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ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to investigate the process of portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders at the master’s degree level and to add to the knowledge base of portfolio assessment practices in the field of educational administration. Particular emphasis was placed on the following issues of portfolio assessment: (1) needs that prompted the redesigning of traditional assessment processes and lead toward portfolio assessment as an alternative; (2) purposes for portfolio assessment in a program; (3) models for portfolio assessment planning and implementation in programs preparing educational leaders, including key people, major stages, events, and unique features; (4) skills, abilities, and educational leadership competencies to be demonstrated by program graduates; (5) structural components of portfolios used to demonstrate specified competencies and rationale for content selection; (6) practices and strategies for portfolio evaluation; (7) lessons learned by people implementing portfolio assessment in the programs; (8) meaning and definitions of portfolios as identified by faculty and students; (9) similarities and differences in perceptions of and attitudes toward portfolio assessment among program faculty and students with the specification of strengths and weaknesses of portfolios, (10) factors that facilitate or inhibit implementation of portfolio assessment in various programs as perceived by faculty and students; and (11) potential ways to improve portfolio assessment as recognized by both students and faculty.

The in-depth study consisted of web-based surveys of faculty and students in four Educational Leadership/Administration programs, telephone and video interviews, and content analysis of documents. Four major purposes of portfolio assessment were identified: (1) assessment of student professional competencies required for graduation; (2) evaluation of internships; (3) program evaluation; and (4) initiation of a career advancement portfolio and job search tool. Such strategies and activities as faculty members serving as mentors in portfolio development, peer and group discussions, written guidelines for portfolio development and evaluation, websites with information related to portfolio assessment in a program, detailed
checklists, rubrics, and evaluation forms available to faculty and students, and culminating portfolio presentation proved to be effective in portfolio assessment implementation process.

Though students in four programs designed their portfolios differently, the following major components were used more often: (1) table of content, (2) introduction to the portfolio, (3) student resume, (4) portfolio artifacts as a demonstration of acquired competencies, (5) self-reflective narrative, (5) leadership framework, (6) statements of five-year professional goals, and (7) summary and conclusions. Portfolio evaluation issues were identified as the most critical both by the faculty and students. Programs in this study used different formats for their assessment rubrics and rating sheets and assessed separately the quality of portfolio and mastery of standards. Student portfolio presentations and feedback provided by faculty seemed to be a valuable practice.

The results of this study support the premise that the use of portfolio assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration has a great potential for preparing educational leaders. Both faculty and students in studied programs saw major strengths in portfolio assessment as portfolios contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies; serve as a self-evaluation tool that help students document areas of strength and become aware of areas of weaknesses; and foster critical thinking in students. However, faculty members and students believed that portfolio assessment had some weaknesses, in particular: portfolios were labor intensive for faculty to evaluate; grading of portfolios was inconsistent with current grading system in higher education; and portfolio assessments lacked demonstrated validity.

Data collected during this study revealed that several factors function as facilitators or as barriers in the assessment process. It is suggested that knowing facilitators and barriers is important and critical for successful portfolio assessment. Identification of these factors influences the strategy of portfolio implementation through removing the barriers and enhancing the facilitating factors. Both the faculty and students considered the importance of facilitating factors, such as the availability of training and/or a portfolio handbook for the faculty and students, availability of the instructor’s time to guide students and evaluate portfolios, systematic and formal planning of the portfolio assessment process, and more detailed information about portfolios. Such factors as faculty members’ assumptions that portfolios are too time consuming to grade, lack of training for the faculty, and lack of information about the advantages of
portfolio assessment were agreed upon by both the faculty and students as barriers to successful portfolio assessment implementation.

The information gained from this study indicated that the portfolio process could be improved in a variety of ways. Both the faculty and students involved in this study made recommendations about improving portfolio assessment in such areas as advising and guiding students in portfolio development, portfolio expectations, evaluation and feedback mechanisms, involvement of practicing school administrators and representatives of state and national agencies, training for the faculty and students, peer review of portfolios, and research on portfolio assessment effectiveness in the program. Moving toward electronic portfolios might make the portfolio process more effective and efficient, thus eliminating many barriers and adding such advantages as easy update, transfer, and storage, interactivity, and use of multiple media for developing artifacts and demonstrating achievements. All these recommendations were incorporated into the Educational Leadership Portfolio Assessment Model that was encouraged by the findings of this study.

Although the current study does not allow for a generalization of findings, it will still provide an important contribution to the literature on portfolio assessment for several reasons. First, it is the first study of portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders of this scope. Second, it is one of few studies comparing perceptions or faculty and students regarding portfolio assessment. Third, this study provides a good resource for Educational Leadership/Administration programs that are considering portfolio assessment implementation or planning improvements in their current portfolio models.
CHAPTER 1
THE RESEARCH PROBLEM AND STUDY FOCUS

Considerable attention is now being paid to the reform of assessment practices in higher education. Faculty members in colleges and universities have been asked to examine competencies of their graduates and to demonstrate that their academic programs accomplish specified purposes. Higher education has been moving from an era dominated by standardized tests to an era concerned with accountability, improvement of learning, and the authenticity of assessment (Angelo, 1999; Banta, Lund, Black, & Oblander, 1996; Baume, 2001; CAEL, 2000; Campbell et al., 2000; Heywood, 2000; Messick, 1999; NPBEA, 2002; Palomba & Banta, 2001; Scott, 2001).

To understand the focus of research and the relevance of this study, it is necessary to place the research problem in a context of present assessment practices in postsecondary education and, especially, graduate programs. A critique of the latter sets the stage for discussing performance-based types of assessment, and, particularly, the portfolio-based assessment as an alternative. A key part of assessment research is developing continuous, systematic, comprehensive, and rigorous tasks that encourage creative approaches and strategies, engage learners in higher-level thinking and meaningful performances, enable students to use and demonstrate a broad range of abilities, promote growth and development, and distinctly and uniformly communicate student achievement to different audiences.

Portfolio-based assessment is one of the approaches that have shown considerable promise (Belenoff & Dickson, 1991; Black, Daiker, Sommers & Stygall, 1994; Calfee & Perfumo, 1996; Campbell et al., 2000; Graves & Sunstein, 1992; Lescher, 1995; Palomba & Banta, 2001; Tillema, 1998). Broadly defined, a portfolio is a systematic collection of artifacts and reflections that demonstrates evidence of student achievement of specified competencies or standards, according to a defined set of principles (AERA, 1999; NPBEA, 2002). Portfolios are gaining attention because proponents believe that portfolios are better predictors of student
performance in "real life" situations as well as capable of improving students' higher order thinking skills and learning experiences (DeFabio, 1993; Feur & Fulton, 1993; Jamentz, 1994; Tillema, 1998).

As an alternative form of assessment, portfolios have a rich history in secondary education (Graves & Sunstein, 1992; Koretz, Stecher, Klein, McCaffrey, & Deibert, 1993; Lescher, 1995; Meyer, Novak, Herman, & Hearhart, 1996; Tusin, & Turner, 1996). Research concerning the use of portfolios at the college and university level, however, is limited at this time. Portfolios are becoming more popular in a variety of postsecondary programs: English composition and writing (Aitken, 1993; Calfee & Perfumo, 1996; Clayton, 1998), introductory chemistry courses (Barrow, 1993), business administration (Bolender, 1996) and business management education (Pool, 2001), health management (Barron & Sartori, 1994) and medical education (Challis, 1999; Snadden & Thomas, 1998), music (Hoyle, 1994), theater (Logue & Murphy, 1994), social work (Spicuzza, 1996), and engineering (Bellamy & McNeill, 1997; Bourne, 1997; Olds & Miller, 1997; Rogers & Williams, 1999). Colleges of education employ portfolio assessment in various undergraduate teacher education programs (Ashelman & Lenhoff, 1994; Barton & Collins, 1993; Douglas & Fennerty, 1994; Eder, 2001; Klenowski, 2001; Pedras, 1994). A limited number of studies have reported the use of portfolios in graduate education programs (Black, 1993; Ford, 1994; Olhhausen & Ford, 1990).

