



美国教师教育电子档案袋评价的比较研究 (三)

内容编辑: 孟伟丽 / 网上发布: 2007-9-7 / 已经查看: 11635次

The Single Subject Program faculty recommended three major changes in the portfolio process as a result of this study. First, artifact submission will be embedded into the program coursework and evaluated by the individual course instructors as part of the course requirements. The Single Subject Program instructors have since identified course assignments that align to the portfolio elements that will be considered signature assignments for use as possible portfolio artifacts. This list of suggested artifacts (e.g., signature assignments) will be given to students when entering the program and will be identified in each course syllabus. Second, all artifacts submitted by students must be their original work. Now that many of the process details and signature assignments have been identified and integrated into the coursework, the Single Subject faculty believes it reasonable for students to generate artifacts that represent their knowledge, skills, and dispositions. Third, the structure of the portfolio evaluation process has been changed. Only the reflective narrative will be evaluated at the end of each semester. This reduces not only the time spent by evaluators but also the cost necessary for paying evaluators. First semester student teachers will submit all of the artifacts and a reflective narrative for one core competency area for formative evaluation. Second semester student teachers (e.g., graduating students) will submit a complete portfolio for summative evaluation. These changes addressed the concerns of the FAC, students, and evaluators regarding the portfolio process.

Interestingly, each program is adopting the practice of signature assignments to embed the portfolio process into the programs' structure but will be doing so in different ways. The signature assignments in the Education Specialist portfolio will be the same for each student. Therefore, every student portfolio will have the same artifacts included in their portfolio. This is not the case for the Single Subject portfolios. The signature assignments are identified as only suggestions for portfolio elements; there is freedom for the students to include other original artifacts in lieu of a signature assignment. Because the single subject students do not all take the same sequence of classes due to the specialized content methods classes and because the faculty feel it



- | | |
|---------|-----------------------|
| [理论探讨] | 中国高校教育技术学科综合竞 ... |
| [新闻快报] | 中国教育技术协会2008年征文通知 |
| [研究生教育] | 教育技术学硕士研究生招生变 ... |
| [资源共享] | CSSCI来源期刊(2008—2009年) |
| [新闻快报] | 第二届国际信息技术研讨会 (...) |
| [专家学者] | 汪琼 教授 |
| [专家学者] | 祝智庭 教授 |
| [就业展望] | 徐州师范大学2008年人才招聘 |
| [课题奖项] | 全国教育科学“十一五”规划 ... |
| [教育技术史] | 思辨中演进的教育技术学(上) |

- 浅析中外网络教育
- 对国外教育信息化研究的回顾与展望
- 中美高校网络教育研究
- 国外有影响的移动教育研究项目比较分析
- 网络教育中外对比研究
- 中印高中信息技术教育课程的比较研究
- “现代教育技术与传统教学手段的比较研究”管见
- 中、英高等教育领域网络教育状况比较
- 我国香港和台湾的教育信息化发展战略及其启示
- 国内外网络课程技术与设计元素对比研究

is more important to see how the students construct their own understandings of the core competencies and make connections in their reflective narrative, this choice was built into artifact selection. This is an important distinction between the two programs.

There were significant concerns raised by evaluators and the FACs about the commercialelectronic portfolio program. Although the evaluator and FAC comments from each program were similar, the Education Specialist program decided not to use the commercial program the following year based upon the difficulties and obstacles identified in this study. The SingleSubject program however, continued to use the commercial product based upon the positive feedback received from the students regarding ease of use and the access to the California State Academic Content Standards within the lesson plan template. The FACs shared the data and initial results from this study with the e-portfolio company. The company has since updated their service to include options for multiple simultaneous raters and aggregating qualitative comments on-line. We feel this is a significant outcome of this study. The Education Specialist program is now reconsidering using the system now that these two major obstacles have been remedied.

It is anticipated that these changes in the portfolio processes in both programs will become seamless and not viewed as an additional assignment giving validity to the portfolio as a significant program requirement. These changes will also make program instructors more aware and accountable for evaluating the portfolio products as part of the curriculum and not a time-consuming event at the end of the semester. As with any form of assessment, time will be needed in learning to use the tools. However, as evaluators use the tools more frequently, less time will be involved in assessing student work.

