reflective teaching is to develop teacher candidates’ reasoning about why they choose certain instructional strategies (i.e., showing what they know about how students learn, as well as evidence-based best practices). The primary benefit of reflective practice for teachers is a deeper understanding of their own teaching style and ultimately, more accomplished teaching. Reflective practice also provides teachers a validation of their teaching ideals, respect for diversity, and the ability to apply theory to classroom practice. But learning activities in teacher education programs should also prompt candidates to reflect on how they can improve their teaching and ultimately improve students’ learning (Lee, 2005). In order for
teacher candidates to become highly qualified teachers, it is recommended that teacher candidates engage in reflective activities not only to better learn new ideas but also to sustain professional growth after leaving the program (Lee, 2005).

**Critique of Reflection**

While many national educational organizations praise the importance of reflection (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005; Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Hatton & Smith, 1995; InTASC Standards, NBPTS, 2014; NCATE Unit Standards, 2008 Liston & Zeichner, 1996;), the construct of reflection remains “elusive” (Thomas & Liu, 2012, p.307). Liston and Zeichner (1996) argued, “that the reflective teaching ‘bandwagon’ includes many variations” (p.73). Therefore reflection often takes on many different forms from one teacher education program to the next. Some educators argue that reflection is unnecessary. Fendler (2003) argued that there is too much focus on reflection, and oftentimes reflection teaches individuals to rationalize their beliefs instead of questioning and interrogating one’s motives or intentions. Since reflection is often taught in a top-down approach, whereby the teacher educator defines the parameters for how reflection should be done, teacher candidates may mimic rather than think critically and push boundaries of their thinking (Smyth, 1989). Even though some educators question this focus on reflection, more argue that learning to become reflective is paramount to effective teaching and professional growth (Hammerness, Darling-Hammond & Bransford, 2005; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Day, 1993; McNay, 1999, Jaeger, 2013, Liston & Zeichner, 1996;). Given the potential of reflection to improve one’s practice, it seems logical that teacher education programs ask teacher candidates to be reflective. However, without a clear definition or expectations for reflection it can be difficult for teacher candidates to understand what is being asked of them.
Facilitation of Reflection in Teacher Education Programs

Different teacher education programs have differing requirements, expectations, and approaches related to reflection (Cochran-Smith & Zeichner, 2005). An example of reflection might include teachers evaluating how a lesson went or when they evaluate student performance on an assessment to determine next steps in instruction. Reflection might take place in a section on a lesson plan that asks the candidate (or teacher) to reflect on the effectiveness of the lesson or on an assignment in which the teacher candidate is asked to reflect on their experience in the clinical practice setting. Some programs have teacher candidates keep a written journal or online journal in the form of a weblog during their practicum experiences. While these are important instructional tasks, it is critical for teacher candidates to be provided multiple opportunities to develop into reflective practitioners. Still further, for reflection to become a habit teacher education programs must evaluate whether assigned instructional tasks or assignments are generative and do indeed help prompt daily reflection (Robixhaus & Guarino, 2012). Darling-Hammond and Bransford (2005) suggest that courses for teacher candidates may be more effective if they include opportunities for candidates to monitor their own learning, and to help them appreciate how thinking about one’s own learning can facilitate greater understanding of themselves as teachers and the needs of their students. In essence, teacher candidates must engage in reflection. Some teachers seem naturally inclined toward reflection; however, researchers argue that generative activities are critical to the development of reflection in teacher candidates (Jaeger, 2013). Reflection generating activities such as examining case studies, journaling, conducting self-studies, and analyzing an audio or visual recording of one’s teaching, have been shown to be valuable in developing teacher candidate reflection (Jaeger, 2013). Some
of the most common practices used to promote reflection in teacher education programs include journal writing, interpersonal interactions, ethnography, and portfolios.

**Journal Writing**

Journal writing is used in many fields to facilitate reflection and encourage students to explore their developing professional identity and educational experiences. Journal writing has been used in the fields of nursing, physical therapy, occupational therapy and teacher education. The format of the journal can vary depending on identified learning outcomes and students’ needs (Walker, 2006). For example, a teacher candidate could be asked to reflect on the challenges of designing and implementing a lesson plan for a diverse group of students within the context of a methods course. Teacher candidates can also be asked to reflect on their struggles with classroom management during any aspect of clinical practice. In both cases students are encouraged to reflect on an experience, whether that experience originated in the university classroom or in the field.

According to Spalding and Wilson (2002), teacher candidates can benefit from journal writing in the following ways: (a) establish a permanent record of experiences, (b) build and maintain a relationship with professors, (c) explore personal concerns, issues and biases, (d) and engage in internal dialogue. However, these researchers argued that while journaling gives teachers a space to reflect, university instructors must actually teach teacher candidates how to reflect.

**Interpersonal Interaction**

Within the field of teacher education many forms of interpersonal interaction take place to encourage reflection. Teacher candidates often participate in seminars designed to facilitate further discussion in small group settings to explore ideas and beliefs about teaching, and bias in
the classroom. These seminars help teacher candidates unpack their ideas about the profession with a hope that teacher candidates can gain a better understanding of their developing identities as teachers. Professional Learning Communities PLCs and/or Communities of Inquiry are also established to aid teacher candidates in the reflection of their developing effective professional practices.

**Ethnography**

Teacher candidates are given assignments that have them study the demographics of the schools in which they will be teaching to further elicit reflection about the community and the students in the schools that serve. Teacher candidates are also asked to observe various grade levels, school sites, and curriculum in order to gain a better understanding of the teaching profession and effective practices in the field across different contexts. This approach provides a space and opportunity for more critical reflection, but there is little evidence that it does so without instructors scaffolding teacher candidates’ ability to process the social, historical, and/or political contexts and their educational implications.

**Portfolios**

According to Abrami and Barrett (2005), there are three types of portfolios, a) process, b) showcase, and c) assessment. Process portfolios are defined as a purposeful collection of student work that tells the story of a student’s effort, progress, and/or achievement in one or more areas (Arter & Spandel, 1992; MacIsaac & Jackson, 1994). This type of portfolio can be used as a tool for reflection. Through the development of a process portfolio, students may increase their ability to a) self-evaluate, b) make choices, c) better understand themselves and their strengths and areas for improvement, and d) track their progress and growth over time (Abrami & Barrett, 2005, Orland-Barak, 2005). Ultimately, process portfolios can promote a commitment to life-
long learning; through the act of creating the portfolio a novice teacher can develop self-awareness about their skill level.

Showcase, portfolios are another way to assess the learners’ competencies and achievements (Abrami & Barrett, 2005, Orland-Barak, 2005). Showcase portfolios illustrate, rather than merely describe, what the individual has learned. This can be accomplished through auditory clips or video clips of the individual teaching. In this way, technology becomes a vehicle through which the candidate can showcase his/her work and reflection, thereby providing the viewer a window into what the individual has truly learned.

Assessment Portfolios are used in both formative and summative evaluation of learning; however the use of portfolios in high stakes assessment of learning is problematic (Abrami & Barrett, 2005). Assessment Portfolios include scoring rubrics of artifacts and personal reflection; they can be used in work place training and to assess prior learning. Such portfolios can also be used for accreditation/certification purposes or to provide credit for training. These assessment portfolios are especially impactful in comparatively judging differences in learning between an individual that might have more life experience and a more traditional, less experienced student.

An electronic portfolio (ePortfolio) is a digital file or container capable of storing visual and auditory content including text, images, video and sound (Abrami & Barrettt, 2005). In many ways the ePortfolio contains many elements of the previously discussed approaches to prompt reflection. EPorfolios have the ability to display multimedia files and demonstrate assessment for various school and work settings and are gaining popularity with advances in technology, especially in teacher education programs (Ayan & Seferoglu, 2011).
EPortfolios in Teacher Education

New technologies in the 21st century have prompted the adoption of an ePortfolio in teacher education programs across the country. EPortfolios are being utilized to aid in meeting the goals of standards-based reforms and performance-based assessment (Barrett, 2007; Clark, 2009). According to Miller and Legg (1993), portfolio assessment is a specific form of authentic or performance assessment that attempts to measure higher order thinking skills, including the ability to communicate clearly, make judgments, and demonstrate specific competencies. Currently, teachers are instructed to be student-centered and emphasize higher order thinking skills in the planning and execution of lessons, as well as development of assessments. Whether process-, showcase-, or assessment-oriented, ePortfolios give teacher candidates a space to present their work and lessons learned in a format that is both student-centered and facilitates reflective thinking skills (Abrami & Barrett, 2005; Jaeger, 2013; Oner & Adadan, 2011).

Delandshere and Arens (2003) describe an ePortfolio as a vehicle to “define, display, and store evidence of teachers’ knowledge and skills that is based on multiple sources of evidence collected over time in authentic settings” (p. 58). Oner and Adadan (2011) note three distinctive features of an effective teaching portfolio. First, it includes a personal philosophy and professional goals. Second, it provides evidence of the connection of one’s practice to theory. Lastly, an effective portfolio would include critical reflections of ones’ decision making in the classroom (2011). EPortfolios are used in many colleges of education and teacher preparation programs as one way to document their teacher candidates are meeting state and national standards, and to meet the accreditation requirements of the programs or institutions themselves (Barrett, 2004; Fagin, Hand, & Boyd, 2003; Strudler & Wetzel, 2011). If used effectively, ePortfolios have the potential to increase reflection, develop content and pedagogical skills,
facilitate communication between teachers and administrators, and promote personal inquiry and growth (Shepherd & Skrabut, 2011).

The use of ePortfolios in teacher education emanates from the constructivist tradition of using portfolios to foster deep student reflection and learning (Strudler & Wetzel, 2011). EPortfolios may determine what teachers know (e.g., an artifact showing a lesson plan that includes state standards), what they can do (e.g., pictures or a video of them teaching a lesson), how they use data (e.g., using student scores on assessment to adjust subsequent instruction), how they reflect (e.g., a section on the lesson plan labeled reflection: candidate documents strengths, concerns, and insights on the lesson), how they use feedback (e.g., teacher candidate response to feedback from the university supervisor or mentor teacher), and decision-making with regard to lesson modification (e.g., what the teacher candidate will do in the future). When teacher candidates choose which artifacts to include in their ePortfolio, the artifacts are usually evaluated according to a set of criteria outlined on a scoring rubric. The rubric could help evaluate the quality of the chosen artifact, as well as the depth of the reflection and rationale for the selection of artifacts within the ePortfolio. Standards and evaluation rubrics provide direction for artifact selection and organization (Strudler & Wetzel, 2011). The ability for teacher candidates to progress through the areas to be documented in an ePortfolio will allow a window into the depth and effectiveness of a candidate’s reflection, and ultimately provide insight into what type of teacher this candidate may be in the future.

**Teacher Candidate Reflection through ePortfolios**

While scant, there exists a developing body of research investigating the potential of ePortfolios to facilitate reflection among teacher candidates. The researcher acknowledges that there is a body of research conducted between 1970-2000 investigating the benefits of using
portfolios to document teachers’ developing pedagogical knowledge and skills, as well as theorizing about teacher reflection. However, it is only recently that we have begun to see studies that focus on the development of reflection through the tool of an ePortfolio. Since there is a current void in the literature regarding the development of reflective thinking through ePortfolios, the researcher has selected to include studies of teacher candidate reflection in both paper-based and electronic portfolios.

Dr. Helen Barrett is internationally recognized as an expert on electronic portfolios in education. She developed the REFLECT Initiative, Researching Electronic portFolios: Learning, Engagement and Collaboration through Technology (Barrett, 2007; 2008) that is often cited and used to guide current ePortfolio practices. Dr. Barrett has focused her research on the experiences of using ePortfolios to assess student learning across the curriculum for K-12 education; however, she also applies the initiative in the study of teacher candidates (Barrett, 2007). She draws several conclusions about the implementation and effectiveness of using ePortfolios for learning. Borrowing from Stiggins (2002), Barrett (2007) makes a clear distinction between ePortfolios used as assessment of learning and those used as assessment for learning. She argues that the ePortfolio should be used to document the learning process and growth of the learner (i.e., for learning) rather than a summative evaluation of learning (see Table 1).
Table 1: Comparison of ePortfolio Assessment Types

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portfolios used for assessment of learning</th>
<th>Portfolios used for assessment for learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of portfolio prescribed by institution</td>
<td>Purpose of portfolio agreed upon with learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artifacts mandated by institution to determine outcomes of instruction</td>
<td>Artifacts selected by learner to tell the story of their learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio usually developed at the end of a class, term, or program-time limited</td>
<td>Portfolio maintained on an ongoing basis throughout the class, term, or program-time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio and/or artifacts usually “scored” based on a rubric, and quantitative data is collected for external audiences</td>
<td>flexible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio is usually structured around a set of outcomes, goals, or standards</td>
<td>Portfolio organization is determined by learner or negotiated with mentor/advisor/teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summative-what has been learned to date? (Past to present)</td>
<td>Rarely used for high stakes decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires extrinsic motivation</td>
<td>Formative-what are the learning needs in the future? (Present to future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audience: external-little choice</td>
<td>Fosters intrinsic motivation-engages the learner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Audience: learner, family, friends-learner can choose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Barrett (2007, p. 444)

Two other conclusions drawn are that 1) to achieve the highest level of implementation of an ePortfolio project requires a strong leader or a technology coordinator, and 2) the “school-
wide, cross-curricular approach offers the most exciting potential to support teaching, learning, and change” (Barrett, 2007, p. 447).

**Feedback in an ePortfolio Environment**

An alternative application of ePortfolios has been investigated whereby networks of student ePortfolios are made available for both teacher and peer feedback (Barbera 2009; Fahey, Lawerence, & Paratore, 2007). Barbera (2009) found that both quality and content of feedback from students and teachers leads to better ePortfolio results. She also argued, “there is a tangible difference between the type of content of the messages between teacher and students and between the students themselves that include greater reflection as a differential fact“ (Barbera, 2009, p.355). This differential is also observed in the results obtained from and student satisfaction with the group assignments.

Fahey and his colleagues (2007) investigated the use of open-source, bulletin-board technology to create an electronic portfolio forum for establishing collaborative learning environments in the context of a middle school, and undergraduate teacher preparation program, and a graduate leadership program. The focus of their research was to “change the ways teachers and students think about, talk about and use data,” with the ultimate goal of making “learning an ongoing process of collegial inquiry” (p.469). Their findings are three-fold. First, students at all levels shared and continued to share large amounts of their work publically. Second, students learned to provide one another with feedback on assignments, to share ideas, and to use feedback to prompt further learning. Third, the forum encouraged students to make connections to their work and their own personal interests. While the goal was to increase the quality of reflection and student learning (e.g. to improve classroom practices), this particular study did not conduct an analysis of the content of teacher candidate reflections. The researcher admits that they have
yet to document a) the effects of the interactions, b) whether the quality of student work improved, c) if reflections became increasingly insightful, and d) if student feedback became more thoughtful (Fahey et al, 2007, p.469).

Wade and Yarbrough (1996) conducted a study of 212 teacher education students’ efforts to think reflectively through the process of constructing a portfolio. The findings revealed that while the portfolio process prompted reflective thinking in many students, it was not observed across all cases. They found that the quality of instructor feedback and the ability for the students to document their experiences well in the portfolio were correlated to the usefulness of the portfolio to prompt reflection (Wade & Yarbrough, 1996). Additionally, “when the portfolio helps students reflect about their learning experiences they are more likely to value and enjoy the portfolio process… and report that they will use the portfolio for personal and professional uses” (Wade & Yarbrough, 1996, p. 72).

Levels of Reflectivity

Orland-Barak (2005) conducted a study of two kinds of portfolios used in in-service courses for mentors of teachers in Israel (process and product portfolios) to explore the quality of reflection within portfolios. The content of the process portfolio was left to the discretion of the participants, while the product portfolio was more structured and focused on the products of learning a new national curriculum. The product portfolio was used as an assessment of their learning and guidelines for writing were provided by the course leaders in advance of portfolio construction. The major finding in this study was that regardless of the type of portfolio created, many of the mentors described the value of learning by doing, but failed to reflect at a deeper level regarding what they were actually learning or applying in practice. Orland-Barak (2005) concluded that the participants remained mainly at the descriptive levels of reflection, “reporting
on their actions and plans, and exhibiting deliberative and technical language of performance” (p.34). In cases where the level of dialogic reflection was observed, it is important to note that the ‘product portfolios’ yielded more entries at this level of reflection than did ‘process portfolios’.

Ayan and Seferoglu (2011) conducted a case study with eight pre-service teachers that investigated the use of ePortfolios to promote reflective thinking. Using Hatton and Smith’s (1994) framework of reflectivity, ePortfolio entries were subjected to content analysis and coded based on the four types of reflection discussed in the framework. According to their findings, the majority of entries fell within the descriptive level. It is important to note that they found evidence of all four levels of reflection, but the total number of dialogic and critical reflection levels was much less than the other two types of reflectivity.

Liu and Zeichner (2008) analyzed the content and quality of reflective thinking within prospective teachers’ ePortfolio artifacts. They employed van Manen’s (1977) three levels of reflectivity as a framework for this analysis. The results of this study indicated that the reflections of prospective teachers tended to fall more at the technical level than the practical level, and rarely at the critical level of reflection. An additional finding was that prospective teachers tend to have a very positive point of view when describing their experiences, an attribute that Liu and Zeichner (2008) refer to as “sunshining.”

Thomas and Liu (2009) analyzed the same case study data used by Liu and Zeichner (2008) using open coding and memoing to investigate the overall positivity or “sunshining” observed across the ePortfolios. The results of this study indicate that prospective teachers tend to “brag about their teaching” through the use of academic buzzwords and downtoning events that took place, often shifting the blame to others for their shortcomings (see Figure 2).
Building on the previous research conducted in 2008, Thomas and Liu (2012) employed a grounded theory approach to analyze teacher candidates’ ePortfolio reflections used in the 2008 studies (Lui & Zeichner, 2008). In this study, student interviews were added as an additional source of data. At one level of analysis they note a predictable and positive pattern of how teacher candidates reflected, a process previously referred to as “sunshining.” The second layer of their study focuses on what the content of teacher candidates’ reflections revealed. The analysis uncovered yet another theme termed Race Talk (Liu, 2011). Consistent with the sunshining pattern, teacher candidates discussed issues of diversity and race but failed to display reflection at the critical level as defined by Hatton and Smith (1995).

Barriers To the Development of Reflection In EPortfolios

Shulman (1998), a leader in the portfolio movement, described five challenges of utilizing portfolios:
1. “Lamination”-A portfolio becomes a mere exhibition, an opportunity for self-aggrandizement, a chance to show off.

2. “Heavy lifting”- Is all the hard work a portfolio demands really worth the effort?


4. “Perversion”- Portfolio scoring systems might objectify portfolios to the point that the portfolios lose their ability to evaluate individual outcomes.

5. “Misrepresentation”- Does the emphasis on best work mis-represent the candidate’s work, so as not to be a true picture of competency (p.35).

Interestingly much of the more current research on ePortfolios and the development of reflective thinking have noted similar barriers (Hatton & Smith, 1995; Hicks, et al, 2007; Jaeger, 2013; Lombardi, 2008; Schön, 1988; Wetzel & Strudler, 2006). Some of the most frequently mentioned barriers that come with creating ePortfolios are a) time constraints, b) unclear benefits and/or rationale, as well as guidelines for creating the ePortfolio, and c) fear of being judged.

Teacher candidates may show resistance to the amount of work required in the creation of an ePortfolio. Many professors and students complain of time wasted on a project through which few will benefit. “If the process of building a portfolio is seen only as an add-on to a course, or as part of an external assessment initiative, then the portfolio writer may only complete the tasks and collect the artifacts as a means to that end” (Hicks et al, 2007, p. 451). When ePortfolios are not implemented with a clear rationale and set of expectations and guidelines throughout the program, the requirement of an ePortfolio can lead to frustration and apathy among teacher candidates (Lombardi, 2008; Wetzel & Strudler, 2006). Indeed, if professors are inconsistent in communicating the benefits of creating the ePortfolio, this can lead teacher candidates to be confused about its purpose. Finally, Wetzel and Strudler (2006) argue that the content and
timing of what should be included in the ePortfolio must be carefully considered so that teacher candidates feel its purpose is validated. Additionally, the fear of being evaluated and the associated consequences attached to high-stakes assessment can become a major barrier to developing reflective thinking. This is especially true among novice teachers who tend to be heavily ego-involved, with an inability to step out of the teaching event in order to reflect on it in an objective way (Jaeger, 2013). Schön (1988) and Hatton and Smith (1995) also cautioned that the expectation of reflective thinking could be particularly strenuous on novice teachers, provoking vulnerability and anxiety leading to the adoption of defensive strategies for self-protection, and can ultimately undermine reflection.