Little research has been completed on the use of portfolios as a graduation requirement in any program, and, in particular, portfolios in graduate educational leadership preparation programs. No reports have been produced regarding portfolio models used, implementation processes, barriers, facilitators, perceptions, and attitudes of faculty and students in educational administration programs involved in portfolio-based assessment. If universities are to enhance assessment reforms in American schools, future educational leaders and administrators should be in the vanguard of knowing, experiencing, and promoting new forms of assessment. Portfolios are seen as a valuable means for aspiring school leaders to apply program content to real situations, to become more reflective about their actions and performance, and to model their professional growth and development (Barnett, 1995; Duncan, 1996; Guaglianone, 1996, McLaughlin et al., 1998). Educational administrators must not only be taught portfolio concepts and terminology, but must also have hands-on experience that involves the collection, selection,
and reflection to model portfolio procedures and true portfolio assessment for teachers and students. Portfolios can help students in educational administration programs not only to earn graduate degrees but also to become successful in their professional education careers as school administrators (Brown & Irby, 2001; Duncan, 1996; Guaglianone & Yerkes, 1998; Hackney, 1999; Meadows, Dyal, & Wright, 1998; Wildy & Wallace, 1994, 1995; Yerkes & Guaglianone, 1998) and superintendents (Al-Rubaiy, 1999; Saban, 1995; Stader, von Krosigk, & Neely, 2001).

**Study Purpose and Research Questions**

The purpose of the study was to investigate the process of portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders at the master’s degree level and add to the knowledge base of portfolio assessment practices in the field of educational administration. The specific questions that address the initial purpose of this research and guide the inquiry are organized in three content areas: portfolio assessment initiation, portfolio assessment implementation, and faculty and students perceptions towards portfolio assessment. The research questions are as follows:

I. Portfolio assessment initiation
1. What needs in the program prompted initiation of portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement in a program?
2. What is the purpose of the portfolio assessment in the program?

II. Portfolio assessment implementation
3. How has summative portfolio-based assessment been implemented at the master’s degree level? What were the major strategies, key players, significant stages, and components of the implementation process? What are the unique features of the portfolio assessment process in a program?
4. What are the skills, abilities, and educational leadership competencies that faculty members expect graduate students to demonstrate in their graduation portfolios?
5. What are the structural components of portfolios (content) that are used for the final demonstration of knowledge and competencies in programs in Educational Leadership/Administration? What is the rationale for those content categories?
6. How are the portfolios evaluated?
7. What lessons were learned by people involved in the implementation process?
III. Perceptions of students and faculty towards portfolio assessment

8. What is the definition and meaning of "portfolio assessment" as given by (a) faculty and (b) students completing their portfolios?

9. What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the portfolio-based assessment as defined by program faculty? By students?

10. What are the facilitators and barriers in the portfolio assessment implementation process, as perceived by faculty? By students?

11. What do students and program faculty perceive to be needed improvements in the implementation of portfolio-based assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration programs?

**Significance of the Study**

No studies were found that describe analytically the use of portfolios as a summative evaluation in programs preparing educational leaders, nor were any studies found that describe the implementation process, and perceptions and concerns of those carrying out the innovation. Therefore, the educational significance of this study is to synthesize and expand the knowledge base and to advance the existing body of knowledge in the field of portfolio assessment in educational leadership preparation programs at the master’s degree level.

Each of the following areas are addressed in the study: (1) needs that prompted the redesigning of traditional assessment processes and lead toward portfolio assessment as an alternative; (2) purposes for portfolio assessment in a program; (3) models for portfolio assessment planning and implementation in programs preparing educational leaders, including key people, major stages, events, and unique features; (4) skills, abilities, and educational leadership competencies to be demonstrated by program graduates; (5) structural components of portfolios used to demonstrate specified competencies and rationale for content selection; (6) practices and strategies for portfolio evaluation; (7) lessons learned by people implementing portfolio assessment in the programs; (8) meaning and definitions of portfolios as identified by faculty and students; (9) similarities and differences in perceptions of and attitudes toward portfolio assessment among program faculty and students with the specification of strengths and weaknesses of portfolios, (10) factors that facilitate or inhibit implementation of portfolio
assessment in various programs as perceived by faculty; and (11) potential ways to improve portfolio assessment as recognized by both students and faculty.

**Limitations of the Study**

1. The constraints of this study primarily involve the population/sample, settings, and documentation available.

2. Regarding the participants of the study there is a possibility of limited representation. Initially, the working population of participants was compiled on the basis of three sources: an official directory of Educational Administration programs 1997-1998 (Lane, 1998), a UCEA membership directory (UCEA, 2001) and a website of Educational Administration programs (McLeod, 2001). As a result, a list of 504 programs of Educational Leadership/Administration was constructed. Programs not included in this list were not surveyed.

   Four Educational Leadership/Administration programs that met specified criteria were selected for an in-depth study. All full-time faculty members who taught master’s level degree and students who prepared their portfolio as a graduation requirement were invited to participate in the study. Only those individuals who self-selected answered the questionnaires, participated in the interviews, and provided documents for content analysis. Data revealed the findings applicable only to the four programs under study. Generalization to the larger population was not in the scope of this research. The study was limited to the perceptions of a particular subset of faculty and students in four programs.

3. A different form of researcher bias might be from my personal knowledge of portfolio construction. I developed competency portfolios for both of my master’s degrees in Educational Leadership/Administration in 1997 and Instructional Systems in 2001. Being personally involved in portfolio construction, I have already seen benefits for creating and using portfolios. I realized that not all people would share my positive attitude toward portfolios. I counteracted my bias by explicitly conducting frequent monitoring of perceptions and concerns to guard against drawing premature or unwarranted conclusions. I also continuously did member checks asking participants to proof read drafts of my conclusions and interpretations to establish whether my conclusions accurately reflected the reality of the participants in the study and to test for quality of research.
Terms and Abbreviations

The following glossary of terms and abbreviations may assist the reader. Most phenomena will be described in detail further in the study.

Alternative assessment generally refers to new assessment techniques in contrast to traditional approaches such as standardized tests or multiple-choice examinations.

Assessment can be viewed as a systematic and comprehensive process of collecting, interpreting, synthesizing, and labeling of information from different sources to determine complex attributes and characteristics of a person assessed.

Authentic assessment involves a real application of a skill beyond its instructional context, i.e., in a real life situation.

Competence is an integration of knowledge, skills, abilities, personal qualities, experiences, or other characteristic that is applicable to learning and success in school or in work (Wheeler & Haertel, 1993).

Evaluation combines assessments with other information to establish the desirability and importance of what has been observed.

ETS—Educational Testing Service, a private educational and measurement testing organization (ETS, 2002).

Formal assessment is an assessment devised in advance. Final exams, unit tests, and graded homework assignments are examples of formal assessment.

Formative evaluations are conducted during instruction to determine whether students have achieved sufficient mastery of skills and whether any adjustments to instruction should be made. The most frequent techniques are informal observations and questions, quizzes, performance assessments, homework assignments, and portfolios.

Informal assessments are spontaneous and less systematic than formal assessments used during the instruction.

ISLLC—The Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) consists of thirty-two education agencies and thirteen education administrative associations that have been working cooperatively since 1994 to establish an education policy framework for school leadership (CCSSO, 2002). ISLLC standards were developed in 1996 (see Appendix A for standards, knowledge, dispositions, and performance).
NBPAS-- National Board for Professional Administrator Standards.

NCATE—National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education, a coalition of 33 specialty professional associations of teachers, teacher educators, content specialists, and local and state policy makers (NCATE, 2002).

NPBEA--National Policy Board for Educational Administration. The purposes of the Board are to advance the professional standards of educational administration by collective action to develop, and implement professional models for the preparation and in-service training of educational leaders; to increase the recruitment and placement of women and minorities in positions of educational leadership; and to establish a national certifying board for educational administrators (NPBEA, 2002).

Performance-based assessment refers to the process of evaluating student's skills by asking a student to perform tasks that require those skills.

Portfolio is a purposeful and systematic collection of thoughtfully selected student work that demonstrates effort, progress, and achievement gained over a certain period of time.

Standardized tests provide teachers with a general estimate of student abilities.