Implications

Overall, a portfolio must be and perceived as integrated into a teacher education program by students and faculty. It is important that portfolio elements are aligned and goals and tasks are clear to the participants. Additionally, the time and resources needed to successfully implement and maintain a portfolio system must not be overlooked. Coordinating the players and tasks, evaluation of candidate work, evaluation of process, aggregation and analysis of data, data management, and maintenance of the process are all necessary elements in a successful portfolio assessment process.

The significance of this pilot study, as compared to other institutions implementing electronic portfolios for the first time, is that being at a start-up institution is an extremely unique environment. As faculty, we had the freedom to create curricular programs and assessment tools without preconceived structures and historical issues to overcome. This freedom exposes other obstacles - ones that may be representative of any teacher education program as evidenced in the literature. At the time of this study, we were not just trying to develop and implement an electronic portfolio assessment system in an established institution; we were (and still are) simultaneously developing curricula and policies for the credential programs and for the university. Ours

is a fluid and flexible environment and one in which our students are learning the same traits as they begin the learning to teach process. At first, the students in both programs viewed the portfolio as an “add-on” piece—because for them, it was not integrated into the program. But, since this study, the portfolio systems in both programs have evolved in different ways and all constituents have a better understanding of the portfolio and its significance in their professional lives (Klenowski, 2000).

References

Bloom, L. A. & Bacon, E. H. (1995). Professional portfolios: An alternative perspective on the preparation of teachers of students with behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders*, 20(4), 290-300.

Dysthe, O. & Engelsen, K. S. (2004). Portfolios and assessment in teacher education in Norway: A theory-based discussion of different models in two sites. *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 29(2), 239-258.

Grier, J. M. & Denney, M. K. (2004). Portfolio evaluation rubrics: Teacher Education Programs Assessment Project. California State University Channel Islands. Unpublished instruments.

Klenowski, V. (2000). Portfolios: Promoting teaching. *Assessment in Education*, 7(2), 215-236.

Loughran, J., Corrigan, D. (1995). Teaching portfolios: A strategy for developing learning and teaching in preservice education. *Teaching & Teacher Education*, 11(6), 565-577.

Wolf, D. P. (1989). Portfolio assessment: Sampling student work. *Educational Leadership*, 46(7), 35-39.

Wolf, D. P. (1991). The schoolteacher's portfolio: Issues in design, implementation and evaluation. *Phi Delta Kappa*, 73, 129-136.

Woodward, H. & Nanlohy, P. (2004). Digital portfolios in pre-service teacher education. *Assessment in Education*, 11(2), 167-178.

Appendix A

Education Specialist: Mild/Moderate Disabilities Level I Credential Program
Portfolio

Organizational Outline:

I. Resume

II. Philosophy of Teaching

III. Core Competency: Foundations

A. History

B. Laws and Policy

C. Ethics

D. Professional Standards and Practices

E. Family Systems across the Life Span

F. Service Delivery Systems

G. Consultation Models and Processes

H. Effective Communication and Collaboration

I. Characteristics of Learners

IV. Core Competency: Assessment

- A. Individual Assessment
- B. Group Assessment
- C. Assessment Processes - Pre-referral, Referral, Identification, Evaluation, Re-evaluation
- D. IEP Goals and Objectives
- E. Behavioral Assessment
- V. Core Competency: Methods

A. Learning Environments, Social Interaction, and Classroom Management

- B. Core Curriculum in General Education
- C. Specialized Curriculum
- D. Instructional Methods
- E. Intervention Methods
- F. Modification of Methods and Materials
- G. Positive Behavioral Support

VI. Guiding Questions:

1. What are the special qualities that you bring as an individual and you have developed as a professional?

2. How does this portfolio represent you as a developing professional who can address the diverse needs of all students?

3. How does this portfolio represent your evolving philosophy of teaching and practice?

V. Core Competency: Methods

A. Learning Environments, Social Interaction, and Classroom Management

- B. Core Curriculum in General Education
- C. Specialized Curriculum
- D. Instructional Methods
- E. Intervention Methods
- F. Modification of Methods and Materials
- G. Positive Behavioral Support

本文来自《美国教育资源信息中心》<http://www.eric.ed.gov/>。

[【 资料 】](#) [【 短消息 】](#) [【 订阅 】](#) [【 收藏 】](#) [【 我要发布 】](#) [【 评论 】](#)