**Summary**

Clearly, open communication and purposeful planning must be central to the implementation of an ePortfolio project if it is to truly serve as a vehicle for the development of teacher candidates reflective practices. Zeichner and Wray (2001) also concluded “Despite the current popularity of teaching portfolios, there have been very few systematic studies of the nature and consequences of their use for either assessment or development purposes” (p. 615). EPortfolios have many beneficial attributes when it comes to their use in teacher education programs; however if the goal of the ePortfolio is to produce reflective practitioners we must focus on ways to mitigate these barriers (Jaeger, 2013). In the next chapter, the researcher describes the methods that will be utilized to analyze the level of reflection evidenced in teacher candidates’ ePortfolios from a small sample from a large University in the southwest United States.
Chapter 3
Methodology

For the purpose of this study, a qualitative case study research design was employed in order to examine the effectiveness of the ePortfolio as a tool to aid in the development of teacher candidate reflection (Creswell, 2007). This researcher selected a case study design because; “it offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomena” (Merriam, 1998, p.41). EPortfolio projects at a university are complex and require the researcher to study many different elements of their creation (i.e., faculty, teacher candidates, program documents).

This case study is situated and bound to one university’s elementary teacher education program’s ePortfolio project. The researcher chose to focus on 15 randomly selected ePortfolios from a class group that the researcher had taught during the fall 2014 semester and analyze them together as one case.

Much of the research on ePortfolios fails to describe what teacher candidates are reflecting on (i.e., content), or identify the type of reflection that is taking place within the ePortfolio. The following questions helped frame this case study:

1. In what ways are teacher candidates prompted to reflect on professional practices throughout their teacher preparation program?
2. What is the quality of teacher candidates’ reflections within the ePortfolio?
3. How did the experience of creating an ePortfolio aid teacher candidates in becoming reflective practitioners?
Participants

This study was situated within a large university in the southwest United States in their College of Education, Teaching and Learning Department. Fifteen (15) teacher candidates who were enrolled in EDU 323 a Teaching and Learning Elementary Education course in fall 2014 and who completed their ePortfolio project represent the sample for this case study. Three (3) teacher candidates from the sample of fifteen ePortfolios participated in the focus group interview. All participants’ names were changed in order to ensure confidentiality. The data gained and converged from this case helps educators better understand the reflective practices that teacher education candidates develop through the construction of ePortfolios and ultimately improve ePortfolio assessment at this particular university and other similar institutions.

Validity and Reliability

With any study the question of validity and reliability depends on the quality and execution of the study. Therefore, these concerns were approached through careful attention to how the study was conceptualized, the sources of data collected, analyzed, and interpreted, and how the findings were presented (Merriam, 1998). A purposeful sampling of participants and systematic collection of data helped ensure validity (Yin, 2003). The sample for this qualitative exploratory case study was selected utilizing a purposeful sampling method. This method is typically used when a researcher wants to discover, understand and/or gain insight regarding a specific population (Merriam, 1998). Purposeful sampling was chosen because the sample (teacher candidates) is likely to be knowledgeable and informed about the phenomena (reflection/ePortfolios) the researcher investigated (McMillian & Schumacher, 1997). For this reason, the researcher chose to select a sample from which one could learn the most. This qualitative case study also utilized multiple sources of data to facilitate a deep understanding of
how ePortfolios aid in the development of teacher candidate reflection (Creswell, 2007). Three different sources of data were utilized: program documents, candidate ePortfolios, and a focus group. Collectively the overall design of this case study helped to ensure that the findings are deemed both valid and reliable.

**Data Sources**

According to Yin (2015), the use of multiple sources of information will provide depth and clarity to ensure a robust case study. Of the four different types of information gathered for qualitative studies, this study utilized two: documents and interviews (Creswell, 2003). Within the category of documents, this researcher chose to analyze program documents and teacher candidate ePortfolios. Following this analysis, a focus group was utilized to further examine emerging themes.

**Program Documents**

The researcher first reviewed documents guiding the universities elementary teacher education program. It was important to better understand the conceptual framework used to establish program learning outcomes and course learning outcomes assessed within the university. Within the teacher preparation program, the syllabi for Practicums I and II, as well as student teaching were reviewed to determine if key assignments were prompting reflection in teacher candidates’ artifacts. It was critical to determine whether reflection is deemed an important quality in teacher candidates at this university, and if there is evidence of that view in the conceptual framework and ePortfolio project assignments (See Figure 2). The 21st Century ePortfolio Project Website (21c ePortfolio Project) used to guide teacher candidates through the creation of their ePortfolio project was also analyzed in order to evaluate the connection between
desired outcomes and the required content of the ePortfolio

(https://sites.google.com/a/unlv.nevada.edu/21cportfolio/home).

Figure 3: Documents Evaluated

Teacher Candidate ePortfolios

Fifteen (15) ePortfolios from a purposeful sample were examined and evaluated in two separate analyses. The first analysis of ePortfolios, artifacts, and narratives were assessed in terms of the four criteria for reflection using Rodgers, (2002) (see Table 2). The second analysis used Hatton and Smith’s (1998) framework, (i.e., descriptive writing, descriptive reflection, dialogic reflection, critical reflection) to analyze the levels and type of reflective thinking prevalent in the ePortfolios.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Artifact or Evidence within the EPortfolio</th>
<th>Emerging Themes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A meaning-making process; candidate demonstrates a deeper understanding of relationships with and connections among experiences and ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate demonstrates a systematic, rigorous, disciplined way of thinking that is grounded in scientific inquiry (theory to practice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate provides evidence of reflecting within a community, in interactions with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidate’s reflections demonstrate a desire for personal and intellectual growth, for oneself and others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Focus Group**

Finally, from the sample of 15, teacher candidates were invited to participate in a focus group to further explore the emerging themes derived from the examination of the ePortfolios. Three teacher candidates of the fifteen that were invited volunteered to participate in the focus group. The focus group uncovered the degree to which teacher candidates’ ideas and perceptions about the process of creating an ePortfolio and the development of becoming reflective in their practices.

**Data Analysis Methods**

When examining the ePortfolios and focus group transcripts, the researcher analyzed data using an open coding technique (Creswell, 2007) in order to separate it into manageable categories. The researcher looked for common themes like educational buzzwords, and similarities in how teacher candidates described the process of creating an ePortfolio. A difference in emerging themes and categories prompted the need for further axial coding (Strauss & Corbin, 1990). The researcher then took similarities and specifically examined them further. Exploring the data further helped the researcher come to a deeper understanding of the research questions.

**Contribution of the Study**

Creating an ePortfolio for teacher candidates has many benefits, most importantly the potential to develop practitioners who are committed to daily reflection as a means for continual improvement. Identifying strengths and areas of improvement in the ePortfolio project ensures promising principles full of potential are developed. To be fully beneficial educators must ensure that all persons involved in the ePortfolio project follow appropriate guidelines for the completion and evaluation of artifacts included in the ePortfolio. This study identifies both
strengths and areas for improvement in the ePortfolio to prompt reflective thinking. Areas of disconnect in the program and/or ePortfolio documents between what administrators and professors desire as outcomes and what the teacher candidates are actually experiencing are uncovered. The implication of this research intends to help fill the existing void in the literature regarding ePortfolios and teacher candidates’ reflective practice. The findings collected from this research are necessary to determine all possible uses and outcomes of ePortfolios, not only in the development of reflective thinking and practice, but also in the overall efficacy of using ePortfolios as a tool in teacher education programs. The research findings are transferable to the use of ePortfolios in other teacher education programs, higher education across disciplines, and into PreK-12 classrooms. Finally, educators must better understand how teacher candidates learn to be reflective and to what extent the process of creating an ePortfolio facilitates reflection.
Chapter 4

Analysis

The purpose of this chapter is to review the three research questions investigated, and the findings of the analyses conducted by the researcher. Table 3 below provides a review of the research questions and the primary sources of data used to answer the questions in this case study.

Table 3: Research Questions and Data Sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Questions</th>
<th>Data Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q1- In what ways are teacher candidates prompted to reflect on professional</td>
<td>University-Level Program Website;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>practices throughout their teacher preparation program?</td>
<td>Practicum and Student Teaching Syllabi;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Department-Level ePortfolio Project Website;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ePortfolio, focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2-What is the quality of teacher candidates’ reflections within the ePortfolio?</td>
<td>ePortfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3-How did the experience of creating an ePortfolio aid teacher candidates in</td>
<td>Focus group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>becoming reflective practitioners?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Documents

University-Level COE Field Placement Website

This website contains a wealth of information about the teacher preparation program. Two of the important documents included are the Student Handbook and the ePortfolio Planning Guide.
Student handbook. Within the website (http://education.unlv.edu/ofe/) teacher candidates are to access the Student Handbook (n.d.) for this program. The document outlines the program learning objectives and other important information related to student success through the program; however, there is no mention of the development of an ePortfolio as a project. An analysis of the program learning objectives further revealed that there is no objective specific to the development of reflection or reflective practitioners.

ePortfolio planning guide. The COE Field Placement Site contains an ePortfolio Planning Guide that identifies seven goals for the ePortfolio. The researcher felt it was important to include all seven goals here to make transparent the misalignment between the university-level and the department-level descriptions of the ePortfolio goals. The university-level COE Field Placement Site lists the following seven goals for the ePortfolio project:

1. To provide a process through which teacher-candidates connect the theory base provided in coursework with the actual practice in the field.

2. To demonstrate that teacher-candidates have a well-defined philosophy of education that reflects their ability to document that through their efforts students will learn.

3. To provide evidence that teacher-candidates have a wide range of skills and strategies that support student learning.

4. To provide evidence-based data for teacher-candidates to use to support student learning.

5. To provide evidence that teacher-candidates understand children as developing young people and how to support them in their journey to competency and maturity.

6. To provide evidence that the College of Education Principles have been learned and implemented.
To provide evidence that teacher-candidates have the professional dispositions that make them exceptional colleagues and professionals.

The researcher observed that the terms reflection and/or reflective practitioner are not included in the ePortfolio goals at the university-level. Additionally, goal number 6 references “College of Education Principles;” however, these principles are no longer being used at this university. It appears that this document may have been created before the department-level ePortfolio website that teacher candidates are currently using, and that the university-level website has not been updated.

**Department-Level 21st Century ePortfolio Project Website**

The 21c ePortfolio Website welcome page gives the teacher candidates a clear rational and purpose for creating the ePortfolio (https://sites.google.com/a/unlv.nevada.edu/21cportfolio/home). Within the statement, reflection is a common theme and mentioned four times. Teacher candidates are expected to show evidence of reflection of past performance in order to improve future performance in the classroom (See Appendix A). However, a similar analysis of other supporting documents provided to teacher candidates shows that the focus is only on the content (i.e. artifacts) and organization of the ePortfolio.

The ePortfolio must include five separate sections: Introduction (about me), Educational Philosophy, Artifacts, Resources, and Conclusion page. In general, teacher candidates included why they wanted to be a teacher or where they were from in the introduction page. Teacher candidates included a short statement of their personal beliefs related to education in their philosophy page. In the artifacts sections, teacher candidates were directed to include at least five to eight artifacts that were connected to the InTASC Standards. Teacher candidates are
reminded that “artifacts are to be drawn from work you have saved/archived throughout your elementary teacher education program. Include only artifacts that have been evaluated by course instructors and revised by you if needed” (21c ePortfolio website, 2016). The researcher notes that none of the ePortfolios included eight artifacts. In fact, most included either six or seven artifacts. In the resources section, half of the teacher candidates used graphics (e.g. graphic of the cover to the Teach Like a Champion book) to show the resource, but failed to describe the resource or reflect on how that resource supported learning in the classroom. The only mention of reflection appears to be the description of the conclusions page of the ePortfolio project, where teacher candidates are to discuss the ways in which the experience of creating the ePortfolio contributed to their professional growth. Interestingly, of the 15 ePortfolios analyzed in this study, the majority of teacher candidates’ conclusions page focused on the impact that a professor/instructor had on them. This appears to have been directed by a site facilitator-created ePortfolio workshop guide (see Appendix B). Included on this website is a resources page where teacher candidates can locate the rubric used to grade the ePortfolio. The site facilitator’s independently created ePortfolio directional worksheet does not align to the grading rubric for the ePortfolio (see Appendix C).

**Practicum I & II, and Student Teaching Syllabi**

Teacher candidates, after completing pre-major course work with a C or better and passing the PRAXIS core exam, are eligible to begin their last three courses in the teacher education program: Practicum I (EDEL311), Practicum II (EDEL 313), and Student Teaching (EDEL 481) (see Appendix D). The researcher analyzed various syllabi for these three courses in order to determine when and how the ePortfolio is implemented.
Practicum I (EDEL 311). A thorough content analysis of all program documents related to Practicum I was conducted specifically checking for references of reflection and key assignments that would aid in the development of reflective practice.

The first practicum meets twice weekly at the school site for three hours each day. The Practicum I syllabus includes InTASC Standards, as well as eleven learning objectives for the course. An analysis of the identified learning objectives for this course reveals that there is no direct mention of reflection or a clear focus on the development of reflective practice.

Within the Practicum I syllabus, there are also six performance assessments identified: lesson planning, disposition evaluation, analysis of student work assignment, classroom instruction (three formal lessons), Lemov assignment, and midterm and final reflections. The syllabus contains information about the dispositions evaluation and the Lemov assignment specifically. It includes a log from the COE Field Placement Site, and the professional dispositions assessment that is completed by the mentor teacher. Teacher candidates are required to use the Elementary Lesson Planning Template (see Appendix E) during the initial period of their practicum. All lessons throughout the semester must be approved in advance of the lesson being taught. Teacher candidates are reminded to complete the reflection portion of the template after each teaching experience (Practicum I Syllabus). Within the materials section of the syllabus teacher candidates are directed to The COE Field Placement Site for more detailed information about evaluation criteria about the performance assessments. However, nowhere in the syllabus or the website are the “midterm and final reflections assessment” described. Also not mentioned anywhere in the syllabus is the ePortfolio project. Clearly, there appears to be a misalignment of the syllabus and program vision.
In regards to the lesson plan, teacher candidates are given a detailed description as well as a lesson plan template to follow (see Appendix E). Included in that template is a section for reflection. In the detailed description, the reflection section asks candidates to “consider how your expectations were or were not met and consider reasons why. Include: strengths, concerns, insights.” However, a closer examination of the lesson plan template given to teacher candidates revealed that teacher candidates are prompted to identify strengths, concerns, and insights with no mention of whether or not learning outcomes were achieved and why this might be the case. Further, an analysis of the reflection section of the grading rubric for the lesson plan revealed that there is a failure to distinguish between “superficial” and “in depth” reflection. Therefore, the majority of the candidates are responding to the simplified prompt on the template and not actually reflecting at a deep level (i.e., dialogic and critical). What remains unknown is whether this rubric is currently being used to (grade), and give feedback, within the course and during the benchmark checks, to allow teacher candidates to develop the skill of reflection and/or reflective practices over time.

The researcher analyzed fifteen ePortfolios. Of those ePortfolios, almost half (7 of 15) did not include an example of a lesson plan. Five teacher candidates (33%) included links to lesson plans in their ePortfolios; however, these lesson plans were missing the reflection section. Of the 15 ePortfolios analyzed only three (20%) teacher candidates’ ePortfolios included a lesson plan with a short reflection section. The reflection sections had three bulleted parts: strengths, concerns, and insights. The teacher candidates wrote one or two sentences describing each. The majority of these reflections are considered to be at the “superficial level” according to the grading rubric and at the descriptive level according to Hatton and Smith (1995). It appears that
the grading rubric for the lesson plan is not being used or at least not being used consistently, by faculty and site facilitators.

**Practicum II (EDEL 313).** The second practicum is taken just prior to student teaching and meets one day a week for ten hours at the school site and a second day for three hours at the school site. Just as with the syllabus for Practicum I, the Practicum II syllabus lists the InTASC Standards and the same eleven learning objectives. Teacher candidates are directed to the same website for more detailed information on the assignments. There are six performance assessments associated with Practicum II: the dispositions evaluations, evaluation of instruction, lesson planning, Lemov strategies assignment, the ePortfolio, and service hours. Reflection appears to be more of a focus in this practicum. In the Lemov strategies assignment, teacher candidates are prompted to reflect on the use of Lemov techniques in their daily clinical experiences. While this assignment has the potential to facilitate the development at a more dialogic reflection, it appears that the reflection in this assignment is merely asking them to “describe” the use of these techniques.

Within the lesson planning section, teacher candidates are reminded to complete the reflection section after each teaching experience just as they were in Practicum I. Within this syllabus exists a detailed description of the lesson plan reflection section. Candidates are to analyze student work “at a deeper level” and are asked to reflect about their teaching approach and implications for future practice (See Appendix D, p. 4). Although teacher candidates are now asked to reflect at a “deeper level,” the syllabus fails to define and/or provide an example of what is meant by “deeper level” reflection.

The researcher notes that Practicum II appears to be the first mention of the ePortfolio project. Interestingly, this syllabus references artifacts that are already stored; (See Appendix, D
p. 7) however, the researcher found no mention of storing artifacts in the previous Practicum I syllabus. According to the syllabus in Practicum II, the teacher candidates are merely being asked to set goals for the ePortfolio and continue to archive artifacts. Teacher candidates are also directed to create an organizational structure for the ePortfolio. For assistance with the organizational structure, teacher candidates are directed to the 21c portfolio website (https://sites.google.com/a/unlv.nevada.edu/21cportfolio/home). In addition, teacher candidates are informed that they will attend an introductory workshop for support of this project and that site facilitators will schedule “benchmark checks” throughout the semester. Clearly, teacher candidates are not yet physically working on creating the ePortfolio within a specific software program. Again, the purpose of the ePortfolio project is missing from the syllabus. It appears that the ePortfolio website and the introductory workshop are where candidates will learn of the purpose and structure for the ePortfolio project. Also, it seems that the majority of the responsibility for the creation and development of the ePortfolios falls to the site facilitators. Unclear, to this researcher, was the purpose and focus of the “benchmark checks”. For example, is the purpose to simply spot-check the development of the ePortfolio components, or are the benchmark checks to facilitate the development of deeper reflection and reflective practitioners?

**Student Teaching (EDEL 481).** Teacher candidates are in the classroom full time for this entire semester. The syllabus for student teaching is similar to the Practicum I and II syllabi in that it includes the same InTASC Standards and eleven learning outcomes. It also references the Office of Field Placement Website for additional information. The performance assessments mirror those of Practicum II. Teacher candidates are again reminded to complete the reflection section of their lesson plans. The Lemov strategies assignment is designed to provide candidates with daily experience and reflection on these techniques (effectiveness and/or challenges).
Teacher candidates are now directed to choose a theme for their ePortfolio, collect five to eight sample artifacts from three semesters and connect them to the InTASC Standards of which there are ten. It is within this semester course that teacher candidates create and present their ePortfolio project.

The researcher wishes to note that while there are ten InTASC Standards, teacher candidates are only asked to provide evidence (i.e., in the form of an artifact) of having met 5-8 of these teacher performance standards. Still further, in the analysis of fifteen ePortfolios, the majority of the teacher candidates only included 5 or 6 artifacts. Although the teacher candidates might leave the program having met all ten-performance standards, there exists no clear evidence of this in the individual ePortfolios.

Analysis of ePortfolios

Within this study, the researcher conducted two separate analyses of the same 15 randomly selected ePortfolios created by teacher candidates the researcher taught in a teacher preparation course in the fall semester of 2014. The first analysis used the Criteria for Reflection Rubric, which was developed based on Rogers’ (2002) characterization of Dewey’s four criteria for reflection (1933), and proved to be insufficient to determine the level of teacher candidates’ reflections within the ePortfolio (see Figure 3). In other words, the researcher was unable to answer research question number two using Rodgers, (2002) four criteria. Therefore, a second analysis was conducted using Hatton and Smith’s (1995) framework outlining four types of reflection. The researcher felt that the four types of reflection (i.e., descriptive writing, descriptive reflection, dialogic reflection and critical reflection) identified by Hatton and Smith (1995) provided a better framework for analyzing the content and/or level of reflection in teacher
candidates’ ePortfolios. In the following sections, the researcher discusses the findings of each analysis.

**Analysis I**

Due to the fact that teacher candidates were simply asked to connect their artifacts to one of ten InTASC Standards, it was impossible to find evidence of Rodgers’ (2002) criteria for reflection within the ePortfolios. Teacher candidates were not instructed to a) draw connections between or among experiences to gain an appreciation for the relationships with other experiences and/or ideas; b) think in a systematic way with evidence of research; and/or c) reflect in community (Rodgers, 2002). In addition, while the last criteria (i.e., possess an attitude that values personal growth) were observed in some ePortfolios, it appeared to be evidenced in a rather superficial way (e.g., “I want to be a lifelong learner”). Given these limitations, two major themes emerged from the first analysis of the ePortfolios: a) the content of the ePortfolios was overly positive, and b) the teacher candidates use of many educational buzzwords.

**Positive ePortfolios.** The first theme that emerged was the content and reflections of the ePortfolios were all positive. Teacher candidates never referenced a situation where they felt they had been unsuccessful at teaching a lesson. None of the ePortfolios demonstrated an understanding of the social, historical, and/or political issues that are involved in teaching in schools today. In general, candidates played it safe, and described artifacts and/or experiences in a complimentary way. For example:

I have learned that it isn't just the students that learn everyday; teachers are constantly learning and reflecting. I feel more prepared than ever to enter into my first year of teaching and couldn't be more excited (EP 2)
My mentors used Classroom Dojo consistently and the students absolutely love it. The dojo is always on the smartboard, and throughout the day students come up to the board to award themselves points for positive behavior. They also take away points but I rarely saw this because my mentors believe that rewarding points is so much more powerful than taking away points (EP 9).