Summative evaluation occurs at the conclusion of the instruction or program to certify student achievements, assign final grades, and refine the instruction or program for the next year. Most formal assessments including written tests, performance assessments, projects, and portfolios.

Organization of This Study

In this study, I explored the use of the portfolio assessment as a means of demonstrating the knowledge and competencies of master's degree level students in the Educational Leadership/Administration programs. Chapter 1 presented the research problem, explained the need for research, formulated potential research questions, and introduced definitions of terms and abbreviations. Chapter 2 presents a review of literature related to portfolio assessment. Chapter 3 describes the methodology employed in the study, the rationale for the design, and the research strategy. Chapter 4 outlines analysis and discussion of findings. Chapter 5 offers summary of findings, conclusions, recommendations, and implications for practice and further research in portfolio assessment for programs preparing educational leaders. Appendices are included to support concepts, ideas, and findings of this research and to demonstrate instruments.
used for data collection. A references section contains a completed list of literature used for this study to assist readers in locating specific resources if needed.
A review of related literature was conducted to determine the questions that are most significant to the topic and to gain some precision in formulating those questions. Because research on portfolios in relation to the scope of this study is limited, the discussion of portfolio concepts presented here uses portfolio assessment literature when available, and also draws on literature on alternative assessment and types of assessment used in graduate programs. The purpose of this literature analysis and the previous research review was "to develop sharper and more insightful questions about the topic" (Yin, 1994, p.9) and to identify significant portfolio assessment concepts to be used for data collection through survey and case study techniques. This literature analysis, the summary of current thinking and debates about portfolio assessment, and the synthesis of previous investigations and publications laid the groundwork for a research methodology.

This chapter begins with the examination of the literature, both descriptive and research-based, and an overview of alternative assessment and status of assessment of master's degree level students. Then, the portfolio within the system of alternative assessment will be presented, followed by a discussion of the concept of portfolio in terms of its essential purposes and types. A significant part of this chapter is devoted to the use of portfolio assessment in higher education, both at undergraduate and graduate levels. Portfolio utilization in master’s degree level Educational Leadership/Administration programs is also reviewed. The chapter concludes with measurement and implementation concerns about portfolio assessment.

Traditional Assessment of Students

In an educational context, assessment is the comprehensive process of gathering data about students by observing, describing, collecting, recording, scoring, and interpreting information to make decisions about placement, promotion, retention, or graduation. Historically, assessment has focused on measuring how thoroughly students have mastered
knowledge and skills. Recently, however, traditional standardized tests have been criticized for removing the human element and restricting communication between students and teachers; for eliminating the opportunity for students to draft and to revise their work; and for not allowing students to participate in choosing work that would better represent their abilities (Black, Daiker, Sommers, & Stygal, 1992; Maeroff, 1991).

Sheppard (1989) admitted that "…accountability testing in the 1980's is having a pernicious effect on education. Standardized tests have always been fallible, limited measures of learning goals" (p. 9). LeMahieu (1992) noted that standardized types of tests are "indirect measures of discrete, often disconcerted facts or skills" (p. 52). Wiggins (1992) considered that traditional testing overasseses student knowledge and underasseses student know-how with knowledge. Hart (1994) elaborated on the following drawbacks of standardized tests: (1) their results are "often inconsistent, inaccurate, and biased" (p. 6); (2) there is doubtful validity (how well the test measures what it purports to measure) of some tests; (3) they mostly measure students' test-taking abilities; and (4) they inflict damage on the nature of teaching and learning by emphasizing the recall of information, implying that there is only one single and acceptable answer to every question, turning student into passive recipients of information, by forcing teachers to teach to the test. Gilman, Andrew, and Rafferty (1995) listed 16 points criticizing standardized tests. In addition to the previously mentioned problems, these authors added the following shortcomings of standardized tests: lack of diagnostic properties, chances of being race or gender biased, test results do not have any further use after filing, lack of student and faculty involvement in test construction, and no evidence of improving learning. Limitations of these tests also include such tendencies as the lack of connection to what practitioners do in the real professional world and the subtle notice that problems always have the “right” answer (Diamond, 1998; Huba & Freed, 2000). Consequently, increasing criticism of standardized tests and greater demands for accountability have given rise to alternative assessments and performance measures to evaluate students.

**Alternative Assessment**

The phenomenon of alternative assessment has being widely analyzed since the late 1980s (Maeroff, 1991; Worthen, 1993; Ryan & Miyasaka, 1995). In testing terms, alternative assessments are classified as criterion-referenced assessments, where an individual's performance
is compared to a specific learning objective or performance standard and not to the performance of other students nationally or locally. As such, alternative assessments provide "a much needed conceptual framework for thinking about the types of performance-based and so-called authentic assessment that are currently being promoted" (Linn, 1994, p. 12). Alternative assessment generally refers to new assessment techniques in contrast to traditional approaches, e.g., multiple choice or short answer tests. According to Worthen (1993), alternative assessment is a more generic term for such types of assessments as direct assessment, authentic assessment, and performance assessment.

Direct assessment of performance may include judging performance in music and athletics, hands-on assessment in vocational practices, competency testing in medical field, and language proficiency testing in conversation and translation (Worthen, 1993). Authentic assessment is a term used to describe meaningful tasks that require students to perform and produce knowledge rather than simply reproduce information others have discovered. Wiggins (1989) offered two criteria of assessment authenticity: that an assessment reflects the challenges, work, and standards engaging practicing professionals, and that it involves a student with opportunities for dialogue, explanations, and inquiry. LeMahieu (1992) considered assessments to be authentic when "they represent behavior or accomplishments that have real meaning and value" (p. 52). This assessment of student performance is relevant not only to class assignment, but it is also "relevant to life outside of school" (Worthen, 1993, p. 445). As Case (1992) stated, "... authentic assessment refers to measuring the real, actual, or genuine [experience] as opposed to measuring a poor substitute" (p. 19). Performance assessment, according to Berk (1986), "is the process of gathering data by systematic observation for making decisions about an individual" (p. ix). Ryan and Miyasaka (1995) considered performance assessment and portfolio assessment to be parts of authentic assessment.

Although direct assessment, authentic assessment, and performance assessment have subtle variations in emphasis, the terms are often used interchangeably as all of them have common characteristics. All three types focus on students' processes, products, or performances. Current assessment theory argues that alternative assessment stimulates thinking and promotes independence by allowing students to reflect on their work, evaluate their progress and accomplishments, set future learning goals, and design a plan for further personal and
professional development (Wittrock, 1991). Combining the characteristics of alternative assessments analyzed by a variety of authors (Table 2.1), it is possible to conclude that a sound alternative assessment is a student-focused, systematic and longitudinal process of assessing student's accomplishments that is anchored in authenticity, open and non-secretive, and fair and non-biased. Students are given an opportunity to present their achievements in multidimensional and knowledge-integrative fashion using the variety of media.

Table 2.1

Characteristics of an Alternative Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description and references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Systematic and longitudinal</td>
<td>Collects samples of student work over time, compiles materials that document a person's learning and represent evolution of skills, achievement, and progress (Case, 1992; Elliott, 1995; Gardner, 1989; Glatthorn, 1996; Mitchell, 1992; Wolf, 1987/88).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anchored in authenticity</td>
<td>Designs tasks that involve thinking processes and purposeful activities; design tasks that require a problem to be solved; designs tasks that are open-ended; evaluation is based on successful completion of the task, relates tasks to &quot;real life&quot; situations (Case, 1992; Hart, 1994; Ryan &amp; Miyasaka, 1995; Stefonek, 1991; Thurlow, 1995; Valencia, 1990; Wiggins, 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open and non-secretive</td>
<td>Makes tasks known in advance; publishes, discusses, practices criteria and standards of evaluation with students; encourages interaction between students; encourages interaction with faculty and other students; permits use of resources (Baker, O'Neill, &amp; Linn, 1993; Dietel, Herman, &amp; Knuth, 1991; Doherty, Chenevert, Miller, Roth, &amp; Truchan, 1997; Gooding, 1994; Linn, Baker, &amp; Dunbar, 1991).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair and non-biased</td>
<td>Alters format to adjust for multiple learning styles and intelligences; designs task to address current needs in education; alters format to reflect skills and content understandings (Lam, 1995; Stiggins, 1995; Thurlow 1995; Wiggins, 1989).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.1—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description and references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Process oriented</td>
<td>Encourages instructors to act as facilitators; expects demonstration of knowledge through presentation or performance; both a learner and an instructor are involved in learning process; teacher-student conversation is two-way and meaningful (Arter &amp; Spandel, 1992a; Barton &amp; Collins, 1993; Berk, 1986; Gooding, 1994; Lamme &amp; Hysmith, 1991; Lescher, 1995; Wiggins, 1990, 1993).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student focused and developmental in nature</td>
<td>Involves students in planning and implementation; requires students to set an individual agenda for completion of the task; requires reflection and self-assessment (Elliott, 1995; Hart, 1994; Herman, 1992; Lowe &amp; Banker, 1998; Mitchell, 1992; Ryan &amp; Miyasaka, 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multidimensional and knowledge-integrative</td>
<td>Based on a broader concept of intelligence, ability, and learning; requires students to use a variety of skills; requires students to access different sources of information; permits presentation of final product to reflect individual student strengths (Gardner, 1989; Gooding, 1994; Ryan &amp; Miyasaka 1995).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multimedia-capable</td>
<td>Includes a variety of projects in various multimedia formats: paper, electronic, video, etc. (Lescher, 1995, Pellegrino, Chudowsky, &amp; Glaser, 2001).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although most educators hold positive attitudes toward alternative assessment, several assessment experts have raised concerns. Herman, Aschbacher, and Winters (1992) emphasized that "regardless of the purpose or format, quality assessment should meet certain common standards" (p. 10). Although an in-depth description of alternative assessment pitfalls is beyond the scope of this review, a few of the most widespread issues are mentioned here. Baker (1993) warned about unrealistically high expectations for alternative assessments and suggested that educators consider the appropriate use of them as one of the key issues. Worthen (1993) stressed the need for a coherent understanding of the concepts and language tied to authentic assessment.
to prevent an alternative assessment movement to become “trapped in the thickets of tangled terminology and conceptual clutter” (1993, p. 447).

Although the pedagogical advantages of alternative assessment in supporting instruction and promoting higher order thinking skills were reported on numerous occasions, researchers have consistently indicated unresolved logistic and psychometric problems, especially with score generalizability (Linn, 1993). Some authors asserted that alternative types of assessment still possess bias (Linn, Baker, & Dunbar, 1991). Critics question the validity and reliability of alternative assessment, saying that the assessments are so open-ended that the same results cannot be replicated. Messick (1995) advised to address "basic measurement issues such as reliability, comparability, and fairness" when choosing an appropriate assessment type (p. 5).

Additionally, several implementation issues have been raised. Maeroff (1991) gave examples showing that alternative assessment, and portfolios as a part of it, "tend to be a time-consuming, labor-intensive, imprecise exercise..." (p. 275). Similar concerns were expressed by Gomez, Graue, & Bloch (1991), Popham (1993), Wiggins (1993), and others.

As with any innovation, research is needed to study the benefits and the pitfalls of the alternative types of assessment. Certain procedures and techniques should be offered to eliminate barriers to successful and effective assessment implementation. It is especially critical for high stakes assessment such as graduation, certification, and licensure of students in any program, especially at advanced levels.

**Assessment of Master's Degree Students**

Master's degree level education in this country has changed dramatically since the first master's degrees were awarded to graduates of Harvard College in 1636 (Conrad & Eagan, 1990). The same college was the first one to award master's degrees to graduates of the seminary for teachers at the end of the 19th century (Glazer, 1986). Since that time, degree requirements varied considerably depending on the type of the institution and program specifications. The majority of programs required at least one year of full-time study and completion of a thesis. Spencer (1986) identified the rise of the non-thesis option in master' programs as one of the important current trends in graduate studies. A relatively small number of scholars examined other trends in master's degree student preparation, especially assessment practices. Mathies and
Uphoff (1992) shared their concern "regarding the quality of graduate programs and the value of master's degree" (p. 4).

Historically, faculty have assessed students by a variety of methods, such as oral and written examinations to determine course grades and whether objectives have been met. Graduate studies and their students have been a grossly neglected area of research and inquiry (Reynolds, 1994). Research on the final evaluation methods and processes in master's degree level is slim. Carney, Cobia, & Shannon, (1998), Peterson, Bowman, Myer, & Maidl, (1992), and Carney et al., (1998), researchers and faculty members in counseling programs, made an attempt to assess the content and structure of these methods and to determine factors influencing the methods selection, development, and processes. It was found that written essay examinations were used in more than half of the 128 programs that participated in the survey. One fourth of these institutions used oral examinations and multiple-choice tests. A master's thesis or research project was required in 20% of these programs. Performance-based methods, such as practicum or portfolios, were rarely identified. The factors considered most important in method selection were validity, ease of administration, and similarity to state and national credential examinations.

In 1991, Osguthorpe and Wong conducted a national survey to examine graduate programs in education and to determine trends regarding master's degree programs. It was noted that the list of master's degree titles offered by colleges of education included 100 sub-specialties. The researchers reported that the written comprehensive examination was still the most common requirement in education master's degree programs. "Fully 77% of the respondents reported that all or most of their programs included this requirement" (Osguthorpe & Wong, 1991, p. 9). It was noted that master's degree projects were also as common as written comprehensive exams. A thesis, as a form of final evaluation, was required in only 27% of 407 participating institutions. Oral examinations were a common practice among 42% of responding institutions.

Comprehensive examinations are a traditional and the most commonly used form of assessment at master's degree level education. Anderson, Krauskopf, Rogers, and Neal (1984) saw the following main reasons for departments' continuing use of comprehensive examinations: "to screen out students on the basis of ability and/or knowledge; to provide a rite of passage so
the students will feel the degree has been earned; to provide an opportunity for students to organize their thinking and integrate what has been learned” (p. 79).

Many of today’s educational leadership programs culminate with a traditional oral or written comprehensive examination focusing on the content knowledge and competencies acquired in completed coursework. According to Meadows et al. (1998), this well-established assessment approach “…fails to provide an accurate and authentic assessment of beginning school leaders’ knowledge, abilities, competencies, and practical experiences which ultimately determine their potential for success as an educational leader” (p. 94). The following were listed among the biggest concerns with the written comprehensive examination: (1) providing just an overview of student knowledge; (2) failure to address acquired skills, practices, and experiences; and (3) students’ emotional stress. Meadows et al. (1998) asserted that other types of exit assessment (e.g., portfolios) might be more meaningful for graduating students, faculty, and potential employers.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics (2002), about 1.74 million degrees were awarded by America’s higher education institutions in the 1999-2000 school year. Of the total number of degrees awarded, 457,056 were master's degrees out of which 124,240 were awarded in education, followed by degrees awarded in business management, health professions, and engineering. The few authors who have addressed issues related to master's programs, (Clowes, 1990; Conrad & Eagan, 1990; Glazer, 1986; Spencer, 1986), examined all academic disciplines rather than focusing on master's degree programs in education, not to mention programs in educational administration. No research-based or experience-based study on the requirements for final assessment in master's degree level programs preparing educational leaders was found. It is evident, that further research is required to identify basic components of educational administration programs including credits, length, required and optional courses, and especially, formal assessment and summative evaluation practices of graduates.

In a speech to the American Association for Higher Education Assessment Forum, Hutchings (1990) stated that assessment "needed to be an enactment of a set of beliefs about the kind of work that matters on our campuses” (p. 6). Hutchings encouraged the notion of student involvement in assessment as this involvement causes the learners to take their learning beyond the single-moment of a test. American Association for Higher Education (1992) published the
principles of good assessment practices of student learning and highlighted that (1) educational values should be at the basis of any assessment; (2) assessment should be multidimensional, integrated, relevant in performance overtime and based on the clear understanding of learning; (3) programs to be assessed should have clearly defined goals; (4) not only outcomes, but experiences leading to these outcomes, should be assessed; (5) any assessment should be an ongoing and systematic process, not episodic and fragmental; (6) involvement of representatives of learning community in program assessment brings greater improvement and effectiveness; (7) assessment should address current educational needs; (8) assessment will lead to improvement if it is a part of a larger set of conditions that promote innovations and change; and (9) through assessment, educators meet responsibilities to students and public (AAHE, 1992, p. 2-3).