The students absolutely loved the lesson! It was great to see how engaged they were and just so excited to get their work done! As a future teacher, nothing made me feel better than watching these students react in such a positive manner to my first lesson! It was also the first time I was implementing a Kagan strategy during my closing, which felt very comfortable with me, and opened the students up to discussing their learning (EP 7).

**Educational buzzwords.** Teacher candidates used many educational buzzwords in their ePortfolios. For example, the term “reflection” would be used without demonstrating their ability to reflect about their practices. EP 13 wrote, “As I reflect now at the end of my student teaching and prepare for my career as a teacher, I believe that a teacher's job is never finished, there is always something new to learn.” Another common buzzword in the ePortfolios was the use of the term “life-long learner.” For example, EP 8 wrote, “My ultimate goal is to create lifelong learners and instill a passion for knowledge in every child that I come across…I am certain that I will create lifelong learners that will do great things in our society.” It appears that teacher candidates have an idealistic view of working with children in the classroom.

Not one of the candidates’ ePortfolios mentioned a struggle with students’ behavior, challenges of working with diverse students and/or families, or even the difficulty of working
through language barriers. These topics would have produced more dialogic and critical reflection among teacher candidates (Hatton & Smith, 1995).

**Analysis II**

Using Hatton and Smith’s (1995) framework for levels of reflection, the researcher conducted a second analysis with the same fifteen ePortfolios. The researcher chose Hatton and Smith’s (1995) framework in order to subject the ePortfolio entries to an additional analysis of the content and code the entries based on the four types of reflection. The findings indicate that the vast majority of the entries fell within the categories of “descriptive writing” or “descriptive reflection.” Only one entry was found at the “dialogic reflection” levels and none of the ePortfolios evidenced “critical reflection” levels.

**Descriptive writing.** According to Hatton and Smith (1995), the first type of reflection (i.e., descriptive writing) occurs when the student [teacher candidate] merely describes an event with factual information. This type of reflection was prevalent in all of the ePortfolios. The following are examples of descriptive writing:

This is the first lesson plan that I carried out in my P1 classroom. This lesson got the students excited to learn and got me even more excited to teach them (EP 11)!

This is a bulletin board I created in the classroom of my first practicum. The classroom motto was to "spread rainbows" and this bulletin board really helped spread positivity in the class (EP 7)!

Here are a couple of examples of the student work from my first lesson. I used these as a formative assessment tool to see if the students understood the concept of persuasive
writing. Additionally, it was a way for me to assess the understanding of adjectives and descriptive writing as well (EP 9).

This was the end product of one of my lessons during my second practicum. The students did a research project on a historical African American for Black History Month. I was so impressed with their work that I used it as a bulletin board (EP 3)!

While working with my fifth graders, we kept a math notebook where we put math rules and math examples in. While the rest of the class worked on the examples independently, I would pull a small group who needed more help (EP 5).

These quotes are all consistent with Hatton & Smith’s (1995) first type of reflection. Teacher candidates are merely describing what took place in the teaching experience.

**Descriptive reflection.** In this type of reflection, the student reflection goes beyond factual information and offers a rationale or justification for one’s actions or decisions. This level of reflection was also prominent in the ePortfolios. The following are examples of descriptive reflection:

Each student in my kindergarten classroom has a job. The classroom community atmosphere is created by both the teacher and the students. I want everyone in the class to love and enjoy the classroom and the others in the classroom. Giving a job to each student means giving responsibility to each student, which everyone in the classroom needs to be responsible in making the classroom a nice and better place (EP 3).
At the beginning of the school year, all students in my class had to do this essential skill assessment, so I know each student's abilities and skills. I recorded with a blue pen on the first time and I will use a different color pen to record every time throughout the year. The students will continue to do this assessment every 5 or 6 weeks until they have the abilities to reached and completed all the skills. This assessment easily helps me to record every student's academic progress in my classroom (EP 5).

The students in my 2nd practicum were having trouble remembering which coins were which, so I found an activity that would help them. This money sort was similar to the traditional word sort, where students have to sort words based on their sounds or spelling patterns. Instead, the students had to sort different facts and glue them underneath the corresponding coin. This allowed the students to self-asses, and me to formatively assess, their knowledge of coins and money (EP 1).

The students are participating in math centers through these centers the students are able to develop the math skills they are learning whole group. These centers are pre-made activities that correlate to the standards previously taught so that students are getting further practice. In addition, the students rotate through the centers with a partner that has been chosen by the teacher. These pairings were made specifically to benefit each student so that they can build off of each other (EP15).

The use of anchor charts is also a great way to help boost learner development, especially when introducing a new topic or learning procedure such as multiplication using The
Lattice Method. Anchor charts can be used as effective instructional/learning tools in the classroom. When used correctly, anchor charts can help to facilitate independent student learning as well as student self-regulation. I found this particularly true, as I watched this anchor chart act as a scaffolding tool during this lesson-at first, students relied heavily on the chart to accurately use The Lattice Method, and after a little practice, students gradually stopped relying on the anchor chart to get through the procedures, but rather to self-check and self-regulate their work (EP 10).

These quotes are an example of how teacher candidates are now going one step further describing what they did in the classroom and giving a justification for doing so.

**Dialogic reflection.** In dialogic reflection, the student demonstrates the ability to self-analyze, while taking a step back to evaluate or critique the situation, using qualities of judgment and considering alternative viewpoints. Out of fifteen ePortfolios, there was only one example that was approaching dialogic reflection. The following is the example of dialogic reflection:

If I were to teach this lesson again, I would definitely break it up over a few days. As it was my first lesson, I was very uncertain on the time expectations I should be setting for the students and I had unrealistic expectations (by a long shot) on how quickly they would be able to write (EP 7).

This teacher candidate is clearly exhibiting some dialogue about the teaching experience that took place, detailing that she had underestimated the length of time that it would take students to do the writing portion of this lesson. The teacher candidate was able to step back and provide an example of how she would do the lesson differently giving students more time to complete the writing.
**Critical reflection.** In this type of reflection, the student demonstrates an awareness of social, historical, and/or political, context of events and/or actions and the influence of these contexts to their current classroom. The findings of this study revealed that the ePortfolios reflections were superficial and failed to reach the critical reflection level. The researcher notes that these teacher candidates are not required to connect their current experiences to social, political, or historical contexts based on the analysis of 15 ePortfolio projects, there is no evidence that teacher candidates have developed the ability to reflect in a critical manner.

**Focus Group**

To further explore the process of creating the ePortfolio from the teacher candidates perspective the researcher conducted a focus group on August 27, 2016. Three teacher candidates from the fall 2014 cohort participated in the focus group. It was a small casual atmosphere where the researcher asked the questions and each member in the group took turns answering the question. Themes emerged in the data: unclear purpose and an incohesive process. Themes are discussed below.

**Unclear Purpose**

Teacher candidates articulated that they were unclear about the purpose and rationale for creating their ePortfolio. One teacher candidate believed the purpose of the ePortfolio was to showcase her work during an interview, while another believed it was a requirement to exit the program. According to the focus group participants, the ePortfolio was not utilized after it was turned in at the end of the program. The researcher made one additional observation related to the purpose of the ePortfolio. Throughout the entire focus group interview, none of the participants mentioned that the purpose of the ePortfolio was to aid them in becoming reflective practitioners. The following quotes from the focus group participants’ from August 27, 2016
support the theme of unclear purpose. “From my interpretation, I thought the purpose is for you to show when you were going to get interviewed for a job…to show your lesson plans and things that you’ve done in the classroom” (Participant One). “I thought of it kind of as an exit ticket for graduating and exiting the program” (Participant Two).

**Incohesive Process**

Throughout the focus group, participants were interviewed about the process of creating the ePortfolio. The researcher asked about the timeframe when they were first presented with the ePortfolio assignment, the type of support they received throughout the process, and how they selected the artifacts that were included in their ePortfolio. Participants agreed they initially learned about the ePortfolio during Practicum II, but most of the focused ePortfolio work was conducted during Student Teaching. “We were given the assignment to create the ePortfolio at the beginning of Practicum II, which was about August 2015,” noted Participant One (FG 08/27/16). Participant Two added, “There was not much information given in Practicum II. More was given in Student Teaching, about January 2016” (FG 08/27/16). Participant Three recalls,

> Our workshop was actually on October 13, 2015 and our ePortfolio didn’t need to be submitted until April. So I just felt like that was a lot of time to say this is what you need to do and then to not see it again until January when you really had to start. (Participant One).

These comments, along with others, revealed another issue. Participants felt there was an overall lack of support throughout the process of creating the ePortfolio. Participants mention a) the directions for creating the ePortfolio were unclear, b) they were not given enough examples of what the final ePortfolio should resemble, and c) they didn’t fully understand how to connect
artifacts to the InTASC standards. The following quotes from the focus group support the theme of an incohesive process:

Our workshop was actually in October…then to not see it again until January when you really had to start…Okay, I don’t remember what happened in October. What was I supposed to have? I felt like it was very disconnected and they should have done it [The ePortfolio Workshop] maybe in January or February when that’s when we really needed to focus on it more. (Participant One)

We had an ePortfolio through the university but there was not much detail-oriented things said in it. It was more happening in our cohort. Our site facilitator was the one who said this is what you need in each section and it went more in depth. (Participant Two)

Basically I remember we had a workshop where they told you what you have to do…to me that was just a little intimidating…I am thinking my questions were not really answered, but during my student teaching my site facilitator actually gave us one of the times that we met to work on it with our peers. (Participant Two)

We were told about it in Practicum II…they made it seem like it was only for Student Teaching, so we didn’t take any pictures or do any of our artifacts during Practicum II…So I don’t know exactly when we were supposed to start…I personally started during Student Teaching. (Participant One)
I wish I had more support during the way so maybe complete a section and then go over it together as a group and make sure that’s solid and acceptable and then maybe move on to a next section. I was kind of just putting sections out just trying to get something on there not knowing is this okay, do I have to go back and fix it or something like that. (Participant Two)

See that’s what I had trouble with because, as I read what the standard was for each one needed, I was still not very clear, like oh, what does it really ask from me? As I said I have no experience at all so basically what I did is I went online, and researched it [The InTASC standards]. (Participant Three)

When asked how they would improve the ePortfolio process, Participant Three suggested, “Maybe have more support, more like this is why it’s important, this is why we should do it, this is how its going to help you in your teaching career.” Participant Two commented, “The language was difficult when you read the InTASC standards word for word, so if it was broken down more into layman’s terms, that would’ve been more beneficial.” A final comment from Participant One noted,

Maybe have some check points throughout the semester…like maybe January or February you have to have this section done, the next month you have to have this section done and maybe have our site facilitator spot check it to make sure you have something done in those sections. (FG 08/27/16).

The researcher explored the participants’ perspectives on what they learned from creating the ePortfolio. Participant One said, “I learned about some great resources to use in my classroom that I never heard of or never experienced and I also learned how to make a “Weebly.”
Participant Three commented, “How to navigate a webpage.” Participant Two said, “I learned that you need to have documentation of your professional learning and growth because it’s always good to look back at and grow from. I like the resources part from seeing other peoples ePortfolios.” When asked what it means to be a reflective practitioner, the participants’ answers revealed that they had a general understanding of the concept of reflection. All three participants mentioned the importance of looking back at what you have done and identifying what worked and did not work in the classroom. What was missing from the conversation was an understanding of dialogic reflection or critical reflection (Hatton & Smith, 1995) that tend to focus more on the individual and their own personal growth and how that growth impacts the students that they teach.

In summary, the triangulation of these three data sources (i.e., program documents, ePortfolios, and focus group interview) helped to give the researcher a better understanding of how the design and implementation of the ePortfolio project at this university impacts the development of reflection among teacher candidates.
Chapter 5

Introduction

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the three guiding research questions, discuss the findings, and provide a framework to better understand the phenomena observed in this case study of the ePortfolio project which took place at a large university in the southwest. The researcher believes that the findings of this study contribute significantly to the existing body of research on ePortfolios and its use to facilitate in the development of reflection among teacher candidates.

Research Question 1

The first question the researcher sought to answer is: In what ways are teacher candidates prompted to reflect on professional practices throughout their teacher preparation program? To answer this question, the researcher discusses the findings from the analysis of program documents, fifteen-randomly selected ePortfolios, and transcript notes from a focus group discussion.

Analysis of Program Documents

The specific program documents analyzed in this study included the university and department level websites, as well as practicum and student teaching syllabi.

University and department-level websites. The home page of the 21st Century ePortfolio Project Website thoroughly details the vision and goal for the project; that of producing reflective practitioners. However, a close examination of the university Field Placement website revealed that the goal of reflection and/or the development of reflective practitioners was missing. In fact, beyond the vision statement of the department level ePortfolio Project website there is no mention of the importance of developing reflective practitioners
through the teacher education program. Another important finding was that the goals stated within the ePortfolio-planning guide produced by the COE Field Placement Site were ambiguous and outdated, referring to College of Education’s Standards rather than InTASC Standards that are currently being used in the program. Such misalignment of the standards being used across the program, and within the ePortfolio itself, can present an area of confusion for teacher candidates completing the ePortfolio.

**Course syllabi/key assignments.** The syllabi for Practicums I and II, as well as Student Teaching were analyzed to identify specific assignments given to teacher candidates across practicum courses. The researcher observed the three syllabi across the field experiences to be almost identical. The focus of reflection in the syllabi appeared minimal as it was only included in the discussion section of the lesson plan. Interestingly, there is no mention of the ePortfolio project until Practicum II. A review of the course syllabi allowed the researcher to identify specific assignments given to teacher candidates across practicum courses. Several assignments that are designed to prompt reflection, such as the educational philosophy statement, lesson plans, the Lemov strategies assignment, the assessment assignment and creating the ePortfolio itself. However, although all of these assignments have the potential to facilitate the development of reflection among teacher candidates, the only assignment that teacher candidates are required to include in the ePortfolio is the educational philosophy statement. Other than the philosophy statement, the program appears to leave the selection of artifacts for the ePortfolio completely up to the individual teacher candidate. As a result, several of the most valuable assignments in terms of reflection were not included in the fifteen ePortfolios analyzed in this study.

**Timing of ePortfolio construction.** It is the opinion of the researcher that the timing of the ePortfolio project comes too late in the program. According to the review of documents, the
identification and gathering of artifacts, the ePortfolio does not actually begin until Practicum II. This is problematic because a large body of research reveals that the development of reflection, and becoming a reflective practitioner, occurs over time (Bishop, Brownell, Klingner, Leko, & Galman, 2010; Shulman, 1998; Turner-Bissett, 1999; Oner & Adadan, 2011; Jaeger, 2013). As teacher educators we may witness glimpses of reflection in individual assignments, however, developing the habit of reflection in, for, and on one’s daily practices appears to require significantly more time than is given in the program that is the focus of this study. Having teacher candidates begin to collect artifacts for their ePortfolio during their second to last semester does not appear to allow them enough time to develop a higher level reflective practice, such as going beyond descriptive writing and descriptive reflection. If teacher candidates were to begin working on their ePortfolios during their first semester of the teacher education program, they would have more time to develop the practice and habit of higher level reflection. Further, even if the ePortfolio project at this university were to start at the beginning of the program, guidelines and assignments must also be altered to better align to the vision and prompt deeper reflection in teacher candidates (i.e., dialogic and critical reflection). In fact, aside from the educational philosophy statement, there is no evidence in the ePortfolios that teacher candidates are developing reflection throughout the program. Lastly, teacher candidates must also be made aware of the ePortfolio’s importance. Teacher candidates should not feel that this ePortfolio project is merely another assignment that needs to be completed in order to graduate, but rather a valuable tool to help in their development as reflective practitioners.

**Analysis of ePortfolio**

Typical artifacts found among the teacher candidates’ ePortfolios in this study included pictures of them working with students in small group settings or pictures of a learning diagram.
that was used with students in a lesson. Because the ePortfolio directions asked candidates to link 5-8 artifacts to the teaching standards, most students included five or six artifacts that were connected to the InTASC Standards. However, out of fifteen ePortfolios analyzed, only three included lesson plans with the reflection section. Seven of the ePortfolios had no lesson plan as an artifact, and five had a lesson plan without a reflection section. This is an interesting observation because the actual lesson plan template that teacher candidates are given has a section that asks them to reflect. In the template teacher candidates are directed to give descriptions of their strengths, concerns and insights after the lesson has been taught. Yet, an analysis of the detailed description of the lesson plan (see Appendix, E) reveals that these three areas are explained in a detailed way that would provide the teacher candidates with the opportunity to reflect at the levels of dialogic or critical reflection. For example, the candidates are prompted to explain (i.e., reflect) areas of the lesson where they felt they had exhibited strengths, concerns and insights, as well as to reflect whether expectations, (e.g., lesson objectives) were met. This type of reflection has the potential for deeper and higher level reflection. However, the researcher found that teacher candidates are merely writing a bulleted list of one or two strengths, concerns and insights without actually elaborating to demonstrate a level of reflection beyond the descriptive writing level described by Hatton and Smith (1995).

Most interesting were the artifacts about how the university helped them grow and/or develop as a teacher. Within the ePortfolios analyzed, many teacher candidates described a professor who had a positive influence on them. The focus on positive influences found in the sample of ePortfolios analyzed in this study may be an example of the “sunshining” affect that Thomas and Liu (2012) describe as “a positive predictable pattern of how teacher candidates reflect” (p.314) While this type of reflection was not in the initial guidelines for the ePortfolio,
the teacher candidates were prompted to add this type of reflection to their conclusions by a site facilitator who had created an easy to follow worksheet for teacher candidates to create the ePortfolio (see Appendix B). The fact that this researcher found evidence of sunshining and an overall lack of personal critic (i.e., dialogic or critical reflection) may also be explained by a “fear of being judged” mentality (Bishop, Brownwell, Klinger, Leko & Galman, 2010; Jaeger 2013; Shulman, 1998; Stiggins, 2002; Thomas and Liu, 2012). In other words, teacher candidates project their best selves without reflecting on how they might have done something incorrectly or insufficiently in order to ensure that the grade for the course is a good one. When ePortfolios are used as a performative assessment (i.e., evidence that program standards are taught and met; assessment of learning) as opposed to a transformative learning tool (i.e., to develop the skills and habit of dialogic and critical reflection; assessment for learning), then candidates may be afraid to be critical of their practices for fear of being judged as not having met the standards of the teaching profession (Bishop, Brownell, Klinger, Leko, & Galman, 2010; Jaeger, 2013; Shulman, 1998; Stiggins, 2002). Clearly, the purpose of the ePortfolio project must be reexamined. This researcher believes that the ePortfolio project has the potential to facilitate the development of reflection and reflective practitioners; however, both insufficient time (e.g., development across a program) and a high-stakes environment (i.e., evaluation with an assigned grade) appear to undermine the transformative potential of this ePortfolio project.

**Analysis of Focus Group Transcript**

The third type of data used to better understand ways in which teacher candidates are prompted to reflect throughout their teacher preparation program was the transcript of a focus group of teacher candidates who completed the ePortfolio project during 2014. Teacher candidates expressed that they felt an overall lack of support throughout the entire process of
creating the ePortfolio. They described being aware of the project in Practicum II; however they stated that they didn’t truly begin working on the ePortfolio until there last course (i.e., student teaching). Additionally, an analysis of the transcript notes reveals that the teacher candidates did not have a clear rationale for the creation of the ePortfolio. Not one participant in the focus group mentioned that the purpose was to develop the skill or habit of reflection and/or to facilitate their development as reflective practitioners. These findings, support the conclusion that, given this time constraint, it is difficult to develop, much less expect that teacher candidates will develop deep reflection (Bishop, Brownell, Klingner, Leko, & Galman, 2010; Shulman, 1998; Turner-Bissett, 1999; Oner & Adadan, 2011; Jaeger, 2013).

Research Question 2

The second question the researcher sought to answer is: *What is the quality of teacher candidates’ reflections within the ePortfolio?* To answer this question, the researcher discusses the findings from the analysis of program documents, fifteen randomly selected ePortfolios, and transcript notes from a focus group discussion.

**Analysis of Program Documents**

Findings revealed that there is a misalignment of the vision statement from the ePortfolio project website and several other documents that are given to teacher candidates. The ePortfolio appears to be used more as an evaluation of the teaching (and/or accreditation) standards with teacher candidates simply selecting artifacts that seem to match a particular standard and describing the standard. However, there is little to no evidence that the teacher candidates actually understand the standards and how the artifacts are connected to and/or reflect the various professional teaching standards.
Analysis of ePortfolios

In order to answer this second research question, we must clarify what is meant by reflection. According to Rodgers (2002), reflection

“Is a meaning-making process that moves a learner from one experience into the next with a deeper understanding of its relationships with, and connections to, other experiences and ideas;…a disciplined way of thinking…happens in community, in interactions with others;” and “requires attitudes that value the personal and intellectual growth of one-self and of others” (p.845).