Portfolios are one of the forms of alternative assessment that can incorporate the above mentioned qualities of a sound assessment and meet the demands for authenticity, multidimensionalism, and accountability (Baume, 2001; Tillema, 1998). The next section presents a variety of portfolio definitions, purposes and types of portfolios, aspects of portfolio use in higher education with particular focus on graduate programs and programs preparing educational leaders, and a description of potentials and concerns about portfolio assessment.

Portfolio and Portfolio Assessment

A Working Definition

The idea of a portfolio in education has emerged from art, architecture, photography, and other creative fields. Graphic designers, artists, performers, and models often use portfolios to organize their work and to showcase their achievements in both academic and job worlds (Baron, 1996; Burke, 1999; Burke, Fogarty, & Belgrad, 1994). In education, the use of portfolios was in response to the alternative assessment movement. Portfolio assessment has been identified as a major curriculum trend. Arter (1991) pointed out that "few topics in education have generated the intensity of interest as portfolios" (p. 1).

Valeri-Gold, Olson, & Deming, (1991) defined portfolio assessment as an assessment wherein students become "active learners and questioning thinkers" (p. 298). Portfolios are "a uniquely flexible means of assessing learning acquired on the job and in life" (Miller & Daloz, 1989, p. 30). According to Paulsen, Paulsen, and Meyer, "a portfolio is a purposeful collection of student work that exhibits the student's efforts, progress, and achievements in one or more areas.
The collection must include student participation in selecting contents, the criteria for selection, the criteria for judging merits, and evidence of student self-reflection" (1991, p. 60).

Harlin, Lipa, & Phelps (1992) produced a descriptive explanation of portfolio assessment: "a multidimensional system which provides teachers with a complete picture of student's abilities and literacy development" (p. 203). MacIsaac and Jackson (1994) viewed portfolios as a carefully documented history of learning. The authors argued that "portfolios provide the opportunity to view learning as it occurs across time, allowing for the process as well as products of one's learning become visible" (MacIsaac & Jackson, 1994, p. 64). Borthwick (1995, p. 25) regarded portfolios as an assessment tool that reflected both the “breadth of study envisaged by the curriculum and the quality of work that students are expected to produce.” Shackelford (1997) considered portfolios as instructional strategies and favored them as "...they promote the application of knowledge, self-assessment, and the development of individual talents, skills, and values” (p. 31). Shulman (1998) argued that a portfolio is a theoretical act, as every time one designs, organizes, or creates a model or portfolio framework, one is engaged in an act of theory. He also offered a descriptive definition, where a portfolio is the structured and documentary history of activities substantiated by work samples, “and fully realized only through reflective writing, deliberation, and conversation” (Shulman, 1998, p. 37).

The portfolio is a broad metaphor interpreted as a collection of student work, as a documented history of learning, as an assessment tool, as an instructional strategy, and as a theoretical act. There are many other interpretations and definitions of a portfolio (AERA, 1999; Graves & Sunstein, 1992; Grovenor, 1993; Hutchings, 1990; NPBEA, 2002; Meyer, Schuman, & Angello, 1990; Wolf, 1991, etc.). Several key characteristics are to be included in a definition of a portfolio: A portfolio is a student centered (Arter & Spandel, 1992b; Kieffer & Morrison, 1994; Oosterhof, 2001), systematic and purposeful (AERA, 1999; Tierney, Carter, & Desai, 1991; Valencia, 1990b), structured and selective (Barnett & Lee, 1994; MacIsaac & Jackson, 1994; Oosterhof, 2001; Wolf, 1991) collection of authentic projects (Arter & Spandel, 1992b) that represents individuals as learners (Belanoff & Dickson, 1991; Flood, Lapp, & Monken, 1992; Graves & Sunstein, 1992; Tierney et al., 1991; Valencia, 1990), actively involves students in creating, assessing, evaluating, and revising portfolio entries (Arter & Spandel, 1992b; Lescher, 1995; Oosterhof, 2001), demonstrates the development of competencies (Baume, 2001;
Simon, & Forgette-Giroux, 2000), and provides a basis for constant and open communication among students, teachers and other audiences, (Barton & Collins, 1993; Church, 1991; Graves & Sunstein, 1992; Valencia, 1990) and is used for learning, assessment, appraisal, and promotional purposes (Klenowski, 2001). In conclusion, while there is no universally accepted definition of a portfolio, it is generally agreed that a portfolio’s format, structure, content, and presentation should vary depending upon the purpose of portfolio assessment.

**Purposes and Types of Portfolios**

The portfolio is a meaningful and valuable tool that can be utilized for a great variety of purposes and educational contexts. Portfolios are flexible and their use can be tailored to fit student needs, faculty expertise and interests, belief systems of every department or program, institutional demands, the local curriculum, instructional goals, pedagogy, and expected educational outcomes, and they are grounded in competencies of any professional practice (Batzle, 1992; Forster & Masters, 1996; Freidus, 1998; Hain, 1991; Mandell & Michelson, 1990; Oosterhof, 2001). Kolanowski (1993) discussed various definitions of portfolios and pointed out that "every portfolio is different, there is no packaged portfolio that everyone should follow..." (p. 17). Types of portfolios vary depending on context and purposes (see Table 2.2). Also, depending on ways of collecting, storing, and presenting portfolio materials, portfolios can be categorized as paper-based or electronic.

**Purposes and context of portfolios.** Mandell and Michelson (1990) distinguished eight types of portfolios on the basis of their major purposes: (1) academic skills portfolios (to demonstrate achieved academic skills and identify weaknesses), (2) college orientation portfolios (to transfer prior experiences to new college environment and facilitate adaptation), (3) personal exploration portfolios (to identify one’s strengths and areas for development), (4) the meaning of education portfolios (to explore learning and knowledge acquisition), (5) careers portfolios (to demonstrate connections between education and work), (6) introduction to a field portfolios (a more focused version of careers portfolios, to reflect on one’s knowledge in a conceptual and professional context), (7) the experience of work portfolios (to articulate mastered skills and to broaden one’s perspective on work experiences), and (8) degree design portfolios (to communicate achievement of curriculum requirement and to set further educational and professional standards).

Lamme and Hysmith (1991) identified two types of portfolios--showcase portfolios and working portfolios. A showcase portfolio consists of the collection of the best of student's works and can be presented to different audiences to illustrate quality learning and student's abilities. A working portfolio is a complete collection of outcomes from learning activities ready for final review.

Mitchell (1992) grouped the purposes of portfolios into four categories, including a teaching tool, professional development of the teacher, assessment, and research tool. When used as a teaching tool, portfolios provide student ownership, motivation, sense of accomplishment and participation in a learning process; help students and teachers to set goals; and involve students in self-reflection and self-evaluation. For professional development, portfolios allow teachers to examine and evaluate curriculum; analyze effective teaching practices; evaluate school needs; and foster professionalism and collaboration. For assessment, portfolios serve as an alternative to standardized tests; can be used as a placement tool in high schools and colleges; serve as a communication tool for providing program evaluation; and replace competency exams. For research purposes, portfolios can be used to provide data on student growth over time and to assess the revision process.

Grosvenor (1993) defined a portfolio as a record of learning that focuses on a student's work and reflections about it. Four types of portfolios were described: literacy, descriptive, showcase, and evaluative portfolios. Literacy portfolios focus on literacy or language progress. Descriptive portfolios demonstrate various skills of a student. Showcase portfolios represent a record of learning that shows the work a student has accomplished. No evaluation takes place for showcase portfolios. Every piece in an evaluative portfolio and the entire portfolio is a subject for evaluation on the basis of specified criteria.

Burke et al. (1994) suggested three distinct categories of portfolios: personal, academic, or professional. Personal portfolios represent a holistic picture of a student (autobiographical sketch, career goals, family plans, and reflections on what is needed to accomplish). The "best
work portfolio" is another representative of this category (Burke et al., 1994, p. 6). The purpose of this type of portfolio is to allow students to select entries from all the work they have done.