As was discussed in Chapter 2, several scholars have put forth theories about reflection (Dewey, 1933; Kolb, 1984; Schön, 1987) and linked reflection to the learning process. As Schön (1987) argued, this disciplined way of thinking should incorporate reflection in action, reflection on action, and reflection for action. Becoming a reflective practitioner is important to being responsive to the ever-changing needs of students, and ultimately to one’s effectiveness in the classroom (Rosen, 2008). Table 4 places Hatton and Smith’s (1995) four types of reflection alongside Bloom’s Taxonomy (1956) of Higher Order Thinking to propose a hierarchical theory much like that of Valli (1997), who argued that reflective thinking is developmental, moving from a lower level (i.e., technical) to a higher level (i.e., critical) of reflection. Bloom’s Taxonomy (Bloom, Englehart, Furst, Hill, & Krathwohl, 1956), is frequently used in education to classify the types of learning objectives set for students; however, the taxonomy also provides a hierarchical framework with which educators can focus on developing higher order thinking. At the lower level, students are asked to simply remember and/or understand facts and concepts; however, at the higher level of thinking, educators would expect students to demonstrate the ability to apply, analyze, evaluate, and/or create (see Table 4).
Table 4: Types of Reflection: Lower and Higher Order Thinking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Higher Order Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create</td>
<td>Critical Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate</td>
<td>Dialogic Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Order Thinking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand</td>
<td>Descriptive Reflection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember</td>
<td>Descriptive Writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remember</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Create:** Produce new or original work (design, assemble, develop, formulate, etc.)

**Evaluate:** Justify a stand or decision (appraise, defend, support, argue, etc.)

**Analyze:** Draw connections among ideas (e.g., differentiate, organize, relate, compare, contrast, examine, distinguish, question, etc.)

**Apply:** Use information in new situations (e.g., execute, implement, solve, demonstrate, interpret, etc.)

**Understand:** Explain ideas or concepts (e.g., describe, classify, discuss, identify, recognize, report)

**Remember:** Recall of facts and basic concepts (e.g., define, duplicate, list, state)
When Hatton & Smith’s types of reflection framework (1995) is placed alongside Bloom’s Taxonomy (1956), we can easily see that descriptive writing (i.e., describing an event factually) demonstrates Bloom’s idea of lower-order thinking (e.g., remembering or understanding). Descriptive reflection, dialogic reflection, and critical reflection all fall into categories that Bloom (1956) would refer to as higher-order thinking. However, while descriptive reflection goes beyond merely describing an event (i.e., remembering) to include a justification for one’s actions (i.e., evaluation level), it appears that both dialogic reflection and critical reflection more accurately mirror the level thinking and/or cognitive processing that Bloom and his colleagues had in mind when they attempted to make a distinction between lower- and higher-order thinking. Indeed, when teacher educators envision the development of reflective practitioners, the reflection that is required to grow professionally and improve one’s daily practices goes beyond describing and providing a rationale or justification for one’s actions. This researcher argues that thinking at a higher level is more consistent with Hatton and Smith’s (2002) examples of a) dialogic reflection, which requires one to step back to self-analyze and apply new understandings and insights to one’s future actions, and b) critical reflection, which requires one to draw connections among an event and the social, historical, and/or political influences on that event (p. 845). Clearly this higher-level reflection requires one to practice the skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation to potentially create a new way of acting.

If we hope to develop higher order thinking and reflection among teacher candidates, teacher educators must prompt teacher candidates, further to develop their reflective skills.

Out of the fifteen ePortfolios that were analyzed in this study, the teacher candidates had a general understanding of reflection. Since teacher candidates are directed to a) select artifacts,
b) connect their artifacts to the InTASC standards, and c) describe the relationships, teacher candidates are merely demonstrating lower levels of reflection.

**Analysis of Focus Group Transcript**

In regards to the content of the ePortfolio entries and the focus of the candidates’ reflections, the focus group didn’t contribute to this particular research question. However, the teacher candidates expressed a disconnect, between the ‘theory’ behind the InTASC standards and their ‘practice’ in the classroom. Teacher candidates felt that it would have been helpful to have someone thoroughly explain the InTASC standards in order to more easily make the connection between the standards and what they were doing in the classroom. This researcher agrees with their assessment, and she finds these comments particularly interesting because the InTASC Standards are listed on every one of the syllabi analyzed in this study. So it appears that there may be an assumption by the Practicum I and II instructors that these standards have already been introduced to the teacher candidates earlier in the program. The participants in this focus group did not feel that the standards were discussed sufficiently enough to help them select and reflect on classroom practices (i.e., artifacts) that demonstrate and/or reflect what is required within each of the InTASC standards that are to be included in the ePortfolio.

The focus group participants also stated that they had been given specific worksheets from their site facilitator that outlined the artifacts and structures that should be included in the ePortfolio. One worksheet (see Appendix B) suggested that the teacher candidates identify a professor or mentor teacher that had helped them develop professionally. As a result all fifteen ePortfolios that were analyzed had a description of a professor and the program at this university. The ePortfolios were also very positive and filled with educational buzzwords (e.g., life long learning) an additional attribute that Thomas and Liu (2012) refer to as “sunshining.”
Having the teacher candidates connect what they are doing in the classroom to a specific InTASC Standard has the potential to prompt higher order reflection; however, teacher candidates appear to need more clarification and guidance with regard to these standards and the selection of artifacts, if the goal is to facilitate and/or develop reflection and reflective practitioners. The educational philosophy also has the ability to prompt reflection in that the teacher candidates had created the philosophy in the beginning of their teacher education program, then they were asked to include a short statement in the ePortfolio, which is situated in the last three courses of the program. In doing so teacher candidates had the opportunity to think about how their educational philosophy had changed over time prompting them to reflect on how they had developed as teachers. However, this type of reflection appears to be by chance. In other words some teacher candidates may just shorten the original philosophy statement and not really reflect on their transformation.

Additionally focus group participants felt they needed more feedback on their philosophy statements. Overall, teacher candidates felt feedback was minimal during the construction of the ePortfolio. If the goal is to develop reflective practice, teacher candidates need the opportunity to dialogue about their educational philosophy statements, artifacts, and the reflections within the ePortfolio. Barbera (2009) found that both the quality and content of feedback from students and teachers lead to better ePortfolio results. She also argues, “there is a tangible difference between the type of content of the messages between teacher and students and between the students themselves that include great reflection as a differential fact” (Barbera, 2009, p. 355). Therefore, increasing the opportunity for dialogue and feedback during the ePortfolio construction may result in higher quality ePortfolios.
Research Question 3

The last question the researcher sought to answer is: *How did the experience of creating a ePortfolio aid teacher candidates in becoming reflective practitioners?* To answer this question the researcher focuses the discussion on the findings from the focus group transcript notes. Clearly, the perceptions of the participants themselves best help us to understand the experience of creating the ePortfolio and its impact on becoming reflective practitioners.

**Analysis of Focus Group Transcript**

Focus group participants did not reference developing as a reflective practitioner. For them the ePortfolio was a means to an end, in order to graduate. “I thought of it kind of as an exit ticket for graduating and exiting the program (Participant Two).” The process of creating the ePortfolio was incohesive and participants indicated that they truly felt rushed because it was mainly during the last weeks of their student teaching course. Teacher candidates felt an overall lack of support with unclear directions for its completion. Most importantly teacher candidates struggled with connecting their artifacts to the InTASC standards. The teacher candidates’ experience of creating ePortfolios demonstrates a general understanding of reflection with the candidates’ artifacts at the descriptive writing and descriptive reflection level (Hatton & Smith, 1995). When discussing what they took away from creating the ePortfolio project they felt it was important to “look back at what worked or did not work in the classroom (Participant Three).

**Viewing the ePortfolio Holistically**

Shepherd and Skrabut (2011) have argued that if used effectively, ePortfolios have the potential to increase reflection, facilitate the development of content and pedagogical skills, increase communication between teachers and administrators, and promote personal inquiry and growth. However, as seen in this case study, in and of itself the ePortolio project will not
automatically produce these results. The ePortfolio is a complex living document that must be viewed and understood much like an ecosystem. This researcher argues that ePortfolio Ecosystem is made up of six parts: Vision, Implementation Process, Supporting Documents, Technology, Key Players, and Evaluation. If the ePortfolio is to live up to its full potential, all parts of the ePortfolio Ecosystem must be aligned to the vision and goal of the programs ePortfolio project (see Figure 4). The ePortfolio Ecosystem is described below:

Figure 4: ePortfolio Ecosystem

**Program Vision**

The vision includes the purpose and goals and should be used to guide the entire ePortfolio project. Program personnel must determine the purpose of the ePortfolio project. For example, will the ePortfolio be *performative*, used merely to demonstrate that teacher candidates have met a set of standards? Is the ePortfolio going to be used for accreditation purposes and/or
evaluation of the program’s effectiveness? Or will the ePortfolio project be transformative, with the purpose being the development of reflection over time? Either purpose is acceptable, but the teacher education program needs to be clear about its vision and purpose in order to align all other aspects of the ePortfolio and ultimately meet its goals for the teacher candidates.

**Implementation Process**

The implementation process is very important to achieving the purpose and goal of the ePortfolio project and to fulfilling the vision of the overall program. Program designers must decide when the teacher candidates will begin the ePortfolio project. Key assignments to be included in the ePortfolio (i.e., those prompting reflection and connected to program standards) should be identified and connected within the program. In other words, key assignments should be woven throughout the program to ensure that the goal or vision is being met. For example, candidates would write a personal philosophy statement early in the program and revise it sometime during the final practicum experience. Teacher candidates could also be asked to develop and teach lesson plans in a variety of courses throughout the program. They would be prompted to a) reflect on the effectiveness of their teaching with regard to meeting the objective of the lesson, b) to offer evidence to support their conclusions, and c) describe what they would do in subsequent lessons (i.e., connecting practice to theory and making data-driven decisions).

**Supporting documents.** All documents that are available for teacher candidates in the university or institution must be aligned to the goal and vision of the ePortfolio. These aspects include, but are not limited to, the student handbook (n.d) and university website; department level ePortfolio website, guidelines and evaluation rubrics; course syllabi; key assignments; and any required artifacts for the ePortfolio. A critical aspect of the alignment is that supporting documents must be developed and/or approved by the directors of the ePortfolio project before
dissemination to the teacher candidates. Once these documents have been developed and there is clear alignment to the goals and vision, the directors of the ePortfolio project should develop and hold regular informational workshops for teacher candidates and other key players.

**Technology**

The software systems that are chosen for the ePortfolio project must be easily accessible and functional for teacher candidates using them. The university has to assess and/or consider teacher candidates’ competency and efficacy levels with technology when selecting specific software systems for the ePortfolio project. There must be a strong project director or faculty facilitator who is in charge of ensuring that the technology is working correctly and meets the needs of the ePortfolio project for both the teacher candidates and the university (Barrett, 2007).

**Key Players**

There are many different individuals who are involved in the ePortfolio implementation and process. These key players include: university faculty, site facilitators/supervisors, mentor teachers and student teacher candidates. All of the key players need to receive current and updated information about the ePortfolio project and its purpose so there is consistency of expectations across the program. The director of the ePortfolio project must identify who these key players are and ensure that they understand the vision and goal of the program and the ePortfolio project. Still further, because key players often change it is important to offer ongoing professional development with regards to the vision and purpose of the ePortfolio project, as well as how to facilitate deep reflection through instructional feedback.

**Evaluation**

In order to maintain consistency across the program; evaluation must be done on a continuous basis at both the teacher candidate and university level. Key players must assess that
teacher candidates are meeting the goals and vision of the ePortfolio project and the university/institution. To ensure success of the teacher candidates, benchmarks for completion and instructor feedback need to be implemented. More specifically, teacher candidates would be required to complete specific sections of the ePortfolio by a specific date, during a specific semester or course. During each benchmark period, the ePortfolio artifacts submitted would be assessed by a specifically identified key player(s) and returned with specific and instructional feedback about their artifacts and how these artifacts are aligned to the ePortfolio project’s vision and goals; but more importantly to prompt reflection at higher levels than descriptive. Evaluation is also important at the institutional level, assessing whether the ePortfolio project is meeting the standards of the original goal and vision for the ePortfolio project. In other words, the university must evaluate, holistically, the ePortfolio project (i.e., all aspects of the ePortfolio Ecosystem) to determine if there is clear alignment and/or areas for improvement.

Maintaining Homeostasis in the ePortfolio Ecosystem

Within the ePortfolio Ecosystem, if all six parts are not aligned and/or maintained potential threats can disrupt the entire ecosystem. These threats are a normal part of an ecosystem and should be expected. Some examples of potential threats have already been talked about in previous research: fear of being judged, sunshining, lack of technological skill levels, a change in key players, the timing of the introduction and creation of the ePortfolio project and lack of alignment between supporting documents and the overall vision (Bishop, Brownell, Klingner, Leko, & Galman, 2010; Turner-Bissett, 1999;Oner & Adadan, 2011;Jaeger, 2013). It is important to be able to anticipate these potential threats to the ecosystem. If left unexamined, these threats can disrupt the homeostasis in the ePortfolio Ecosystem and result in mutations to the original purpose of the ePortfolio project.
Mutations

Mutations are a disruption to homeostasis of the ePortfolio Ecosystem, and can alter the ePortfolio project. Once a mutation has occurred, it is important to identify the threat and introduce an adaptation, (i.e., a positive improvement or change), to bring the ePortfolio Ecosystem back to its original goal and vision, (i.e. homeostasis). For example, an adaptation could be adding an important key assignment to the program, or ensuring that syllabi are aligned to the vision and goal.

Symbiotic relationships in the ePortfolio Ecosystem are important to maintain. Directors of the ePortfolio project must identify other key players. For example, site facilitators must work in schools and develop partnerships (i.e., symbiotic relationships) with principals and mentor teachers, along with the directors of the ePortfolio project. Key players must continue to develop and maintain symbiotic relationships, which are beneficial for the ePortfolio Ecosystem and ensure that the vision and goal is maintained.

Conclusions: This Case Study ePortfolio Ecosystem

The original vision and goal for of this particular university’s ePortfolio project is to develop reflection among teacher candidates and aid teacher candidates in their documentation of their professional growth. The major purpose is helping teacher candidates reflect on their own professional development. However, there have been many threats to this ePortfolio Ecosystem that have caused mutations to occur. In the figure below, the potential threats are in red font, and homeostasis, alignment, and maintenance have been removed from the original figure (see Figure 5) to demonstrate the current imbalance in the ePortfolio Ecosystem (i.e., loss of homeostasis).
Based on the findings from this study, several threats within the area of implementation (i.e., timing, key assignments, artifacts, informational workshops, and professional development) occurred and resulted in mutations to the ePortfolio project in this university.

**Timing.** The timing of the introduction and implementation of the ePortfolio project is misaligned to what is stated in program documents. The department level website says, “you will be introduced to the ePortfolio project when you enter the teacher education program (21c ePortfolio home page). There is mention of collecting and/or working on the ePortfolio project throughout the teacher education program. However, according to all participants in the focus group and an analysis of the practicum course syllabi, the ePortfolio project is not introduced until their second to last (i.e., Practicum II) course in the field experiences segment of the teacher education program.
education program. Still further, participants indicated that the development of the ePortfolio occurred during student teaching. This timeframe poses a serious threat to the development of reflective practice and higher levels of reflection (i.e., dialogic and critical) among teacher candidates (Bishop, Brownell, Klingner, Leko, & Galman, 2010; Turner-Bissett, 1999; Oner & Adadan, 2011; Hatton & Smith, 1995; Jaeger, 2013).

**Key assignments.** The researcher refers to key assignments as those that have the greatest potential to develop effective and reflective practices among teacher candidates (i.e., Lesson Planning, Lemov Strategies, Student Assessment Analysis). These assignments are not currently required to be included in the ePortfolio. In fact, the findings suggest that the only required assignment is the educational philosophy statement. None of the 15 ePortfolios analyzed in this study included the Lemov Strategies Assignment or the Student Assessment Analysis and Planning Assignment. Of those teacher candidates who included a lesson plan as an artifact, many failed to include the reflection section. These threats cause a mutation to the ePortfolio Ecosystem that has as its vision to develop reflective practitioners.

**Artifacts.** Teacher candidates are given the freedom to self-select the artifacts to be included in the ePortfolio. They are directed to include five to eight artifacts and connect each artifact to one of the ten InTASC Standards. The first threat here appears to be implicit assumption that making this connection will aid in the development of reflection. The second threat is evidenced by the fact that the majority of teacher candidates in this study only included six to seven artifacts. As such it is unclear if teacher candidates have mastered all ten InTASC Standards. The third threat was identified when focus group participants indicated that they did not have a clear understanding of the InTASC Standards. This lack of understanding may help
explain why teacher candidates’ ePortfolios only had examples of lower level reflection (i.e., descriptive writing and descriptive reflection).

Informational workshops. According to focus group participants, the informational workshop was provided during Practicum II and additional information was distributed through the site facilitator. Comments indicate that teacher candidates felt “intimidated” (Participant Three), “did not know exactly when we were supposed to start” (Participant One), and “there wasn’t much detail-oriented things said” (Participant Two). According to the focus group members, a graduate of the teacher education program presented his ePortfolio project during this workshop.

The focus of this presentation (i.e., organization, content, technology, or reflection) remains unclear. Based on the analysis of the 15 ePortfolios in this study, the researcher is led to believe that the focus may be on organization, artifacts, and technology (and not depth of reflection).

Professional development. To maintain alignment to the vision and maintain homeostasis within the ePortfolio Ecosystem, all key players must receive on-going professional development in regards to a) the vision (i.e., reflective practitioners), b) the ePortfolio project, and c) how to facilitate the development of higher levels of reflection. The researcher is unsure as to whether such professional development is taking place. What is known is that it is common for key players to change within an ePortfolio Ecosystem. Therefore, a failure to conduct on-going professional development can pose a serious threat to maintaining homeostasis.

Supporting Documents

The supporting documents within this university’s ePortfolio Ecosystem were analyzed (e.g., student handbook, ePortfolio websites, course syllabi, lesson planning template and rubric,
and the ePortfolio grading rubric) to gain an understanding of vision, purpose, and goals of the ePortfolio project and teacher education program. Misalignment to the original vision of the ePortfolio project was uncovered, causing mutations in the ePortfolio Ecosystem.

**Student handbook.** Within the student handbook (n.d), which is accessed via the University Field Placement Website, the researcher found that there is no mention of the ePortfolio project. Additionally, the program learning objectives do not align with the program vision and goal of developing reflection and reflective practitioners. This misalignment indicates that this document may not have been updated since the ePortfolio project was implemented; and therefore poses a threat to the ePortfolio Ecosystem. While participants in the focus group did not mention this handbook, the researcher believes that any documents that the teacher candidates have access to should be aligned to prevent confusion among candidates.

**ePortfolio websites.** Within the teacher education program, teacher candidates are directed to access documents from two different websites: the University Field Placement Website and the Department of Teaching and Learning’s 21c ePortfolio Website. Teacher candidates are directed to the university level website through their syllabi to find information specific to different assignments (e.g., teaching log, professional dispositions, etc.). In this university level website, there is an ePortfolio planning guide that is misaligned to the department level ePortfolio website. At this moment, no link exists from the university level website to the department level website. As a result, teacher candidates may access misinformation about the ePortfolio project. Such a threat poses a challenge or possible mutation to the ePortfolio Ecosystem.

**Program syllabi.** The researcher observed that the three syllabi are almost identical and share many of the same key assignments (e.g., lesson planning, Lemov strategies, and student
assessment analysis). If the goal of the program is to develop reflective practitioners and “deeper level reflection” (Practicum II Syllabus, 2014), then one has to question why teacher candidates are not given the opportunity to revisit some of those key assignments from earlier practicum courses to develop the skill of reflecting at deeper levels. Additionally, there is no example or definition of what is meant by “deeper level reflection,” so it appears teacher candidates remain with a superficial understanding of reflection (i.e., descriptive).

**Lesson plan description, template & rubric.** In the program there exists three separate documents related to lesson planning. The in-depth lesson plan description, the template for the lesson plan, and the lesson plan grading rubric. The main threat that appears within these documents is a misalignment of what is required in the “reflection section” of the lesson plan. For example, within the in-depth lesson plan description, teacher candidates are prompted to “consider how your expectations were or were not met, and consider reasons why. Include: strengths, concerns, and insights” (Elementary Lesson Plan Detailed Description, p.3). In the reflection section of the lesson plan template, candidates are prompted to “reflect” on the “strengths, concerns, and insights.” Clearly, most of the teacher candidates do not review the detailed description of the lesson plan and fail to address whether or not lesson expectations were met. Still further, in the analysis of 15 ePortfolios, at least half of the lesson plans included failed to even include a reflection section.

A review of the lesson plan-grading rubric reveals the goal for teacher candidates is to provide “notes relating to strengths, challenges, and insights of the lesson plan as well as suggested modifications or improvements for future replication.” The distinguishing characteristic among target, acceptable, and unacceptable is “in-depth notes,” “notes,” and “superficial” notes. It appears that the rubric is not being used because the majority of teacher
candidates’ lesson plans that were included in the ePortfolio did not include suggestions for future improvement. This misalignment has created a mutation in the ePortfolio Ecosystem that is specific to lesson planning.

**ePortfolio grading rubric.** The researcher located the ePortfolio-grading rubric (see Appendix C) within the 21c ePortfolio Project Website. This particular rubric outlines specific areas for evaluation of the ePortfolio: standards, assessment, content, technology, and format/technical skill. The standards section appears to align with the ePortfolio project website in that candidates are to “address more than five InTASC Standards.” In the assessment section, teacher candidates are to show “evidence of having used student assessment data to modify instruction for student learning.” The findings of this study indicate that there is no assessment section in the ePortfolio. Therefore, it is by chance that teacher candidates will include an assessment assignment as an artifact in their ePortfolio. Another issue that was uncovered is that the rubric calls for “examples of lesson planning in more than three content areas/integrates content/refers to content standards/uses a variety of instructional strategies/reflection on professional growth through program content.” Again, findings from the analysis of 15 ePortfolio projects indicated that the rubric is not being used to a) guide the creation of the ePortfolio, b) provide feedback to candidates related to the selection of artifacts and to develop reflective practice, and c) provide a grade for the ePortfolio project.

**Technology**

Teacher candidates are free to choose various software systems they wish to use. However, the focus group participants indicated that their choice was influenced by the software system used by the graduate who presented the ePortfolio in the introductory workshop. The
researcher did not uncover any serious threat to the ePortfolio ecosystem related to the software being utilized.

**Teacher candidates’ competency and efficacy levels.** Teacher candidates have different levels of competency and efficacy with technology. Some teacher candidates felt more confident and more competent in their ability to use the technology required to complete the ePortfolio project. Participant 3 from the focus group expressed that had there not been an individual in her cohort that was technologically savvy, she would have struggled even more with creating the ePortfolio. This points to the need for a software facilitator who can offer tech support to teacher candidates and facilitators.

**Site facilitator.** Research indicates that programs using an ePortfolio should have a strong leader and a technology facilitator (Barrett, 2007). Currently, no technology facilitator was identified. Therefore, the responsibility of supporting teacher candidates with navigating software systems falls to the site facilitator. However, focus group participants indicated that they relied on one another within the group to navigate the technology needed for the ePortfolio project. One potential threat would be a low competency level with technology among site facilitators and/or the teacher candidate cohort. While this was not fully explored, it is an important factor to consider in maintaining homeostasis within the ePortfolio ecosystem.

**Key Players**

The key players are made up of the university faculty and director(s) of the ePortfolio project, site facilitators/supervisors, mentor teachers, and teacher candidates. Any change in the key players involved in the ePortfolio project poses a potential threat to the ePortfolio Ecosystem. At this time, changes in teacher candidates do not appear to pose a threat to the ePortfolio Ecosystem. Key players where a change may pose a threat are discussed below.
University faculty. Through various informal conversations with current directors of the ePortfolio Project, the researcher discovered that five different faculty members designed the project. Since the ePortfolio project’s inception, two of these designers have left the university. Therefore, at this time, three of the original designers continue to be involved and direct the project. The researcher was unable to identify whether this change led to a mutation of the ePortfolio Ecosystem. Additionally, faculty members in this department have also changed. It is unclear as to whether all faculty within the Department of Teaching and Learning are aware of, and understand, the vision and goal for the ePortfolio project. If on-going professional development among faculty does not occur, this poses yet another threat to homeostasis.

Site facilitators/supervisors. There are over forty different site facilitators. Some of these site facilitators are new, while others have been working with the ePortfolio project for some time. During the focus group discussion one participant offered all of the documents that were given to her by the site facilitator. It was discovered at that time that this particular site facilitator independently created her own worksheet guides for her teacher candidates. This guide (i.e., E-Portfolio Workshop), a template for the sections that should be included in the ePortfolio, though helpful to teacher candidates, has also created a mutation. In the conclusion section of this guide, teacher candidates were prompted “look back at the [university] and talk about what you learned from that, professor that impacted you” (see Appendix B). This prompting of focusing on a positive experience has created a “sunshining effect” (Thomas & Liu, 2012), and all 15 ePortfolios that were analyzed included a positive reference to a professor and/or the university program in their ePortfolio. This mutation is counter to the actual goal and vision of the ePortfolio project.
Mentor teachers. The university relies on the mentor teachers to participate in the development of its teacher candidates. It is unclear as to what training or information about the ePortfolio and the development of reflective practice has been provided to mentor teachers. The researcher did not analyze the role of the mentor teachers in this study.

Evaluation

Evaluation of the entire ePortfolio Ecosystem needs to take place to ensure that homeostasis is maintained with the goal and vision of the ePortfolio project. Evaluation must be observed at both the teacher candidate level and institutional level.

Teacher candidate level. The researcher discovered that across the program documents (i.e., the course syllabi, rubrics, websites), the InTASC Standards are referenced along side the learning outcomes. If the InTASC Standards are the driving force behind the teacher preparation program, then at the individual candidate level, the program needs to assess whether the teacher candidates are demonstrating competency with regards to these standards. Some program documents also refer to teacher candidates receiving “benchmark checks” throughout the creation of the ePortfolio. However, all three participants in the focus group noted a need for more support and that they actually never received feedback from the site facilitator in relation to the selected artifacts, the content of their reflections, or how to improve their ePortfolio. In regards to how to improve the ePortfolio project experience, Participant Two suggested, “Maybe have more support…this is why it’s important…this is why we should do it…and give you how its going to help you in your teaching career.” Clearly there are some mutations that need to be addressed at the teacher candidate level of evaluation within the ePortfolio Ecosystem

Institutional level. To maintain homeostasis, on-going evaluation must occur across all parts of the ePortfolio Ecosystem (i.e., implementation, supporting documents, technology, and
key players). As previously discussed, the researcher found misalignment throughout this university’s ePortfolio Ecosystem. Several threats within the ecosystem have caused various mutations to occur. Failure to address these identified threats and mutations within this ePortfolio Ecosystem will ensure that the teacher candidates will not develop higher levels (i.e., dialogic or critical) of reflection or the habit of reflective practice.

**Benchmarks and feedback.** Teacher candidates must have specific “benchmark checks” throughout the creation of the ePortfolio project. There needs to be feedback given to the teacher candidates about their ePortfolio artifacts and reflections. Providing teacher candidates with specific and instructional feedback with regard to reflection would give the teacher candidates the opportunity to grow and develop their reflective practice, which is the vision and goal of the ePortfolio project.

In summary, this project was undertaken by this Department of Teaching and Learning with the major purpose of helping candidates reflect on their own professional development (COE ePortfolio Project, 2013). The identified threats that occurred at each level have affected the homeostasis of the ePortfolio Ecosystem and have caused mutations to the original vision and goal of the ePortfolio project at this university. If the department and/or director(s) of the ePortfolio Project do not address each of the mutations and identify their source (i.e., threat), the ePortfolio Ecosystem will continue to mutate and alter final projects.

**Recommendations**

**Introduction of Adaptations**

Threats are a normal part of an ePortfolio Ecosystem, however these threats do cause mutations and distort the original vision and goal of the program/project. It is important to anticipate these threats, investigate their source, and introduce an adaptation (e.g., faculty/site
facilitator development, website updates, realignment of documents) that will facilitate a return to homeostasis within the ePortfolio Ecosystem. More importantly if program/project directors are proactive and anticipate areas where threats are likely to occur, they can work to prevent mutations within the ePortfolio Ecosystem. The following recommendations are offered to assist this university and potentially other institutions that choose to use an ePortfolio as a tool to develop reflective practice among teacher candidates.

**Vision, Purpose and Goals**

If the goal at this university is to develop practitioners who practice reflection on a daily basis to refine and improve their teaching skills and student achievement, then the university must develop teacher candidates who can reflect at the dialogic and critical levels (Hatton & Smith, 1995). The university should consider viewing the ePortfolio as a *transformative* tool and use the ePortfolio as assessment *for* learning, rather than a *performative* tool that is used as assessment *of* learning (Barrett, 2007; Stiggins, 2002) (see Table 1). This researcher believes when the ePortfolio is used as a transformative tool barriers to the development of reflection such as the fear of being judged, which appears to lead to “sunshining”, can be mitigated (Barbera, 2009; Shulman, 1998; Liu & Zeichner, 2008; Thomas & Liu, 2009; Jaeger, 2013). Doing so will ensure teacher candidates leave the program as reflective practitioners who continue to grow and exhibit the professional skills and dispositions reflected in the InTASC Standards.

The researcher has observed this university’s ePortfolio Ecosystem to have threats and mutations occurring in five different areas within the ePortfolio Ecosystem: implementation, supporting documents, key players, technology, and evaluation. In order to return to homeostasis, a series of adaptations must be introduced. Directors of the ePortfolio project must
revisit the original purpose and goal and ensure all six areas of the ePortfolio Ecosystem are aligned to the vision. If the goal is to develop reflective practitioners, then reflection needs to be developed across the entire program not just in the last three semesters (i.e., practicum experiences).

**Implementation**

**Timing.** Given that dialogic and critical reflection develop over time (Bishop, Brownell, Klingner, Leko, & Galman, 2010; Shulman, 1998; Turner-Bissett, 1999; Oner & Adadan, 2011; Jaeger, 2013) teacher candidates should be introduced to and begin working on the ePortfolio before or during their first course in the education program. A director should facilitate this introductory informational workshop in ensure that the vision of the program and ePortfolio project is delivered to the students clearly and consistently. The goal of this introductory workshop should be to inform teacher candidates about a) the program’s vision, b) the InTASC Standards, c) the purpose of the ePortfolio project. The early introduction of the ePortfolio, along with teacher candidates beginning to think and understand what it means to be a reflective practitioner, will aid in developing the practice of reflection over time (Stiggins, 2002).

**Key assignments.** Key assignments related to reflection should be woven throughout the entire teacher education program. To help teacher candidates progress from descriptive writing and reflection to dialogic and critical reflection (Hatton & Smith, 1995), teacher candidates should be given the opportunity to revisit some of the key assignments from earlier courses.

**Artifacts.** Assignments that prompt the most reflection should be identified and required in the ePortfolio. The required artifacts must be included, however the teacher candidate would self-select which artifacts best reflect each of the ten InTASC Standards. Doing so will ensure that teacher candidates understand, and have met, each of the teacher performance standards.
Additionally, this would mean that there would be at least ten artifacts gathered across the entire teacher preparation program.

Supporting Documents

The original goal that is articulated on the ePortfolio website should be used as the purpose and vision of the ePortfolio project, as well as be included on all supporting documents. The goal should be revisited with teacher candidates in each of their courses. Many of the supporting documents within this university’s ePortfolio Ecosystem are misaligned (e.g., student handbook, ePortfolio websites, course syllabi, lesson planning template and rubric, and the ePortfolio grading rubric). These documents need to be revised and corrected to align to the purpose and goal. Further, revision is needed for the last three syllabi for the field experience courses, as they are almost identical. Each course should continue to develop different skills among teacher candidates.

Technology

Project directors should select one software system for the ePortfolio project. This will aid in consistency, and help teacher candidates focus on the content of their reflections and not the aesthetics of the ePortfolio. Software chosen should be user-friendly; however, technology support should be available in situations where the site facilitator or teacher candidates might have a low competency or efficacy level with technology. Finally, in order to create alignment between the university- and the department-level documents, a link should be established between the 21c ePortfolio Website and the COE Field Placement Website.

Key Players

Key players (i.e., site facilitators, mentor teachers, elementary teacher education faculty) must participate in on-going professional development workshops to ensure that they understand
the purpose and goal of the ePortfolio project. Site facilitators must also understand that ePortfolio project directors must approve all documents before they are distributed to teacher candidates. This will aid in eliminating independently created worksheet guides for teacher candidates and subsequent mutations, as well as some of the “sunshining” (Thomas & Liu, 2008) that was observed the ePortfolios.

**Evaluation**

Evaluation must take place at both the teacher candidate level and institutional level. Teacher candidates need benchmark checks for the completion of various parts of the ePortfolio. EPortfolio evaluators (as well as mentor teachers) need to provide teacher candidates with feedback to prompt deeper reflection. Teacher education faculty needs to consistently use corresponding grading rubrics for all assignments to ensure that teacher candidates are progressing in the development of dialogic and critical reflection. At the institutional level, on-going evaluation must occur across all parts of the ePortfolio Ecosystem (i.e., implementation, supporting documents, technology, and key players) to maintain alignment and homeostasis. This maintenance will aid in the identification of threats and prevention of mutations.
Summary

An ePortfolio project used within a teacher preparation program must be created and examined holistically. The ePortfolio Ecosystem has many moving parts, and it is important to view it as such. First, program directors must determine the vision and/or purpose of the ePortfolio project. Next, alignment of all parts of the ePortfolio Ecosystem must be established. Directors must decide how to implement the project. To ensure the most potential for personal transformation and growth, a cross-curricular approach should be taken where key assignments are woven throughout all courses (Barrett, 2007). Artifacts should represent the progression of professional development across the program. Directors must create professional development workshops for all key players. All supporting documents, including websites, must be aligned to the ePortfolio program/project vision and goals. The technology that will be used must be decided upon and ensure that teacher candidates have access to technology support. There must be evaluation at both the program level and teacher candidate level. Teacher candidates need benchmarks and feedback as they progress through the program to ensure they are developing the skills and habits consistent with reflective practice. At the institutional level, it is important for program directors to anticipate threats that can occur within the ePortfolio Ecosystem. Having the ability to anticipate threats and be proactive will help ensure that timely adaptations can be introduced to regain homeostasis within the ePortfolio Ecosystem. This on-going maintenance and alignment will help ensure that the vision of the program and ePortfolio project is achieved.
Appendix A

21st Century ePortfolio Project Site

Home

College of Education, Department of Teaching and Learning

21st Century ePortfolio Project Site

An ePortfolio for Professional Practice

Welcome to the ePortfolio project for the elementary and secondary teacher education programs.

Becoming a teacher is more than a sequence of college courses and more than time spent in classrooms. Becoming a teacher is a journey of transformation from tacit knowledge learned from books and lectures to practical knowledge gained in classrooms. It is a journey through measurable stages filled with novel experiences in familiar and well established circumstances. Becoming a teacher involves meeting benchmarks, achieving standards, and reflecting on past performance in order to improve future performance. While accumulating and recording artifacts during courses and field work, you will also be establishing a record of your learning and providing evidence that you have fulfilled the objectives outlined for the ePortfolio.

This ePortfolio project is designed to serve as documentation of your performance in course assignments, in field experiences and through the reflections you are required to complete during Practicum 1, Practicum 2, and Student Teaching/Internship in the teacher education program. Your e-portfolio is primarily a tool for your own learning and reflection as you complete your program at UNLV. Putting it together will help you to review all the good work you have done in your teacher education program and to appreciate how much you have learned and grown.

You will be introduced to the e-portfolio project when you enter the teacher education program. Your progress will be checked along the way by site facilitators. At the end of your Student Teaching/Internship, you will present parts of your portfolio to your peers, your mentor teacher, site facilitator, and UNLV faculty. Your portfolio will be evaluated by a rubric and receive a satisfactory or unsatisfactory grade.

You will begin collecting digital artifacts for your ePortfolio during your first semester of professional field work. The accumulation of artifacts will continue until you have finished the program. You are encouraged to save artifacts that you believe illustrate your achievements and the special “aha” moments you experience working with students. This body of work will serve as the master file from which you will select specific artifacts to complete your ePortfolio. There are some required artifacts but you are encouraged to add additional items that you believe are especially reflective of your professional growth.

The e-portfolio is designed to help you demonstrate how well you meet the Interstate Teacher and Assessment Support Consortium Standards (INTASC) Model Core Teaching Standards. Your e-portfolio will also help faculty show accrediting agencies what our students know and can do.

At some point, you may find that this e-portfolio proves helpful for employment purposes. You may, for example, add your resume or a video of your classroom or other artifacts that might be of interest to a potential employer. You also might choose to remove materials that you might not wish to share. At the
very least, creating this eportfolio now should help you to address a critical step in your search for a teaching position--taking stock of your professional growth, beliefs, and goals.

Confidentiality Statement:

Selected information from your ePortfolio may be used in confidence by faculty for improving the COE ePortfolio Project, for future ePortfolio submissions, for teacher education program improvement, for research and dissemination of research in presentations at regional, national and international education forums as well as in publications. Candidates who choose not to share their ePortfolios beyond the evaluation period (completion of the program), will in no way be penalized or receive a lower assessment for their ePortfolio Project.
Appendix B

ePortfolio Workshop Worksheets

E-Portfolio Workshop

Themes
- Something you can relate to and integrate into your personal life as well as teaching
- Etc. gardening, baking, sports, legos
- Always signed release from parent if you post pictures of students

About me page
- About me- Why you’re here, what made you decide to go into teaching
- Tie back into UNLV – link back to UNLV homepage
- Your journey through UNLV, experiences, etc.
- Keep it professional- clothing, background, appearance

Philosophy page
- How you feel about teaching, how you feel about the impact that you’re making on your students
- Methods-what you will do to assess your, how you will teach them

Artifacts page***
- As you go through P2 and student teaching, collect artifacts
- Include some assignments that you completed throughout
- Put up lesson plans – UNLV format
- Refer to Lemov
- COE principles-INTASC standards
- Formative Assessments
- ex. Twitter board- think of ways to assess your students
- ex. 4-3-2-1 chart
- 4 meaning you got it and could teach it
- 3 you got it but you couldn’t teach it
- 2 needs some teacher help
- 1 needs a lot of assistance
- Journal entries, exit tickets, etc.

Resources page
- All sites utilized
- hyperlinks to websites
- under each website, small blurb about what you used the site for
- make sure link works

Conclusion
- Discussing what you learned throughout the journey
- List methods-CHAMPS, Kagan strategies
- Components of an effective lesson plan
- Bloom’s, Marzano, AR goals
- Look back at UNLV and talk about what you learned from that, professor that impacted you
E-PORTFOLIO LINKS AND HELPFUL WEBSITES

www.teacherspayteachers.com
www.google.com (create your own blog/website)
www.glogsteredu.com
www.prezi.com
www.educationworld.com
www.shutterfly.com
www.edhelper.com
www.mathwire.com
www.teachersnotebook.com
www.scootpad.com
www.busyteacherscafe.com
www.padlet.com
www.edu-cyberpg.com
https://sites.google.com/site/21cportfolio1/home
Tips for creating your E-Portfolio:

Save, save, save documents!!
Save lesson plans and take pictures!
If you take pictures: You MUST get copies of the network permission forms from your Mentor Teacher for those students in your e-portfolio. If you don’t you must cover the student’s faces in your website.
Start working on it NOW!! Don’t wait until last minute.
Back up all of your work!
Be creative and pick a theme early. It will help you to organize your thoughts as you gather materials, lessons, and artifacts.
Appendix C

ePortfolio Evaluation Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Target (3)</th>
<th>Acceptable (2)</th>
<th>Unacceptable (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Addresses more than five InTASC Standards in discussion of growth as teacher and professions</td>
<td>Addresses five InTASC Standards related to growth as a teacher</td>
<td>Address less than five InTASC Standards related to growth as a teacher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment</td>
<td>Evidence of ASW Assessments and use of assessment data to modify instruction for student learning</td>
<td>Evidence of ASW Assessments/some discussion of use of assessment data to plan lessons</td>
<td>ASW and Assessments not evident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Provides examples of lesson planning in more than three content areas/integrates content/refers to content standards/uses a variety of instructional strategies/reflection on professional growth through program content</td>
<td>Lesson planning evident in three content areas/use of more than one instructional strategy evident/reflection on professional growth throughout program content</td>
<td>Lesson planning evident in only one content area/limited use of instructional strategies/little or no discussion of accumulated professional growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>Incorporates a variety of digital tools in instruction/plans for student use of digital tools and Internet in lessons/evidence of student use of digital tools</td>
<td>Incorporates digital tools in instruction/plans for student use of digital tools in lessons</td>
<td>Occasional to limited use of digital tools in instruction. Limited provisions for student use of digital tools or the Internet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format/Technical Skill</td>
<td>Navigation of ePortfolio facilitated through menu and links/wallpaper, font, use of white space makes information easy to access/integrates use of digital tools in presentation/wallpaper reflects theme</td>
<td>Navigation of ePortfolio facilitated through menu and links/wallpaper, font, use of white space makes information easy to read</td>
<td>Navigation of ePortfolio limited by non-working menu and links/design and color limit readability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Practicum I, II, and Student Teaching Syllabi

Department of Teaching and Learning

Course Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Methods Practicum I</th>
<th>EDEL 311</th>
<th>3 Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Semester Year</td>
<td>Day, Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2014</td>
<td>M-W 8:30-11:30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Office Location</th>
<th>Office Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CEB-347A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Hours:</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday 2:00-4:00pm, Wednesday 2:00-4:00pm, or by appointment</td>
<td><a href="mailto:gaos2@unlv.nevada.edu">gaos2@unlv.nevada.edu</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Description

Elementary school Practicum I where students apply content acquired in methods courses to initial field-based experiences. The following courses are aligned to this course:

- EDEL 323: Teaching and Learning Elementary Education
- EDRL 442: Literacy Instruction I
- EDRL 474: Methods for English Language Learners
- EDEL 453: Teaching Elementary School Social Studies

INTASC Standards

The Learner and Learning

Standard #1: Learner Development – The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.
Standard #2: Learning Differences – The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

Standard #3: Learning Environments – The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning and self-motivation.

Content Knowledge

Standard #4: Content Knowledge – The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry and structures of the discipline he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assume mastery of the content.

Standard #5: Application of Content – The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

Instructional Practice

Standard #6: Assessment – The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher’s and learner’s decision making.