**Academic portfolios** were subdivided by Costa (1991) and Burke, et al. (1994) into several sub-categories in accordance with their purposes: integrated portfolios which demonstrate connections between different subject areas students have taken during the course of study and various concepts and skills that have been acquired in and outside the school setting; cooperative group portfolios which emphasize the importance of collaboration, different strengths and talents of group members; multi-year portfolios which demonstrate student's progress in different subject areas and in personal and academic growth; class profile portfolios which reflect the accomplishments of the class as a whole; portfolios of intelligent behavior which include the reflections of students focused on socially responsible behaviors, interpersonal communication skills, flexibility in thinking, meta-cognitive awareness, and problem solving; and multiple intelligences portfolios which showcase all aspects of student talents. The last sub-category of portfolios was based on Gardner's (1983) multiple intelligences theory (visual/spatial, logical/mathematical, verbal/linguistic, musical, rhythmic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and bodily/kinesthetic). Belanoff (1996) stated that "portfolios allow us to show our multiple selves" (p. 353).

Burke et al. (1994) analyzed the following sub-categories of **professional portfolios**: college admission portfolios that are prepared by high school graduates for college admission and placement; college scholarship portfolios compiled for scholarship eligibility purposes; employability portfolios which present students' employability skills, ability to communicate, work in a group, and act responsibly; pre-service portfolios used in undergraduate education to reflect on student training and teaching experiences and to assign grades, or to be used for job interviews and certification; teacher portfolio which include evidence of successful teaching; staff evaluation portfolios compiled to facilitate the evaluation of a teacher by administration; administrator portfolios that include evidence of leadership abilities, administrator's knowledge of and commitment to the best educational practices; and performance review portfolios that include evidence about employees' abilities and attitudes on the job.

Barnett (1995) distinguished between "a folio and a portfolio" (p. 202, italics in original). **A portfolio** was viewed as a finished product containing only specific and selected evidence
relating to the depth of person's knowledge, skills, and dispositions (Barnett, 1995; Bird, 1990). A folio consisted of evidence accumulated during a course of study. Artifacts created by the owner of a folio, e.g., term papers, course projects and assignments, work-related tasks and attestations, e.g., references verifying student's accomplishments and capabilities, can be the most appropriate for a folio. Entries in a folio, even if accompanied by reflective notes, are not selective in nature and are broad representations of person's experiences (MacIsaac, 1991; MacIsaac & Jackson, 1994).

Cole, Ryan, and Kick (1995) proposed a categorization of portfolios similar to Lamme and Hysmith (1991) and Barnett (1995). They divided portfolios into two types: process portfolios and product portfolios. Students place in their process portfolios all finished and unfinished work to reflect and identify areas for improvement. Chronological placement of various projects, journals, and even formal testing results allow seeing student progression. The “leaner and more abbreviated” product portfolio (Cole et al., 1995, p.11) is designed at the end of a program of study. It contains only materials that a student is willing to share and that demonstrate student mastery of curriculum goals.

Lankes (1995, 1998) described six types of portfolios used in education: developmental portfolios documenting improvement in a particular subject area; teacher planning portfolios assembled to allow teachers to determine abilities of an incoming class; proficiency portfolios used for determining the eligibility and readiness for graduation; showcase portfolios for collecting best sample of one's work and serving as a resume; employment skills portfolios collecting and demonstrating evidence of work readiness; and college admission portfolios used to complement standard admission procedures.

Brown and Irby (1997, 2001) presented a detailed description of three types of portfolios used by school principals: professional growth portfolios that allow principals to engage in reflection of their experiences to improve current practices; evaluation portfolios that present principal’s as a leader to a panel of evaluators; and career advancement portfolios with the primary goal to market an individual for a particular position.

Kimeldorf (1998) considered three types of portfolios: personal, professional, and student. Personal portfolios include areas of one's interest and hobbies. Professional or expert portfolios might be used in the search for a new employer or customer. A primary purpose of a
student portfolio is to demonstrate what has been learned in a given class or across a certain part of a school career.


Klenowski (2001) argued that portfolio assessment has been developed and used for a number of different purposes in teacher education: as summative description to provide quality information about student performance, as a certification or selection function to enter a profession or higher education, as support for teaching and learning to help preservice teachers develop their learning, as appraisal or promotion to support professional development and promotional aspirations, and as professional development to provide evidence for critical examination of teaching and learning.

Oosterhof (2001) suggested distinguishing between student portfolios and professional portfolios as they "differ with respect to their roles" (p. 252). He stated that professional portfolios should emphasize summative evaluation, whereas student portfolios often emphasize formative evaluation. One of the distinct differences is evaluation of portfolios. Professional portfolios are evaluated not by a person who developed the portfolio, but by a prospective client or employer, whereas student portfolios are evaluated by both the student and instructor. Thus, student portfolios can be viewed as an integral part of instruction that is used to facilitate assessment. A summary of portfolio types and purposes is presented in Table 2.2.

Table 2.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Types and purposes of portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mandell and Michelson (1990)</td>
<td>Academic skills, college orientation, personal oration, the meaning of education, careers, introduction to a field, the experience of work, and degree design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2.2—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Types and purposes of portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell (1992)</td>
<td>Teaching tool; professional development of the teacher, assessment, and research.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burke, et al (1994)</td>
<td>Personal portfolios, academic portfolios (integrated portfolios, cooperative group portfolios, multi-year portfolios, class profile portfolios; portfolios of intelligent behavior, multiple intelligences portfolios), and professional portfolios (college admission portfolios, college scholarship, employability portfolios, pre-service portfolios, teacher portfolio, staff evaluation portfolios, administrator portfolio, performance review portfolios).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimeldorf (1998)</td>
<td>Personal portfolios; professional portfolios; high school student portfolios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baume 2001</td>
<td>Filing, learning, assessment, and employment portfolios.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Types and purposes of portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Klenowski (2001)</td>
<td>Summative description portfolios; certification or selection portfolios; support for teaching and learning portfolios; appraisal or promotion portfolios; and professional development portfolios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oosterhof (2001)</td>
<td>Student portfolios and professional portfolios.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although the most traditional and widely used form of portfolios is a paper format, the advanced pace of technology changes the way people teach, learn, and work. As a consequence, higher education extends the new technology-based modes of learning to prepare graduates to cope with and succeed in their technology advanced professional lives. Technology offers "a more extensive and varied role of assessment in higher education" (Messick, 1999, p. 245). Technological innovations promote the usage of multimedia strategies and encourage the design of portfolios in electronic format to enhance learning and facilitate assessment. Modern technology has certain unique capabilities that can be integrated in the instructional and assessment systems and can make meaningful contributions to the creation of electronic formats of assessment.

**Electronic Portfolios**

Hawisher and Eldred (1995) pointed that "over time, people will both shape and be shaped by electronic communication" (p. 346). Electronic forms of communication are already intensively used in academic context. Dochy and McDowell (1997) noted that

The use of multimedia, local area networks, shared communication systems, the Internet, shared electronic databases, video conferencing facilities, electronic self-study materials, study support and guidance through networks, progress assessment systems, intake and monitoring systems, and so on, will lead to the development of new teaching and learning strategies. (p. 280)

A portfolio assessment system that allows permanent storage of data, written and drawn images, and sounds is a relatively new concept in education. The first real use of technology for assessment was word processing for writing portfolios. Lately, other technologies, such as CD-
ROM, videotapes, videodisks, and scanners have been employed more frequently for portfolio assessment (Campbell, 1992). The use of emerging technologies in alternative assessment seemed to address some of the challenges of portfolios. Thus, Worthen (1993) noted that the use of computers will simplify labor-intensive techniques of assessment and will make them more feasible. Video portfolios were suggested as an excellent venue for students to use as self-assessment of their teaching abilities (Cambridge, 2001; Campbell, 1992; Rogers & Tucker, 1993; Zelazek, Williams & Garten, 1993). Kroonenberg (1994) foresaw that the use of information technology (electronic mail, digital portfolios) would extend possibilities for continual and rapid transmission of information, feedback, and authentic assessment. Mathies (1994) concluded that technology can assist in the development of testing activities "that can be designed to replicate constraints and opportunities encountered in real-life professional situations" (p. 5). Backer (1998) emphasized a critical need "to explore new opportunities for students to expand beyond the walls of the classroom and draw and publish in new, diverse, electronic formats including the World Wide Web and CD-ROM" (p. 2). New technologies inspire and permit a dramatically different approach to portfolio preparation, engaging students in the process of reflecting upon and integrating their life experiences and academic outcomes. Yancey (1996a) noted "…together, the electronic and the portfolio ask, allow, and invite students to become literate in new, challenging, and complex ways that we are only now beginning to understand" (p. 262).