Standard #7: Planning for Instruction – The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.
Standard #8: Instructional Strategies – The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

Professional Responsibility

Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice – The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration – The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, and other school professionals and community members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InTASC Standard</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Dispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard #1: Learner Development</td>
<td>a,b,c</td>
<td>d,e,f,g</td>
<td>h,i,j,k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #2: Learning Differences</td>
<td>a,d,f</td>
<td>g,j,k</td>
<td>l,m,n,o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #3: Learning Environments</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f</td>
<td>i,j,k,l,m</td>
<td>n,o,p,q,r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #4: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>c,d,e,f,g</td>
<td>j,k,n</td>
<td>o,p,q,r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #5: Application of Content</td>
<td>c,d,f,g,i</td>
<td>j,k,l,m,o</td>
<td>q,r,s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #6: Assessment</td>
<td>d,e,f,g,i</td>
<td>j,k,n,o</td>
<td>q,r,s,t,u,v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #7: Planning for Instruction</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f</td>
<td>g,h,i,j,k,m</td>
<td>n,o,p,q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #8: Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>a,b,d,e,f,g,h,i</td>
<td>j,k,l,m,n,o</td>
<td>p,q,r,s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f</td>
<td>g,i,j,k</td>
<td>l,m,n,o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f,g,i</td>
<td>l,m,n,o</td>
<td>p,q,r,s,t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Elementary teacher candidates in this course will address the following criteria for compliance. This will be accomplished through the coordination of coursework and field experiences. Accordingly, teacher candidates will be able to:

- Understand and describe personal beliefs that influence the ways teachers organize and manage classrooms for diverse learners

- Study selected literature on teacher roles, classroom environments, planning, organization, and management of instruction, managing behavior, and meeting learning needs of diverse students and assessing children’s learning in schools

- Applying knowledge of the teaching/learning process in organizing for teaching

- Demonstrate an understanding of the relationships among environment, curriculum, instruction, organization, and management in the elementary classroom.

- Understand and demonstrate classroom management strategies that create an effective classroom and support behavioral growth in their students.

- Understand and utilize the UNLV Department of Curriculum and Instruction Lesson Planning Template and meet the standards of the department rubric.

- Develop lesson plans that align with the CCSD Standards and those of the State of Nevada

- Develop and demonstrate classroom management strategies that allow for whole group, small group, cooperative group, paired/shared grouping patterns that support a variety of learning opportunities for students

- Develop skills for assessment of learning and decision making that a data-driven classroom teacher needs in order to successfully educate students

- Develop a “toolbox” of teaching strategies in various content and management areas

- Recognize the diversity of learners that they will be expected to teach and develop and demonstrate strategies to meet their needs
Required Books and Materials

**Book**

**Materials**
The following are available on the Office of Field Experiences website (http://education.unlv.edu/ofe/tl/):
- Absence Form
- Collaborative Assessment Log
- Community Service Log
- Elementary Lesson Plan Template
- Elementary Lesson Plan Rubric
- Analysis of Student Work (ASW)
- Dispositions Evaluation & Rubric
- Performance Evaluation
- Performance Evaluation Criteria
- Professional Dispositions Form
- Professional Dispositions Rubric
- Time Record

Performance Assessments
1. Lesson Planning: Teacher candidates are required to use the Elementary Lesson Planning Template during the initial period of their Internship. All lessons throughout the semester must be approved in advance of the lesson being taught. Interns are reminded to complete the reflection portion of the template after each teaching experience. Students are required to teach a minimum of 3 lessons which they plan within the curriculum and concurrent with their experiences in their coursework. The lesson plan template is to be used and the rubric is the standard for assessment.
2. Dispositions Evaluation
3. Analysis of Student Work assignment
4. Classroom instruction: three formal lessons
5. Lemov Assignment
6. Mid-term and Final Reflections

**Purpose of this course**
*EDEL 311 is the first field experience for teacher candidates. It is the function of this course to serve as a lab for the four concurrent courses. For this reason, the assignments for*
this course are generated from the course syllabi and should be reviewed by the teacher candidate and their pre-service mentor for EDEL 311 in order to meet the requirements of the individual courses.

Grading Policy
The Pre-Service Mentor Teachers (PSMT) at the Partnership Schools will make grade recommendations to the UNLV instructor of record. The UNLV evaluation form, lesson plan and rubric are the standards for evaluation. In addition, students must model professional behavior, a positive open response to mentor-student feedback and work to meet all classroom/school expectations. If a student is performing at an unsatisfactory level in the judgment of the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher, he/she must contact the Coordinator of Field Experiences. The UNLV staff will then work directly in the classroom and with the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher to support the growth of the intern and work towards their success. If a Pre-Service Mentor Teacher is unsure of how to evaluate an intern, and requests support, it will be provided. A grade evaluation worksheet is attached to this syllabus. Please note:

Any student receiving less than a “B” in a practicum will not be permitted to advance to the next clinical experience. Any student with less than a “B” in the Dispositions Evaluation at mid-term will be required to meet with a Site Facilitator and develop an intervention plan.

Assessment Criteria:
- Performance Evaluation Form: assessed by Teacher/Educator (30%)
- Mid-term and final reflections: assessed by UNLV faculty (30%)
- Analysis of Student Work (ASW): assessed by UNLV faculty (20%)
- Dispositions Evaluation: assessed by Teacher/Educator (15%)
- Lemov Assignment: assessed by Site Facilitator (5%)

Attendance: Students are expected to be present at their school for three hours per session and record the time on the Time Record. If school is not in session, they are to make up the time. If there is a professional development day, they are to make every effort to attend. If a student is ill and needs to miss a class, s/he is to contact the school office manager, site facilitator, and Dr. Su Gao (by email) and his/her Pre-Service Mentor Teacher. All absences are to be made up by the UNLV student.

Dress Code: UNLV interns are expected to dress in compliance with the UNLV expectations which are posted on their website.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Specific Due Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidates will attend Orientation</td>
<td>08/25 at 10:00 a.m. - 11:30 a.m. in BDC 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidates will provide the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher with a letter of introduction, a copy of the syllabus and necessary evaluation forms and obtain his/her e-mail information. The information is to be submitted to the site facilitator. Students are to share the expectations from their courses with the Pre-Service Mentor for additional assignments and expectations.</td>
<td>Students report to schools on 8/27.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis of Student Work (ASW) Workshop</td>
<td>9/29/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher candidate prepares first lesson and PSMT reviews it prior to delivery. Student will teach one lesson prior to mid-term.</td>
<td>Due by 10/9/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluation #1 and Dispositions by PSMT due</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-Term Reflections due to site facilitator</td>
<td>10/15/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluation #2 by PSMT due</td>
<td>11/05/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW due to Dr. Gao on campus by 4:00pm</td>
<td>11/25/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluation #3 by PSMT due</td>
<td>12/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemov Assignment due to site facilitator (to be arranged at each site)</td>
<td>12/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day of student attendance.</td>
<td>12/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Record due to site facilitators or Dr. Gao</td>
<td>12/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Service Mentor Teacher will provide feedback for a course grade to the Site Facilitator.</td>
<td>12/03/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Reflections due to Dr. Gao</td>
<td>12/08/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make up days, if needed, to be completed with permission of Dr. Gao</td>
<td>By 12/10/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final grade due from site facilitator to Dr. Gao</td>
<td>12/12/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
College of Education Policies

Academic Misconduct – Academic integrity is a legitimate concern for every member of the campus community; all share in upholding the fundamental values of honesty, trust, respect, fairness, responsibility and professionalism. By choosing to join the UNLV community, students accept the expectations of the Student Academic Misconduct Policy and are encouraged when faced with choices to always take the ethical path. Students enrolling in UNLV assume the obligation to conduct themselves in a manner compatible with UNLV’s function as an educational institution.

An example of academic misconduct is plagiarism. Plagiarism is using the words or ideas of another, from the Internet or any source, without proper citation of the sources. See the Student Academic Misconduct Policy (approved December 9, 2005) located at: http://studentconduct.unlv.edu/misconduct/policy.html.

Copyright – The University requires all members of the University Community to familiarize themselves with and to follow copyright and fair use requirements. You are individually and solely responsible for violations of copyright and fair use laws. The university will neither protect nor defend you nor assume any responsibility for employee or student violations of fair use laws. Violations of copyright laws could subject you to federal and state civil penalties and criminal liability, as well as disciplinary action under University policies. Additional information can be found at: http://www.unlv.edu/provost/copyright

Disability Resource Center (DRC) – The Disability Resource Center (SSC-A 143, http://drc.unlv.edu/, 702-895-0866) provides resources for students with disabilities. If you feel that you have a disability, please make an appointment with a Disabilities Specialist at the DRC to discuss what options may be available to you.

If you are registered with the Disability Resource Center, bring your Academic Accommodation Plan from the DRC to me during office hours so that we may work together to develop strategies for implementing the accommodations to meet both your needs and the requirements of the course. Any information you provide is private and will be treated as such. To maintain the confidentiality of your request, please do not approach me before or after class to discuss your accommodation needs.

Religious Holidays Policy – Any student missing class quizzes, examinations, or any other class or lab work because of observance of religious holidays shall be given an opportunity during that semester to make up missed work. The make-up will apply to the religious holiday absence only. It shall be the responsibility of the student to notify the instructor no later than the end of the first two weeks of classes, September 5, 2014, of his or her intention to participate in religious holidays which do not fall on state holidays or periods of class recess. For additional information, please visit: http://catalog.unlv.edu/content.php?catoid=6&navoid=531.

Incomplete Grades - The grade of I – Incomplete – can be granted when a student has satisfactorily completed three-fourths of course work for that semester/session but for reason(s) beyond the student’s control, and acceptable to the instructor, cannot complete the last part of the course, and the instructor believes that the student can finish the course without repeating it. The incomplete work must be made up before the end of the following regular semester. If course requirements are not completed within
the time indicated, a grade of F will be recorded and the GPA will be adjusted accordingly. Students who are fulfilling an Incomplete do not register for the course but make individual arrangements with the instructor who assigned the I grade.

**Tutoring** – The Academic Success Center (ASC) provides tutoring and academic assistance for all students taking courses. Students are encouraged to stop by the ASC to learn more about subjects offered, tutoring times and other academic resources. The ASC is located across from the Student Services Complex (SSC). Students may learn more about tutoring services by calling 702-895-3177 or visiting the tutoring web site at: [http://academicsuccess.unlv.edu/tutoring/](http://academicsuccess.unlv.edu/tutoring/).

**Writing Center** – One-on-one or small group assistance with writing is available free of charge to students at the Writing Center, located in CDC-3-301. Although walk-in consultations are sometimes available, students with appointments will receive priority assistance. Appointments may be made in person or by calling 702-895-3908. The student’s Rebel ID Card, a copy of the assignment (if possible), and two copies of any writing to be reviewed are requested for the consultation. More information can be found at: [http://writingcenter.unlv.edu/](http://writingcenter.unlv.edu/).

**Rebelmail** – By policy, faculty and staff should e-mail students’ Rebelmail accounts only. Rebelmail is UNLV’s official e-mail system for students. It is one of the primary ways students receive official university communication such as information about deadlines, major campus events, and announcements. All students receive a Rebelmail account after they have been admitted to the university. Students’ e-mail prefixes are listed on class rosters. The suffix is always @unlv.nevada.edu. **Emailing within WebCampus is acceptable.**

**Final Examinations** – The University requires that final exams given at the end of a course occur at the time and on the day specified in the final exam schedule. See the schedule at: [http://www.unlv.edu/registrar/calendars](http://www.unlv.edu/registrar/calendars).

**Any other class specific information** - (e.g., absences, make-up exams, extra credit policies, plagiarism/cheating consequences, policy on electronic devices, specialized department or college tutoring programs, bringing children to class, policy on recording classroom lectures, etc.)
# Office of Field Experiences
## Time Record

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time Arrived</th>
<th>Time Left</th>
<th>Major Activity</th>
<th>Time at School</th>
<th>Mentor Teacher Initials</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total hours at school
### Office of Field Experiences
#### Professional Dispositions

**Student Name________________________________**

**Pre-Service Mentor____________________________**

**Date: __________**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Not Acceptable (1)</th>
<th>Acceptable (2)</th>
<th>Target (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practices appropriate personal hygiene (appearance, grooming, attire)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintains good punctuality/ attendance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is responsible, reliable, dependable and prepared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates ethical behavior, is tactful and maintains confidentiality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is receptive to feedback/suggestions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates collaborative skills (including respecting and valuing the contributions of others)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acts as a positive role model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates effective and appropriate interpersonal communication skills, both oral and written</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takes responsibility for personal actions; is honest and truthful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrates a commitment and enthusiasm to the profession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Score**

**Score:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-27</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24-26</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17-20</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;17 points</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please note:**

*Your response to this review provides the basis for assigning a final grade for the field experience portion of this course.*

*Effective 6/11/11, any student receiving less than a “B” in a practicum will not be permitted to advance to the next clinical experience. Any student with less than a “B” in the Dispositions Evaluation at mid-term will be required to meet with a Site Facilitator and develop an intervention plan.*
Comments:
Please provide specific suggestions for the prospective teachers enhanced success:

Indicate whether or not you have discussed this review with your UNLV student ______

Thank you very much for your professional commitment to the mentoring of prospective teachers. Your contribution is uniquely invaluable to future teachers, to the university and to our community. Please submit online before the mid-term date of October 15, 2014.

Date: _____________

College of Education
Field Experience Performance Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Practicum I</th>
<th>Elementary ○ Secondary ○ Special Education ○ Sports Education Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Practicum II/</td>
<td>Elementary ○ Secondary ○ Special Education ○ Early Childhood ○ Sports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Student</td>
<td>Education Leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teaching</td>
<td>Elementary ○ Secondary ○ Special Education ○ Early Childhood ○ Sports Education Leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Student: ______________________________
Cooperating Teacher:________________________________
School:_______________________________ Grade: _____ Room#: ___________
UNLV Supervisor: _____________________________ Semester______________
Observation #___________
Subject: _______________________________ Lesson Topic

Check all that apply: Integrated Lesson: ______ Midterm Grade_____ Final Grade_____

Planning and Preparation ○ Rating Comments
## Recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals/Objectives Written</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Based on Prior Knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Differentiated Instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures and Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Component</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Learning Environment

| Classroom Expectations                        |
| Efficient Activities and Routines             |
| Classroom Management/Monitors Student Behavior|
| Builds Positive Self Concept                  |
| Proactive Discipline                          |
| Interactions with Students                   |
| Cultural Diversity                           |

## Instruction

| Introduces Lesson and States Objectives       |
| Content Knowledge                             |
| Directions and Explanations                   |
| Procedures and Activities                     |
| Use of Materials/Equipment                    |
| Student Involvement                           |
| Effective Pacing                              |
| Smooth Transitions                            |
| Ongoing Assessment                            |
| Accommodates Individual Needs                 |
| Evaluation of Lesson                          |

## Professional Dispositions

| Professional Appearance                       |
| Punctuality/Attendance                        |
| Self-Initiative/Independence                  |
| Reliability/Dependability                     |
| Collegiality                                  |
| Receptive to Feedback                         |
| Ability to Reflect on Performance             |
| Interpersonal Skills                          |
| Tact/Judgment                                 |
| Written Expression                            |
| Oral Expression                               |

__________________________  ____________________  ______________________
__________________________
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluator signature</th>
<th>Print name</th>
<th>Student signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Confidential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating Scale</th>
<th>Print name</th>
<th>Student signature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Target</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Not Evident</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Not Applicable</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Lemov Assignment”
Working With Strategies for Effective Daily Instruction

Text: Lemov, Doug, Teach Like A Champion: 49 Techniques that put students on the path to college.

Purpose of this assignment: Clinical students need to bridge the gap between the theory of creating instruction based solely on the transmission of standards and objectives to implementation in a way that provides students with rigor and success. If we truly believe that all children can learn, then we must believe that we can teach them effectively. This text was selected because it is unique in its practicality and the volume of effective, proven pedagogical strategies that are effective in all grades and subjects. This assignment is designed to provide each clinical student with daily experience and reflection on these techniques.

Materials: folder, file cards

Process:
1. Read the entire text as an overview to the acquisition of the 49 strategies.

2. Set up the notenook/binder and choose the strategies that you want to learn/master during this semester. One strategy must be utilized during each of the 3 lessons that are taught. The Site Facilitator will check and review the student’s progress.
   a. Practicum 1: 3 required strategies
   b. Practicum 2: additional 10 required strategies
   c. GLP Secondary Practicum 2: 5 required strategies
   d. Student Teachers: additional 15 strategies required
   e. **All students will start this assignment by using three of the strategies in Chapter 1 of Lemov. Other strategies to meet the expectations of this assignment are “student choice” items. The goal here is not volume but repetition and transfer to the practitioner.**

3. Start a “card” for each strategy. As you use it, note its effectiveness or challenges and the date. Examples:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identification of Strategy</th>
<th>Effectiveness Rating</th>
<th>Reflection/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stretch It</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>It worked because the ELL students were able to expand their thinking and gain confidence in their ideas (2/5/11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretch It</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>My questions did not stimulate the students enough; I need to be better prepared next time. The kids seemed confused about what I was asking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right is Right</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>This was challenging; I didn’t have enough information myself to ask a better follow-up question. (3/14/11)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Discuss your strategy use throughout the semester as you learn from/with others.

5. Date for completed assignment: 12/03/14

6. Take this folder into the classroom with you as you begin your career along with Lemov and continue to develop and refine your pedagogical skills. Expect 3 years to proficiency and 5 to mastery. Be patient. Champion teachers can do these things. Be one!

**Rubric: Lemov Assignment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Not Acceptable (1)</th>
<th>Acceptable (2)</th>
<th>Target (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Cards loose and disorganized and the # of strategies less than the minimum required</td>
<td>Cards in folder; required number of strategies present</td>
<td>Cards in folder, organized and neatly maintained; required number of strategies present; detailed documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Entries are infrequent and do not display clear understanding of each strategy</td>
<td>Entries are regular and demonstrate an understanding of the strategies</td>
<td>Entries are regular, demonstrate an understanding of strategies and reflect success/challenges and next steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Site Facilitator will periodically review the Lemov assignment and grade it according to the rubric during the final visit (at a date to be determined).

Grading Scale:
5-6 points = A
4 points= B
Any “not acceptable” areas =
Course Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Methods Practicum II</th>
<th>EDEL 313</th>
<th>3 Credit Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Tuesdays and Thursdays (One morning and one full day for a minimum of 135 hours during the semester)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name:</th>
<th>Office Location:</th>
<th>Office Phone:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lois Paretti, Ed. M.</td>
<td>CEB 368A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Office Hours:</th>
<th>E-Mail:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monday: 9:30-11:30 1:00-2:00</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lois.Paretti@unlv.edu">Lois.Paretti@unlv.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuesday: 9:30-11:30 or by appointment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Course Description

Elementary school Practicum II where students apply content acquired in methods courses to initial field-based experiences. The following courses are aligned to this course:

- EDEL 433: Teaching Elementary School Math
- EDEL 443: Teaching Elementary School Science
- EDRL: 443: Literacy InstructionII
- EDEL 408: Classroom Management for Elementary Educators

InTASC Standards Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>InTASC Standard</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Dispositions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard #1: Learner Development</td>
<td>a,b,c</td>
<td>d,e,f,g</td>
<td>h,i,j,k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #2: Learning Differences</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f</td>
<td>g,h,j,k</td>
<td>l,m,n,o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #3: Learning Environments</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h</td>
<td>i,j,k,l,m</td>
<td>n,o,p,q,r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #4: Content Knowledge</td>
<td>c,d,e,f,g,h,l</td>
<td>i,k,l,n</td>
<td>o,p,q,r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #5: Application of Content</td>
<td>c,d,f,g,h,i</td>
<td>j,k,l,m,o</td>
<td>q,r,s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #6: Assessment</td>
<td>b,c,d,e,f,g,i</td>
<td>j,k,n,o</td>
<td>q,r,s,t,u,v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #7: Planning for Instruction</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f</td>
<td>g,h,i,j,k,l,m</td>
<td>n,o,p,q</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #8: Instructional Strategies</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f,g,h,i</td>
<td>j,k,l,m,n,o</td>
<td>p,q,r,s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f</td>
<td>g,h,i,j,k</td>
<td>l,m,n,o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration</td>
<td>a,b,c,d,e,f,g,l,j</td>
<td>l,m,n,o</td>
<td>p,q,r,s,t</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Knowledge INTASC 1 and 5

- Working knowledge of general teaching models including expository, inquiry, demonstration and integration
- Recognition of effective teaching practices
- Differentiation between instructional and managerial dimensions of teaching

Performance: INTASC 1,2,3, and 7

- Demonstration of lesson planning, teaching and exhibit presentation
- Demonstration of teaching strategies
- Integration of relevant technology into teaching demonstrations

Dispositions: INTASC 3, 9, and 10

- Demonstration of strategies that promote responsibility, motivation and appreciation of diversity
- Collaboration with colleagues for purposes of effective teaching/learning experiences for themselves and for elementary students

Results: INTASC 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10

Prospective elementary teachers in this course will address the following criteria for compliance. This will be accomplished through the coordination of coursework and field experiences.