**Electronic portfolios defined.** An electronic portfolio developer uses various electronic technologies to create, collect, and organize portfolio artifacts in many media types (audio, video, graphics, text). Baron (1996) discussed a digital portfolio and referred to "a collection of personal visual materials created and/or presented via digital media" (p. 1). Yancey (1996b) defined an electronic portfolio as a "metatext" with several specific features (p. 130). Often, the terms “electronic portfolio” and “digital portfolio” are used interchangeably. However, according to Barrett (2000), there is a distinction: an electronic portfolio contains artifacts that may be in analog form, such as a video and audio tape or in computer-readable form; in a digital portfolio, though, all artifacts have been transformed into computer-readable form.

**Potential of electronic portfolios.** Reilly, Hill, and Greenleaf (1993) noted that an electronic portfolio "...offers a way to extend the community of portfolios by capturing more of
the context in which writing takes place. ...Such a system can also provide an interactive environment where students, teachers, and others can explore student writing in more depth” (p. 82). Yancey (1996b) considered electronic portfolios to be a collection and a selection of work supplemented by additional texts created specifically for portfolio use and accompanied by reflection entries. Electronic portfolios were favored by Yancey (1996b) as an effective tool to document individual, cognitive, cultural, and institutional diversity, to communicate the values of student's work and environment, and to evaluate student achievements.

Tuttle (1997) contended that digital portfolios should be used because they demonstrated wider dimensions of learning; their parts could be interconnected, and they saved space. Heise (1998) emphasized not only technical advantages of electronic portfolios (easy update, storage, transportability) but also highlighted the authenticity of assessment materials that "addresses all modalities of learning" (p. 1). Pack (1998) considered electronic portfolios to be a valuable means of gathering, organizing, and conveying information. It was noted that electronic portfolios naturally incorporate the electronic documents that faculty require of students to meet course or program instructional objectives. Technology-based portfolios can be presented in different formats: saved on a computer disk, on a CD-ROM, or on a website, or a combination of all mentioned above. The publishing format of electronic portfolios depends on program objectives and resources (Levin, 1996; Petrakis, 1996). Jacobs (1998) forecasted that electronic portfolios would replace the way students submit their applications for college admission. Work samples, submitted on a disk or through electronic mail and accompanied by SAT scores, would be used to determine student's eligibility for admission. Lankes (1998) shared the practices of East Syracuse-Minoa High school graduates who sent their electronic portfolios (CD-ROM) along with their college applications.

Electronic portfolios encompass a wide range of forms: work on diskette, on CD-ROM, work presented on portable computers, and work displayed on a website. It is not a purpose of the current study to assess the logistics of electronic portfolios or technology requirements. However, I will briefly review the current trends in formatting the electronic portfolios that are most widely used and that seem to be the most feasible forms: web-based, floppy disk, and CD-ROM electronic portfolios.
Baron (1996) favored web-based portfolios for their "updateability" and flexibility, portability, long term cost-effectiveness, and larger potential audience (p. 35). Barrett (1997) advocated the use of an Intranet-based system for creating and storing electronic portfolios because of distributed storage and processing, a common document standard (HTML), operating system (Mac/Windows) independency, easy integration with other applications, and flexible access. Electronic portfolios stored on a floppy disk have their advantages and disadvantages (Baron, 1996; Barrett, 1997). Diskettes are favored for easy back up, portability, and good shelf life. Baron (1996) mentioned that diskettes "...are small, relatively sturdy, and extremely inexpensive" (p. 29). Pitfalls include the increase in evaluator's time to retrieve and assess portfolios, difficult storage, and lack of cross-platform compatibility. Baron (1996) considered that a CD could solve most of the problems inherent in the direct use of computer disk media. CDs are fairly familiar to most people, are easy to integrate into a traditional portfolio, and can be conveniently stored and transported. The advantages of electronic portfolios are presented in Table 2.3.

Table 2.3
Advantages of Electronic Portfolios

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electronic portfolio (EP) is a valuable process for learning new multimedia technologies and appreciating the power of such technologies to organize, present, and use information stored in digitized media.</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 16, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP can be used for teaching and advising.</td>
<td>1, 2, 8, 9, 12, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is value in the EP for students after graduation.</td>
<td>1, 8, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP can be used when applying for internships, jobs, or graduate schools.</td>
<td>1, 2, 5, 9, 12, 14, 15, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP better engages students in the process of reflecting upon and integrating their learning experiences and outcomes.</td>
<td>1, 10, 13, 15, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP allows students to readily see the transferability and overlap of skills and abilities students have developed across the wide spectrum of learning experiences; and cross-discipline integration.</td>
<td>1, 7, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.3—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EP clearly articulates and tracks accomplishments in and outside the classroom.</td>
<td>2, 8, 12, 15, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP allows students to draw connections among experiences, achievements, and specified standards.</td>
<td>2, 7, 15, 16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP increases students' self-understanding and confidence.</td>
<td>2, 8, 12, 15, 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP allows students to see patterns emerging in their areas of study and interest and concepts across disciplines.</td>
<td>2, 7, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP brings a greater clarity of purpose and a higher level of motivation to the classroom.</td>
<td>2, 6, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP allows students to be more proactive than reactive in designing their educational plans and pursuing postgraduate opportunities.</td>
<td>2, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP is a student-centered model for assessment.</td>
<td>3, 5, 10, 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP makes student work accessible, portable, examinable, widely distributable.</td>
<td>3, 4, 5, 6, 1, 10, 17, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP forms basis for evaluating quality of student overall performance, progress, and achievement.</td>
<td>4, 5, 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP integrates instructional assessment.</td>
<td>4, 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP can be used at different levels: from elementary to graduate.</td>
<td>5, 6, 10, 12, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP reflects individual strengths, interests and personalities.</td>
<td>4, 5, 9, 10, 15, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EP can be employed by and presented to different users (students, faculty, employers, administrators).</td>
<td>5, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When properly formatted, EP permits operating system/platform independence.</td>
<td>1, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Challenges of electronic portfolios. Irby and Brown (1998) reported their exploratory study findings on the perceptions of two groups of preservice administrators who completed their career advancement portfolios in paper (group 1) and electronic format (group 2). The electronic portfolio group used commercial multimedia software PersonaPlus (Global Corporate Solutions,
In general, it was noted that the electronic portfolio had benefits over the traditional paper portfolio as it presented a person visually and orally; gave an opportunity to present competencies in a more "alive, real" context (Irby & Brown, 1998, p. 8); made it possible to put it on the Internet or send it via e-mail to the potential employer; showed that "we are up with the current trends" (in Irby & Brown, 1998, p. 9); presented one's technology skills; and demonstrated to the potential employer that one was really interested in the job since so much effort was put in the preparation.

Though both groups reported feelings of accomplishment, satisfaction with portfolio assessment, and confidence, the electronic portfolio group had some concerns: a burden of time to create electronic portfolios, technology issues (software compatibility, transporting portfolios via the Internet, enabling/not enabling an interviewee via technology, compiling the audio/video components, security issues with the Internet), and willingness and time availability of the interviewer to assess the electronic portfolio. Some participants in the study were concerned with ethnic, linguistic, or gender issues. They hypothesized that "if video is included in the portfolio, that could be a potential bias in who the employers will bring in for an interview..." (in Irby & Brown, 1998, p. 10). The authors concluded that the electronic portfolio might be a very effective and successful tool for career advancement if the proper hardware and software is in place, thereby, reducing technology stress of users.

Abrams (1997) addressed the following challenges of electronic portfolio assessment: time consuming to create; required computer and technology skills; required equipment; currently available and affordable computer systems did not allow many sound and video samples; electronic portfolios could become competitive and could be judged by appearance and not a content; confidentiality issues; distribution, and storage. Staff members facilitating the Kalamazoo portfolio program (1999) encountered many challenges, including lack or different levels of technology competencies among students and faculty, an initial reluctance on the part of students, inadequate access of technology for students and faculty, and the necessity to conduct thorough planning.