Accordingly, prospective teachers will be able to:

- Understand and describe personal beliefs that influence the ways teachers organize and manage classrooms for diverse learners
- Study selected literature on teacher roles, classroom environments, planning, organization, and management of instruction, managing behavior, and meeting learning needs of diverse students and assessing children’s learning in schools
- Applying knowledge of the teaching/learning process in organizing for teaching
- Demonstrate an understanding of the relationships among environment, curriculum, instruction, organization, and management in the elementary classroom

- Professional Training Guide/Handbook
- Service Log
- Time Record
Purpose of this course

_EDEL 313 is the initial placement in a 21st Century School and is a two-semester placement. EDEL 313 is aligned with four department courses. For this reason, the assignments for this course are generated from the course syllabi and should be reviewed by the teacher candidate and their pre-service mentor for EDEL 313 in order to meet the requirements of the individual courses. Site Facilitators may also assign work based on the needs of students at their site (Effective 1/10)._**

Assessment Criteria

Dispositions Evaluation: 15%

Evaluation of instruction (Performance Evaluation Form): 30%

Lesson Planning/Assessment/Results: 25%

Lemov Strategies Assignment: 10%

E-portfolio: 10%

Service: 10%

Performance Assessments

1. Dispositions Evaluation:

To be completed by 2/27 by the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher (PSMT) and submitted online after reviewing with teacher candidate.

2. Evaluation of Instruction:

Instruction will be evaluated by the Pre-service mentor teacher at midterm (3/13) and at the end of the semester (5/8) by submitting the Performance Evaluation online.

In addition, the PSMT will complete the (ungraded) Collaborative Assessment Log (CAL). Formative assessment should be provided on a bi-weekly basis after the third week of school as the student and the PSMT meet to assess progress and set goals. The teacher candidate is required to provide this form to the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher. It can be downloaded from the OFE website. A copy of each CAL is to be given to the Site Facilitator upon completion.

3. Lesson Planning:

Teacher candidates are required to use the Elementary Lesson Planning Template. All lessons throughout the semester must be approved the week in advance of the lesson being taught. Teacher candidates are reminded to complete the reflection portion of the template after each teaching experience.

Teacher candidates are required to teach a minimum of 5 lessons which they plan within the ____ curriculum and concurrent with their experiences in their
coursework. The lesson plan template is to be used and the rubric is the standard for assessment. At least one of the lessons must incorporate the use of technology.

In addition, candidates are required to identify the Lemov strategies used and specify Bloom questions for every lesson.

Detailed assessment is to include the following:

1) Formative:
   a) Use of work product
      i) Item analysis/Attach sample product
      ii) Student analysis
      iii) Next steps/lesson plan
      iv) Results of next steps
      v) Reflection about your teaching approach and implications for future practice
   b) Use of Formative Assessment strategies other than work product
      i) Identify the strategy and describe
      ii) Student analysis
      iii) Next steps/lesson plan
      iv) Results of next steps
      v) Reflection about your teaching approach and implications for future practice

2) Summative:
   a) Describe and attach results including an item analysis and reflection

4. Lemov Strategies Assignment

Clinical students need to bridge the gap between the theory of creating instruction based solely on the transmission of standards and objectives to implementation in a way that provides students with rigor and success. If we truly believe that all children can learn, then we must believe that we can teach them effectively. This text was selected because it is unique in its practicality and the volume of effective, proven pedagogical strategies that are effective in all grades and subjects. This assignment is designed to provide each clinical student with daily experience and reflection on these techniques.

Materials:
- Small (3x5 or 4x6) Binder
- File card

Process:
1. Read the entire text as an overview to the acquisition of the 49 strategies.
2. Choose the strategies that you want to learn/master during this semester. At least one strategy must be utilized during each of the lessons that are taught. The Site Facilitator will check and review the student’s progress and check that the strategies are documented in the lesson plan. An additional 10 strategies are required.
3. Start a "card" for each strategy. As you use it, note its effectiveness or challenges and the date.
Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Effectiveness Rating</th>
<th>Date Implemented/Reflection/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Opt Out</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(2/5/11) Asked student A if the drawing was 'one' or 'two' point perspective. His response was incorrect, so I asked Student B who responded correctly and then had him explain 'why.' Then, came back to student A, asking him the same question on a different one-point example. This time, his answer was correct and he was able to give me the reason why: one vanishing point. Next step: use the same technique on different content and, to involve more of the class, get several other students to respond before returning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stretch It</strong></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>It worked because the ELL students were able to expand their thinking and gain confidence in their ideas (2/5/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right is Right</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>This was challenging; I didn’t have enough information myself to ask a better follow-up question. (3/14/12) Next step: Prepare a list of correct ideas to feel confident in addressing student responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Stretch It        | -                    | My questions did not stimulate the students enough; I need to be better prepared next time. The kids seemed confused about what I was asking. (2/7/12) |

**Stretch It**

Build on other questions you pose in order to drive home a main point – provide informational clues to spark deeper questioning and critical thinking.
**Precise Praise**
Providing specific praise to students exhibiting good work habits such as following the directions, working quietly; ideally, working to provide this to every student during a session.

(3/17/11) AP students enjoy receiving praise for completing each step of challenging work; it kept of momentum and provided a confidence boost.

**Next step:** use a chart or other tracker to help identify which students were provided specific praise so that all students can be contacted.

---

*NOTE: You will need to create definitions in YOUR OWN WORDS – please, do not copy from the student examples above.*

4. Discuss your strategy use throughout the semester as you learn from/with others.

5. Take this binder into the classroom with you as you begin your career along and continue to develop and refine your pedagogical skills. Expect 3 years to proficiency and 5 to mastery. Be patient. Champion teachers can do these things. Be one!
### Rubric: Lemov Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Not Acceptable (1)</th>
<th>Acceptable (2)</th>
<th>Target (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Cards loose and disorganized and the # of strategies less than the minimum</td>
<td>Cards in binder; required number of strategies present</td>
<td>Cards in binder, organized and neatly maintained; required number of strategies present; detailed documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Entries are infrequent and do not display clear understanding of each strategy</td>
<td>Entries are regular and demonstrate an understanding of the strategies</td>
<td>Entries are regular, demonstrate an understanding of the strategies and reflect success/challenges and next steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Site Facilitator will periodically review the Lemov assignment and grade it during the final visit (at a date to be determined).

Grading Scale: 54-60 points = A  
48-53 points = B  
42-47 points = C  
Any “not acceptable” areas = F

### 5. E-Portfolio

a. During Practicum 2, candidates will begin to establish goals for the electronic portfolio based, in part, on the artifacts already stored. Establish a Google website using a professional address. Do not use “cutie pie 11” or anything remotely similar.  
**SueBrown@google.com** is an example.

b. Continue to archive artifacts from the field and coursework for use during the final stage of this project.

c. Create the identifying information for the e-portfolio and an organizational structure as described on the 21c portfolio website: [http://sites.google.com/site/21cportfolio1/](http://sites.google.com/site/21cportfolio1/)

An introductory Workshop will be arranged during practicum hours in February to review this assignment and help you create the website. The site facilitators will schedule benchmark checks during the semester.

Grading Scale: 
10 points = Satisfactory completion  
0 points = Any components not completed
6. **Service**

   - During the two-semester assignment to a campus, each student is to contribute to the school by earning a total of 10 service points, 5 during the Practicum 2 semester and 5 during the internship semester. Each point represents one hour of service.
   
   - Points can be accumulated by a cohort developed project, tutoring, research for a teacher, creating teaching materials, volunteering at school events, committee membership, etc.
   
   - Teacher candidates are required to keep a log of their efforts and submit it to the Site Facilitator at the end of the semester (the specific date is to be determined by the SF).

**Grading Policy**

Effective Fall 2009, the Pre-Service Mentor Teachers at the Partnership Schools will make grade recommendations to the Instructor of record. The evaluation form, lesson plan and rubric are the standards for evaluation. In addition, teacher candidates must model professional behavior, a positive open response to mentor-student feedback and work to meet all classroom/school expectations. **If a teacher candidate is performing at an unsatisfactory level in** the judgment of the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher, **he/she must contact the Coordinator of Field Experiences.** The staff will then work directly in the classroom and with the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher to support the growth of the candidate and work toward his/her success. If a Pre-Service Mentor Teacher is unsure of how to evaluate an intern, and requests support, it will be provided. A grade evaluation worksheet is attached to this syllabus. It is expected that the grade recommendation from the PSMT will match the ongoing feedback/goal setting reflected in the Collaborative Assessment Log.

**Effective Fall 2011, any student who does not earn a grade of “B” or better will not proceed to Internship and will repeat the EDEL 313 field experience. A grade of “B-“ will not be acceptable.**

Grade Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>94-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>90-93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>87-89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>84-86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>80-83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A grade of less than B requires that a student repeat this course. Late papers/assignments will not be accepted.
Attendance:

1. The standard of performance is that teacher candidates will be present on campus at their expected time. Their commitment to the program is a minimum of 135 hours over 15 weeks. Practicum 2 students are required to commit one morning and one full day to their campus each week. This can be arranged (with the PSMT and the SF) by staying all day on a Tuesday or Thursday (Effective Fall 2012).

2. If an absence occurs the student must do the following:
   a. Contact the PSMT on his/her cell phone by 7:00 AM
   b. Call or email the Site Facilitator (based on his/her instructions) by 7:00 AM
   c. Fill out an absence form to be signed by the PSMT and SF and turned in to Mrs. Paretti indicating the reason for the absence and when the time is to be made up.
   d. If all of the steps outlined above are not taken, the intern will be penalized a day's absence without leave and his/her grade lowered ½ (i.e. A becomes A-)
   e. Student tardiness is not tolerated. If a candidate fails to arrive before the students are in class, the day is considered an absence and it must be made up. An attendance form needs to be filled out as in an absence.

3. PSMT's are not permitted to approve absences from campus, early departures or late arrivals. They are to be approved only by Site Facilitators.

Dress Code:

Teacher candidates are expected to dress professionally and in compliance with the expectations which are posted on their website.
# PRACTICUM 2 CALENDAR-SPRING 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orientation for Practicum 2 Teacher candidates</td>
<td>1/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDSC 313 and CIS 602: 8:30-10:00am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDEL 313: 10:00 -11:30 am</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum 2 Teacher candidates report to assigned school site</td>
<td>1/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Practicum 2 Teacher candidates establish schedule for morning and full days of attendance (1 ½ days per week) during the semester; submit to the Site Facilitator and PSMT for approval</td>
<td>1/23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First of five whole class lessons to be taught during the semester; small group work can begin at any time. More than 5 lessons can be taught but 5 are required. All lessons require that plans be submitted to the PSMT the week before being taught for approval.</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First CAL due</td>
<td>2/13 and bi-weekly after this date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Development Day</td>
<td>2/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President's Day</td>
<td>2/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispositions evaluation by PSMT due</td>
<td>2/27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term Performance Evaluation by PSMT due</td>
<td>3/13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td>3/17-3/21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td>4/14-4/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Record, Service Log, Lemov Binder, and E-portfolio requirements due to Site Facilitator</td>
<td>By 5/8 (date to be arranged by Site Facilitator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day in field</td>
<td>5/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Performance Evaluation by PSMT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade recommendation due to Site Facilitator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades submitted by SF to Mrs. Paretti</td>
<td>5/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Misconduct – Academic integrity is a legitimate concern for every member of the campus community; all share in upholding the fundamental values of honesty, trust, respect, fairness, responsibility and professionalism. By choosing to join the UNLV community, students accept the expectations of the Academic Misconduct Policy and are encouraged when faced with choices to always take the ethical path. Students enrolling in UNLV assume the obligation to conduct themselves in a manner compatible with UNLV's function as an educational institution.

An example of academic misconduct is plagiarism. Plagiarism is using the words or ideas of another, from the Internet or any source, without proper citation of the sources. See the Student Academic Misconduct Policy (approved December 9, 2005) located at: http://studentconduct.unlv.edu/misconduct/policy.html.

Copyright – The University requires all members of the University Community to familiarize themselves and to follow copyright and fair use requirements. You are individually and solely responsible for violations of copyright and fair use laws. The university will neither protect nor defend you nor assume any responsibility for employee or student violations of fair use laws. Violations of copyright laws could subject you to federal and state civil penalties and criminal liability, as well as disciplinary action under University policies. Additional information can be found at: http://provost.unlv.edu/copyright/statements.html.

Disability Resource Center (DRC) – The Disability Resource Center (DRC) determines accommodations that are “reasonable” in promoting the equal access of a student reporting a disability to the general UNLV learning experience. In so doing, the DRC also balances instructor and departmental interests in maintaining curricular standards so as to best achieve a fair evaluation standard amongst students being assisted. In order for the DRC to be effective it must be considered in the dialog between the faculty and the student who is requesting accommodations. For this reason faculty should only provide students course adjustment after having received an “Academic Accommodation Plan.” If faculty members have any questions regarding the DRC, they should call a DRC counselor. UNLV complies with the provisions set forth in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The DRC is located in the Student Services Complex (SSC-A), Room 143, phone (702) 895-0866, fax (702) 895-0651. For additional information, please visit:

Religious Holidays Policy – Any student missing class quizzes, examinations, or any other class or lab work because of observance of religious holidays shall be given an opportunity during that semester to make up missed work. The make-up will apply to the religious holiday absence only. It shall be the responsibility of the student to notify the instructor no later than the end of the first two weeks of classes, February 1, 2013, of his or her intention to participate in religious holidays which do not fall on state holidays or periods of class recess. This policy shall not apply in the event that administering the test or examination at an alternate time would impose an
undue hardship on the instructor or the university that could not reasonably been avoided. For additional information, please visit: http://catalog.unlv.edu/content.php?catoid=4&navoid=164.

Incomplete Grades - The grade of I – Incomplete – can be granted when a student has satisfactorily completed all course work up to the withdrawal date of that semester/session but for reason(s) beyond the student’s control, and acceptable to the instructor, cannot complete the last part of the course, and the instructor believes that the student can finish the course without repeating it. A student who receives an I is responsible for making up whatever work was lacking at the end of the semester. If course requirements are not completed within the time indicated, a grade of F will be recorded and the GPA will be adjusted accordingly. Students who are fulfilling an Incomplete do not register for the course but make individual arrangements with the instructor who assigned the I grade.

Tutoring – The Academic Success Center (ASC) provides tutoring and academic assistance for all UNLV students taking UNLV courses. Students are encouraged to stop by the ASC to learn more about subjects offered, tutoring times and other academic resources. The ASC is located across from the Student Services Complex (SSC). Students may learn more about tutoring services by calling (702) 895-3177 or visiting the tutoring web site at:

UNLV Writing Center – One-on-one or small group assistance with writing is available free of charge to UNLV students at the Writing Center, located in CDC-3-301. Although walk-in consultations are sometimes available, students with appointments will receive priority assistance. Appointments may be made in person or by calling 895-3908. The student’s Rebel ID, a copy of the assignment (if possible), and two copies of any writing to be reviewed are requested for the consultation. More information can be found at:

Rebelmail – By policy, faculty and staff should e-mail students’ Rebelmail accounts only. Rebelmail is UNLV’s official e-mail system for students. It is one of the primary ways students receive official university communication such as information about deadlines, major campus events, and announcements. All UNLV students receive a Rebelmail account after they have been admitted to the university. Students’ e-mail prefixes are listed on class rosters. The suffix is always

Final Examinations – The University requires that final exams given at the end of a course occur at the time and on the day specified in the final exam schedule. See the schedule at:
Department of Teaching and Learning

Course Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elementary Supervised Student Teaching</th>
<th>EDEL 481-GLP</th>
<th>12 credit hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring 2014</td>
<td>Full Time/ hours of the School Partnership Site</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordinator of Field Experiences/ Dept. of Teaching and Learning</th>
<th>Office Location</th>
<th>Office Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor Lois Paretti</td>
<td>CEB 368 A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Office Hours:
Monday: 9:30-11:30, 1:00-2:00
Tuesday: 9:30-11:30 or by appointment

E-Mail:

Course Description
Full time teaching as a teacher candidate in an elementary school related directly to the student’s elementary education program of study. Elementary teacher candidates demonstrate their knowledge, skills and disposition for teaching through directed mentorship from certified licensed teachers and university site facilitators and participate in all aspects of an elementary school for a total of 12-16 credit hours.

InTASC Principles Addressed:
Standard #1: Learner Development
The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences.

Standard #2: Learning Differences
The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards.

Standard #3: Learning Environments
The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation.

Standard #4: Content Knowledge
The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make these aspects of the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content.
Standard #5: Application of Content
The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues.

Standard #6: Assessment
The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher’s and learner’s decision making.

Standard #7: Planning for Instruction
The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context.

Standard #8: Instructional Strategies
The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways.

Standard #9: Professional Learning and Ethical Practice
The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner.

Standard #10: Leadership and Collaboration
The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession.

This course addresses all of the elements included in the InTASC Principles.

Results: InTASC 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,and 10
Prospective elementary teachers in this course will address the following criteria for compliance. This will be accomplished through the coordination of coursework and field experiences. Accordingly, prospective teachers will be able to:

• Understand and describe personal beliefs that influence the ways teachers organize and manage classrooms for diverse learners

• Study selected literature on teacher roles, classroom environments, planning, organization, and management of instruction, managing behavior, and meeting learning needs of diverse students and assessing children’s learning in schools
• Applying knowledge of the teaching/learning process in organizing for teaching

• Demonstrate an understanding of the relationships among environment, curriculum, instruction, organization, and management in the elementary classroom.

• Understand and demonstrate classroom management strategies that create an effective classroom and support behavioral growth in their students.

• Understand and utilize the UNLV Department of Teaching and Learning Lesson Planning Template and meet the standards of the department rubric.

• Develop lesson plans that align with the Standards and those of the State of Nevada

• Develop and demonstrate classroom management strategies that allow for whole group, small group, cooperative group, paired/shared grouping patterns that support a variety of learning opportunities for students

• Develop skills for assessment of learning and decision making that a data-driven classroom teacher needs in order to successfully educate students

• Develop a “toolbox” of teaching strategies in various content and management areas

• Recognize the diversity of learners that they will be expected to teach and develop and demonstrate strategies to meet their needs

**Required Textbook/Resource:**

**Supplemental Texts and/or Materials**
The following are available on the Advising and Field Placement Center website:

• Absence Form
• Collaborative Assessment Log
• Community Service Log
• Elementary Lesson Planning Rubric
• Elementary Lesson Planning Template
• Field Experience Handbook
• Performance Evaluation Criteria
• Performance Evaluation Form
Assessment Criteria:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lesson Planning and Implementation</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Evaluation</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lemov Strategies Assignment</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Portfolio</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dispositions will only be reviewed if issues arise and will result in a lowered letter grade.

Performance Assessments

1. **Lesson Planning and Implementation**
   
   Student teachers/interns are required to use the Elementary Lesson Planning Template during the initial period of their Student Teaching/Internship and until the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher feels that the Student teacher/Intern has a strong enough pedagogy to use the short form. All lessons throughout the semester must be approved in advance of the lesson being taught. Student teachers/interns are reminded to complete the reflection portion of the template after each teaching experience.

2. **Evaluation of Instruction**: Instruction will be evaluated by the Pre-service mentor teacher at midterm (2/28) and at the end of the semester (4/25) by submitting the Performance Evaluation online. This evaluation will be discussed during a three-way conference with the student teacher/intern, the PSMT and the site facilitator.

   In addition, the PSMT will complete the (ungraded) **Collaborative Assessment Log (CAL)**. Formative assessment should be provided on a bi-weekly basis after the second week of school as the student teacher/intern and the PSMT meet to assess progress and set goals. The student teacher/intern is required to provide this form to the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher. It can be downloaded from the OFE website. **A copy of each CAL is to be given to the Site Facilitator upon completion.**

3. **Lemov Strategies Assignment**

   Clinical students need to bridge the gap between the theory of creating instruction based solely on the transmission of standards and objectives to implementation in a way that provides students with rigor and success. If we truly believe that all children can learn, then we must believe that we can teach them effectively. This text was selected because it is unique in its practicality and the volume of effective, proven pedagogical strategies that are effective in all grades.
and subjects. This assignment is designed to provide each clinical student with daily experience and reflection on these techniques.

Materials
- Small (3x5 or 4x6) Binder
- File cards
- Process:
  - Read the entire text as an overview to the acquisition of the 49 strategies.
  - Choose the strategies that you want to learn/master during this semester. At least one strategy must be utilized during each of the lessons that are taught. The Site Facilitator will check and review the student's progress and check that the strategies are documented in the lesson plan. An additional 15 strategies are required.
  - Start a “card” for each strategy. As you use it, note its effectiveness or challenges and the date.

Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Effectiveness Rating</th>
<th>Date Implemented/Reflection/Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Opt Out</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>(2/5/11) Asked student A if the drawing was ‘one’ or ‘two’ point perspective. His response was incorrect, so I asked Student B who responded correctly and then had him explain ‘why.’ Then, came back to student A, asking him the same question on a different one-point example. This time, his answer was correct and he was able to give me the reason why: one vanishing point. Next step: use the same technique on different content and, to involve more of the class, get several other students to respond before returning to the original responder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretch It</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>It worked because the ELL students were able to expand their thinking and gain confidence in their ideas (2/5/12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stretch It</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>My questions did not stimulate the students enough; I need to be better prepared next time. The kids seemed confused about what I was asking. (2/7/12)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**NOTE:** You will need to create definitions in YOUR OWN WORDS – please, do not copy from the student examples above.

- Discuss your strategy use throughout the semester as you learn from/with others.
- Take this binder into the classroom with you as you begin your career along and continue to develop and refine your pedagogical skills. Expect 3 years to proficiency and 5 to mastery. Be patient. Champion teachers can do these things. Be one!

### Rubric: Lemov Assignment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Not Acceptable (1)</th>
<th>Acceptable (2)</th>
<th>Target (3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>Cards loose and disorganized and the # of strategies less than the minimum required</td>
<td>Cards in binder; required number of strategies present</td>
<td>Cards in binder, organized and neatly maintained; required number of strategies present; detailed documentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Entries are infrequent and do not display clear understanding of each strategy</td>
<td>Entries are regular and demonstrate an understanding of the strategies</td>
<td>Entries are regular, demonstrate an understanding of the strategies and reflect success/challenges and next steps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Site Facilitator will periodically review the Lemov assignment and grade it during the final visit (at a date to be determined). The assignment will be grading according to the rubric.
4. E Portfolio
   a. Continue the work that was started in the previous semester, and as described on the 21 e-portfolio website: http://sites.google.com/site/21cportfolio1/
   b. Continue to archive artifacts from the field
   c. Choose a theme
   d. Connect 5-8 sample artifacts from the three semesters of this project and connect them to the College of Education Principles.
   e. Practice presenting the portfolio to an audience
   f. Present the portfolio on your assigned portfolio day at the end of the semester.

Grading Scale:
10 points = Satisfactory completion
0 points= Any components not completed

5. Service
   o Each UNLV student teacher/intern is to contribute to the school by earning a total of 10 service points during the student teaching/internship semester. Each point represents one hour of service.
   o Points can be accumulated by a cohort developed project, tutoring, research for a teacher, creating teaching materials, volunteering at school events, committee membership, etc.
   o Student teachers/interns are required to keep a log of their efforts and submit it to the Site Facilitator at the end of the semester (the specific date is to be determined by the SF).

Attendance:
1. The standard of performance is that student teachers/interns will be present on campus at their expected time. Student teachers/interns are expected to be present at their schools during the required hours of teacher attendance. It is suggested that students make every effort to shadow the hours of their Pre-Service Mentor Teacher if that is beyond the required hours.
2. If an absence occurs the student must do the following:
   a. Contact the PSMT on his/her cell phone by 6:00 AM
   b. Call or email the Site Facilitator (based on his/her instructions) by 6:00 AM
   c. Fill out an absence form to be signed by the PSMT and SF and turned in to Mrs. Paretti indicating the reason for the absence and student teacher/when the time is to be made up.
   d. If all of the steps outlined above are not taken, the student teacher/intern will be penalized a day’s absence without leave and his/her grade lowered ½ (i.e. A becomes A-)
e. Student tardiness is not tolerated. If a candidate fails to arrive before the
students are in class, the day is considered an absence and it must be
made up. An attendance form needs to be filled out as in an absence.

3. PSMT’s are not permitted to approve absences from campus, early departures or
late arrivals. They are to be approved only by Site Facilitators.

Dress Code: UNLV student teachers/interns are expected to dress in compliance with
the expectations which are posted on their website.

Grading Policy
Effective Fall 2009, the Pre-Service Mentor Teachers at the Partnership Schools will
make grade recommendations to the UNLV instructor of record. The UNLV evaluation
form, lesson plan and rubric are the standards for evaluation. In addition, student
teachers/interns must model professional behavior, a positive open response to mentor-
student feedback and work to meet all classroom/school expectations. If a student
teacher/intern is performing at an unsatisfactory level in the judgment of the Pre-Service
Mentor Teacher, he/she must contact the UNLV Site Facilitator or the Coordinator
of Field Experiences. The UNLV staff will then work directly in the classroom and with
the Pre-Service Mentor Teacher to support the growth of the student teacher/intern and
work towards their success. If a Pre-Service Mentor Teacher is unsure of how to
evaluate a student teacher/ intern, and requests support, it will be provided.
Grade Scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>94-100</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90-93</td>
<td>A-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87-89</td>
<td>B+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84-86</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-83</td>
<td>B-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Due Dates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers/Interns report to assigned school site</td>
<td>1/6/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers /Interns submit all forms, syllabi, and supplemental materials to PSMT and review jointly</td>
<td>1/6/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teachers /Interns begin planning and instruction within the co-teaching model</td>
<td>1/6/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First CAL due</td>
<td>1/24/14 and bi-weekly thereafter; more if needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-term Performance Evaluation by PSMT due</td>
<td>2/28/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three-week leadership take over</td>
<td>Dates determined for individual student teachers/interns at each site by the PSMT and Site Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Portfolio presentations at school sites</td>
<td>Dates determined for individual student teacher at each site by the PSMT and Site Facilitator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit Survey Meeting</td>
<td>4/9 on UNLV campus  (Room TBD) EDSC: 3:00-4:30 pm EDEL: 4:45-6:00 pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Break</td>
<td>4/14-4/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Last day in field for Student Teachers /Interns; Time Record, Service Log, and Lemov Binder due to Site Facilitator Final Performance Evaluation by PSMT due Grade recommendation due to Site Facilitator</td>
<td>4/25/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E Portfolio presentations at UNLV</td>
<td>5/2/14 at 9:00 am on UNLV campus (Room TBD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades submitted by Site Facilitator</td>
<td>5/2/14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Misconduct – Academic integrity is a legitimate concern for every member of the campus community; all share in upholding the fundamental values of honesty, trust, respect, fairness, responsibility and professionalism. By choosing to join the UNLV community, students accept the expectations of the Academic Misconduct Policy and are encouraged when faced with choices to always take the ethical path. Students enrolling in UNLV assume the obligation to conduct themselves in a manner compatible with UNLV's function as an educational institution. An example of academic misconduct is plagiarism. Plagiarism is using the words or ideas of another, from the Internet or any source, without proper citation of the sources. See the Student Academic Misconduct Policy (approved December 9, 2005) located at: [http://studentconduct.unlv.edu/misconduct/policy.html](http://studentconduct.unlv.edu/misconduct/policy.html).

Copyright – The University requires all members of the University Community to familiarize themselves and to follow copyright and fair use requirements. You are individually and solely responsible for violations of copyright and fair use laws. The university will neither protect nor defend you nor assume any responsibility for employee or student violations of fair use laws. Violations of copyright laws could subject you to federal and state civil penalties and criminal liability, as well as disciplinary action under University policies. Additional information can be found at: [http://provost.unlv.edu/copyright/statements.html](http://provost.unlv.edu/copyright/statements.html).

Disability Resource Center (DRC) – The Disability Resource Center (DRC) determines accommodations that are “reasonable” in promoting the equal access of a student reporting a disability to the general learning experience. In so doing, the DRC also balances instructor and departmental interests in maintaining curricular standards so as to best achieve a fair evaluation standard amongst students being assisted. In order for the DRC to be effective it must be considered in the dialog between the faculty and the student who is requesting accommodations. For this reason faculty should only provide students course adjustment after having received an “Academic Accommodation Plan.” If faculty members have any questions regarding the DRC, they should call a DRC counselor. UNLV complies with the provisions set forth in Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 and the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. The DRC is located in the Student Services Complex (SSC-A), Room 143, phone (702) 895-0866, fax (702) 895-0651. For additional information, please visit: [http://provost.unlv.edu/copyright/statements.html](http://provost.unlv.edu/copyright/statements.html).

Religious Holidays Policy – Any student missing class quizzes, examinations, or any other class or lab work because of observance of religious holidays shall be given an opportunity during that semester to make up missed work. The make-up will apply to the religious holiday absence only. It shall be the responsibility of the student to notify the instructor no later than the end of the first two weeks of classes, February 1, 2013, of his or her intention to participate in religious holidays which do not fall on state holidays or periods of class recess. This policy shall not apply in the event that administering the test or examination at an alternate time would impose an undue hardship on the instructor or the university that could not reasonably been avoided. For additional information, please visit: [http://provost.unlv.edu/copyright/statements.html](http://provost.unlv.edu/copyright/statements.html).

Incomplete Grades - The grade of I – Incomplete – can be granted when a student has satisfactorily completed all course work up to the withdrawal date of that semester/session but for reason(s) beyond the student’s control, and acceptable to the instructor, cannot complete the last part of the course, and the instructor believes that the student can finish the course without repeating it. A student who receives an I is responsible for making up whatever work was lacking at the end of the semester. If course requirements are not completed within the time indicated, a grade of F will be recorded and the GPA will be adjusted accordingly. Students who are fulfilling an Incomplete do not register for the course but make individual arrangements with
the instructor who assigned the I grade.

Tutoring – The Academic Success Center (ASC) provides tutoring and academic assistance for all students taking courses. Students are encouraged to stop by the ASC to learn more about subjects offered, tutoring times and other academic resources. The ASC is located across from the Student Services Complex (SSC). Students may learn more about tutoring services by calling (702) 895-3177 or visiting the tutoring web site at:

Writing Center – One-on-one or small group assistance with writing is available free of charge to students at the Writing Center, located in CDC-3-301. Although walk-in consultations are sometimes available, students with appointments will receive priority assistance. Appointments may be made in person or by calling 895-3908. The student’s Rebel ID Card, a copy of the assignment (if possible), and two copies of any writing to be reviewed are requested for the consultation. More information can be found at:

Rebelmail – By policy, faculty and staff should e-mail students’ Rebelmail accounts only. Rebelmail is UNLV’s official e-mail system for students. It is one of the primary ways students receive official university communication such as information about deadlines, major campus events, and announcements. All students receive a Rebelmail account after they have been admitted to the university. Students’ e-mail prefixes are listed on class rosters. The suffix is always @unlv.nevada.edu.

Final Examinations – The University requires that final exams given at the end of a course occur at the time and on the day specified in the final exam schedule. See the schedule at:
Appendix E

Elementary Lesson Plan Description, Template and Rubric

**Elementary Lesson Plan Detailed Description**

1. **State Standards:** Standards refer to state approved, subject and grade level specific, documents. Lessons must address at least one standard. District level curriculum documents usually link objectives to standards, however, you may also identify appropriate standards by consulting the state department of education’s listing of approved state standards for your content area.

2. **Teaching Model:** For methods courses, this maybe dictated via a methods instructor’s syllabus. Simply put the name of the teaching method(s) here, eg: “Direct or Indirect Instruction” – Cooperative learning; Centers

3. **Objective(s):** If you are placed in a field experience, objectives should be sourced from specific district specific curriculum documents. When providing an objective, also provide any specific numbering that refers to district curriculum and state standards. Include four parts; Audience, Behavior, Degree, Condition

   If you are not using a district specific curriculum document: using Bloom’s (revised) taxonomy, clearly state the objective(s) of the lesson. The objectives should be SMART (student-centered, measureable, attainable, reasonable, and teachable). Make sure you consider higher levels of learning and ensure that you have considered and addressed cognitive, affective and psychomotor domains (as applicable). Also, align the standards from #1 above to your objectives. Which objective(s) meet which standard(s)

4. **Materials & Resources:** Use a variety of modes and materials (e.g., use of internet, textbooks, handouts, overhead transparencies, PowerPoint, videos, guest speakers). Include description of quantity, distribution and collection strategies.

5. **Instructional Procedures: General Guidelines**

   This section includes the a. Motivation/Engagement, b. Activities or Student Learning Experiences, c. Closure, and d. Extension and Contingency Plans.

   • Indicate an estimated time for each step in the instructional procedures.
   • Steps: Is the new material presented in small steps, focusing on one skill or concept at a time? Are there sufficient and appropriate examples? Are examples concrete?
   • Management issues: Where and how will the transitions in the lesson occur? How will you begin? What is your quiet signal?
   • Technology use: What technological aids are you use to help students’ understanding? Is there evidence of technology and audio-visual use/integration?
   • Student learning: Are there opportunities for active learning? Are you addressing different modes, styles and ways of learning? Are students sufficiently prepared for student practice? Is there sufficient student practice (where appropriate)? Are these
aligned to the objectives of the lesson? Is there sufficient teacher feedback during student practice?

**Specific Guidelines**

a. Motivation/Engagement: Explain how you will establish set and how much time the lesson will take. Explain how the objectives of the lesson will be communicated to students. Describe the motivational techniques you will use. Explain how this lesson links to prior knowledge, learning experiences, and other lessons. What is your hook to engage the students?

b. Activities or Learning Experiences: State how the activities or learning experiences help students meet the objective(s) of the lesson. Estimate how much time each step will take. Describe the motivational techniques you will use. Explain how the activities or learning experiences link to prior knowledge, learning, and lessons. Clearly outline teacher and student actions for each step of the instructional procedure. Identify Lemov, Kagan and Questioning Strategies.

c. Closure: State how the lesson will end and how you will ensure student understanding. Explain what students can expect in future lessons. In your closure, you should refer to the objectives that were introduced in the beginning of the lesson.

d. Extension and Contingency Plan: Describe what you and the students will do if time remains in the lesson, especially if the students have achieved mastery or understanding of the content. How can you extend their learning in the remaining time? List some extensions to the lesson and the procedures for them. Describe your contingency plan if you need to cut the lesson short due to unforeseen circumstances. What can you cut or move without drastically changing the learning outcomes?

6. **Modifications and Accommodations:** Explain how you modify the lesson and/or accommodate the classroom environment for diverse learners (e.g., special needs students, ELL, differences in learning styles, different abilities, cultural differences). In the field, as much as possible, refer to your PSMT for specific students’ IEPs and/or 504 accommodations in order to align the lesson to their specific needs.

7. **Student Assessment:** Generally, the assessment tools should be based on the teaching model and aligned to the instructional procedures and objectives of the lesson. State how you will review and check for student understanding during and at the end of the instructional process. Use a variety of ways to check for student understanding. Provide an accounting of formative and summative assessments in the lesson.
If you are in Practicum 2 and Internship, your formal lessons must include the detailed assessment of student work included here:

**Formative Assessment:**

a. Use of student artifact
   I. Item analysis/Attach sample of student work
   II. Teaching strategy used
   III. Next steps/new effective re-teaching strategy
   IV. Results of next steps
   V. Reflection about your teaching approach and implications for future practice

**Summative Assessment:**

a. Describe method for summatively assessing students
   I. Summative assessment of achievement based on objective
   II. Have students achieved desired objectives?
   III. Have you used effective questioning techniques to promote critical thinking?
   IV. Did you use a variety of assessments in order to accommodate different learning styles?

Data collection procedures for formative and summative assessments may include observations, interviews, graphic organizers, performances, products, tests, drawings, written communications, etc. Be sure to specify how you will collect the data and what data you plan to collect. For example, if you plan to "observe" students, be sure to identify what you are looking for and create a checklist for record-keeping purposes. If you plan to interview them, develop your questions. If you plan to assess an activity, product or writing, develop a rubric.

8. **Homework:** Describe the homework assignment, how it is aligned to the instructional objectives and process, and how it should be assessed. If you do not have a homework assignment provide an explanation, for example “No homework necessary because lesson objectives were met during class time.”

9. **Reflection:** if the lesson is taught in the field, then this reflection should be completed after the lesson was taught. Consider how your expectations were or were not met and consider reasons why. Include: strengths, concerns and insights.
UNLV Student: | PSMT Name: 
---|---
Lesson Plan Title: | Lesson Plan Topic: 
Date: | Estimated Time: 
Grade Level: | School Site: 

1. State Standard(s):

2. Teaching Model(s):

3. Objective(s):

4. Materials and Technology Resources

5. Instructional Procedures:
   a. Motivation/Engagement:
   b. Developmental Activities or Learning Experiences:
   c. Closure:
   d. Extension:

6. Accommodations, Modifications and Differentiations for Diverse Learners:

7. Assessment and Evaluation of Learning:
   a. Formative:
   b. Summative:

8. Homework Assignment:

9. Reflection:
   a. Strengths:
   b. Concerns:
   c. Insights:
### Correlation to The Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC)
Model Core Teaching Standards are indicated for each component.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lesson Plan Component</th>
<th>Level 3 - Target</th>
<th>Level 2 - Acceptable</th>
<th>Level 1 - Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. State Standards (INTASC 1, 7)</strong></td>
<td>Identifies all relevant and applicable content area standards as provided by the Nevada Department of Education.</td>
<td>Identifies most relevant and applicable content area standards as provided by the Nevada Department of Education.</td>
<td>Identifies few relevant and applicable content area standards as provided by the Nevada Department of Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Teaching Model (INTASC 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
<td>Teaching model listed matches syllabus requirement.</td>
<td>Teaching model not listed.</td>
<td>Teaching model not listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Objectives (INTASC 4, 5)</strong></td>
<td>Objectives are appropriately sourced from district curriculum documents if possible and meet all of the &quot;SMART&quot; objective descriptors.</td>
<td>Objectives are appropriately sourced from district curriculum documents if possible and meet most of the &quot;SMART&quot; objective descriptors.</td>
<td>Objectives are appropriately sourced from district curriculum documents if possible and meet few of the &quot;SMART&quot; objective descriptors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Materials &amp; Resources (INTASC 3, 7)</strong></td>
<td>Describes all of the materials and resources required.</td>
<td>Describes most of the materials and resources required.</td>
<td>Lists few of the materials and resources required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Instructional Procedures (INTASC 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)</strong></td>
<td>a. <strong>Motivation/Engagement</strong> Addresses all of the elements of an introduction—establish set, define time, quiet signal, &quot;hook,&quot; motivational techniques, and links to prior knowledge.</td>
<td>Addresses most of the elements of an introduction—establish set, define time, quiet signal, &quot;hook,&quot; motivational techniques, and links to prior knowledge.</td>
<td>Addresses few of the elements of an introduction—establish set, define time, quiet signal, &quot;hook,&quot; motivational techniques, and links to prior knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b. <strong>Activities &amp; Experiences</strong> Follows all steps/phases of the teaching model and clearly outlines teacher and student actions. Lesson process is clearly defined.</td>
<td>Follows most steps/phases of the teaching model and clearly outlines teacher and student actions. Lesson process is well defined.</td>
<td>Follows some steps/phases of the teaching model and outlines some teacher and student actions. Lesson process is unclearly delineated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Closure</td>
<td>Encompasses all of the requirements as described: definite end to lesson, ensures links between current and prior learning, lets students know what to expect in the future, refers back to learning objectives.</td>
<td>Encompasses most of the requirements as described: definite end to lesson, ensures links between current and prior learning, lets students know what to expect in the future, refers back to learning objectives.</td>
<td>Encompasses few of the requirements as described: definite end to lesson, ensures links between current and prior learning, lets students know what to expect in the future, refers back to learning objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Extension &amp; Contingency</td>
<td>Provides reasonably planned extensions and contingencies based on the lesson plan description.</td>
<td>Provides either a reasonably planned extension or reasonably planned contingency based on the lesson plan description and omits one.</td>
<td>Does not provide either an extension or contingency plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Modifications &amp; Accommodations (INTASC 2, 3, 6, 7)</td>
<td>Provides at least two reasonable modifications or accommodations to the lesson that differentiate instruction for diverse learners.</td>
<td>Provides at a reasonable modification or accommodation to the lesson that differentiate instruction for diverse learners.</td>
<td>Does not provide any reasonable modifications or accommodations to the lesson that differentiate instruction for diverse learners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Assessment (INTASC 1, 2, 6, 7)</td>
<td>Meets all of the requirements as detailed in the lesson description and based on field experience level: (follows teaching model, aligned to procedures and objective, reviews for understanding during and after, uses variety, equitable distribution of teaching and learning, <strong>formative</strong> and <strong>summative</strong> assessments are listed).</td>
<td>Meets most of the requirements as detailed in the lesson description and based on field experience level: (follows on teaching model, aligned to procedures and objective, reviews for understanding during and after, uses variety, equitable distribution of teaching and learning, <strong>formative</strong> and <strong>summative</strong> assessments are listed).</td>
<td>Meets few of the requirements as detailed in the lesson description and based on field experience level: (follows on teaching model, aligned to procedures and objective, reviews for understanding during and after, uses variety, equitable distribution of teaching and learning, <strong>formative</strong> and <strong>summative</strong> assessments are listed).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Homework <em>(INTASC 6, 7)</em></td>
<td>Meets all of the requirements as provided in the Lesson Description alignment to objectives, assessment, materials.</td>
<td>Meets most of the requirements as provided in the Lesson Description alignment to objectives, assessment, materials.</td>
<td>Meets few of the requirements as provided in the Lesson Description alignment to objectives, assessment, materials.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reflection – if taught in field experience <em>(INTASC 9)</em></td>
<td>In depth notes relating to strengths, challenges and insights of the lesson plan as well as suggested modifications for future replication.</td>
<td>Notes relating to challenges, strengths, challenges and insights of the lesson plan and suggested improvements for future replication.</td>
<td>Superficial notes relating to either strengths, challenges and insights of the lesson and/or suggested improvements for future replication.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Reflection – for methods courses <em>(INTASC 9)</em></td>
<td>Reflects on the advantages and challenges of writing the lesson based in the assigned model for the chosen content. Specific attention is paid to the process of planning the delivery of instruction and evaluation of learning.</td>
<td>Reflects on only the advantages or challenges of writing the lesson based in the assigned model with little regard for the chosen content. Some attention is paid to the process of planning the delivery of instruction and evaluation of learning.</td>
<td>Superficially reflects on writing the lesson based in the assigned model with little regard for the chosen content. Little attention is paid to the process of planning the delivery of instruction and evaluation of learning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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