Barrett (1998b) was concerned with the fact that many educational institutions rushed to implement electronic portfolios providing "very little linkage to the actual benchmarks that students are supposed to be demonstrating" (p. 1). She proposed "to begin focusing our attention
less on the ‘electronic’ and more on the ‘portfolio’-- the standards..." that students were to
achieve and demonstrate through a variety of evidence and media (Barrett, 1998b, p. 1).
Otherwise, electronic portfolios could just become fancy digital scrapbooks and high technology
disconnected from curriculum standards and outcomes, increasing the gap between meaningful
integration of technology into the teaching and learning process.

Portfolios can fulfill different purposes and be presented in different formats. The
National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS, 1991) supported the assessment
system that examines a multidimensional knowledge base and employs a flexible,
comprehensive, and integrated approach. Ryan and Kuhs (1993) noted that portfolios can serve
this purpose in higher education providing a "natural cumulative record" of student
developments and demonstrating four critical features of a sound assessment system: "(a)
flexibility, (b) the use of information from a variety of sources, (c) collecting assessment data
longitudinally, and (d) processing or interpreting the information in an integrated, holistic
fashion" (p. 78).

Portfolios in Higher Education
Portfolios in Undergraduate Education

Many authors (Anderson & DeMeulle, 1998; Black, 1993; Banta et al., 1996; Barton &
Collins, 1993; Christian, 1993; Reilly et. al., 1993) discussed the benefits of employing
portfolios at the college level. Prus and Johnson (1993) defined portfolios as a "collection of
multiple student work samples usually compiled over time" (p. 15) and listed the following ten
advantages for portfolio assessment: (1) portfolios are useful to view student learning and
development longitudinally; (2) multiple curricular components can be included in and measured
within the same portfolio; (3) samples in a portfolio are more likely to contain authentic
reflections of a student abilities if planned correctly; (4) the process of reviewing and grading
student portfolios is the excellent opportunity for faculty to assess curriculum and provide
program feedback and improvement; (5) portfolios are economical in terms of student time and
effort; (6) faculty have a greater control over interpretation and use of results; (7) portfolios are
more likely to be meaningful to all stakeholders; (8) portfolio assessment avoids and minimizes
test anxiety; (9) portfolios increase the power of maximum performance measures over more
artificial "one short" and "speed" measures; and (10) portfolios increase student interest and
participation in the program. It is evident that portfolios are beneficial for both faculty and students.

Black (1993) described the use of portfolios in Emporia State College to evaluate two of five general education goals dealing with integration, critical thinking, analysis of issues, value clarification, and multicultural issues of student writing. Though Black (p. 145) agreed that there were “little hard data available yet to substantiate” faculty perceptions, there was a strong indication that portfolio assessment brought the following benefits to the program and faculty members: portfolio assessment revealed the essence of the program, motivated faculty to undergo a thorough self-examination of instructional objectives, encouraged reaching agreement on program standards, stimulated productive discussion among students and faculty, fostered faculty collegiality, led to refining of courses and aligning of curriculum to meet specified performance standards, helped faculty remain in control of their academic programs, and provided directions for faculty development. These data were consistent with findings of Hamp-Lyons and Condon (1993) who reported on their five-year longitudinal study of portfolio-based assessment at the University of Michigan. The benefits for the writing program described by the authors included promotion of communication among faculty, faculty training and development, and consensus and collaboration.

Jones (1996) considered the portfolio to be a significant contribution to education and a powerful tool for encouraging students to interact with and interpret their own growth process and for improving instruction. Frazier and Paulson (1992) argued that "... portfolio assessment offers students a way to take charge of their learning; it also encourages ownership, pride, and high self-esteem" (p. 64). Belanoff (1996) also emphasized student ownership as one of the greatest characteristics of portfolios.

Olds and Miller (1997) indicated several strengths of portfolio methods in their engineering program. Portfolios did not intrude on normal classroom procedures; allowed faculty to view multiple examples of student's work over time; promoted the development of student analytical skills; could be used both for formative and summative assessment purposes; urged positive changes in courses and programs; increased faculty involvement in the process through their bottom-up approach; and created a data-based decision making process.
Aitken (1993) reported that according to English department faculty, portfolios yielded information needed for program improvement "without the costs and dangers of inappropriate statistical reportage inherent in quantitative assessment measures" (p. 14). Portfolios can be part of the curriculum and provide input into its redesign (Borthwick, 1995; Maeroff, 1991; Robbins, Brandt, Goering, Nassif, & Wascha, 1994). Frazier and Paulson (1992) and Hansen (1992) viewed portfolios as being both a more accurate and a more comprehensive type of student assessment in higher education. Portfolios have been used by adult students returning to post-secondary education as an option to receive credit for college-level learning and as a measure of learners' personal accomplishments in fields such as business, law, and medicine (Barnett & Lee, 1994; Bassett & Jackson, 1994; Fingert, 1993; Fisher, 1991; Geiger & Shugarman, 1988; MacIsaac & Jackson, 1994). It was argued that portfolios better serve needs of adult learners and function as a catalyst to reflective practice and multi-sided "collaboration with other learners, faculty, and colleagues through supportive coaching or mentoring..." (MacIsaac & Jackson, 1994, p. 66).

Portfolio assessment in teacher education is consistent with the move to use portfolios in state and national certification (Constantino & DeLorenzo, 1994; Kendall, 1994). Teacher education and professional development programs have a rich history of using portfolio-based assessment allowing students to capture the complexities of the teaching and learning processes (Anderson & DeMuelle, 1998; Barton, 1993; Barton & Collins, 1993; Bradshaw & Hawk, 1996; Diez, 2001; Edgerton, Hutchings, & Quinlan, 1991; Geiger & Shugarman, 1988; Johnson & Hodges, 1998; Klenowski, 2001; Lyons, 1998; Shulman, 1998). Barton and Collins (1993) described their portfolio experience in teacher education programs and believed that portfolios could serve as the most meaningful assessment on the basis of at least four reasons: (1) portfolios allow both students and teachers to reflect on student growth and development—an opportunity that does not exist with practices of comprehensive exams administered at the end of the program; (2) portfolios allow faculty to observe student work in the context of teaching as a complex process with interrelated factors; (3) portfolio development shifts the ownership of learning onto the student as it encourages students to build and use knowledge as they determine the necessity; and (4) portfolios assist students in becoming more articulate because of the wealth of collegial sharing and collaboration built into portfolio development.
Barton (1993) provided a meaningful summary of strengths of portfolios in teacher education: portfolios empowered students by shifting the ownership of learning from faculty to students; enhanced collaboration by allowing students to engage in ongoing discussion about content with peers, faculty, and other audiences; integrated theory and practice by making meaningful connections; focused on the specificity of shared purposes; provided direct links between artifacts included in the portfolio and authentic practices; fostered critical thinking by providing opportunities to reflect on change and growth over a period of time.

Lyons (1998) suggested viewing portfolios in teacher education from three perspectives: as a credential to validate one’s teaching authority, as a set of assumptions about teaching and learning, and as a powerful personal reflective learning experience. The author concluded that “while portfolios in teacher education are yet in their infancy, they hold great promise” (Lyons, 1998, p. 5).

Mokhtari, Yellin, Bull, and Montgomery (1996) reported results of their study of portfolio assessment in language art courses at Oklahoma State University. It was demonstrated that portfolios had a great appeal among the pre-service teachers surveyed because they promoted collaborative learning and student reflection, helped future teachers become more articulate, and maintained a "psychologically secure environment in the classroom" (Mokhtari et al., 1996, p. 248). Students who participated in the study enjoyed being evaluated using portfolios, felt comfortable planning and developing portfolios, and were positive toward the use of portfolios in their teacher education classes.

Davis et al. (2001) conducted a study with 129 medical students who used portfolios as a final examination. It was noted that portfolio assessment had great potential for encouraging and enhancing student learning. In addition, portfolios allowed assessing a range of outcomes not easily measured by other methods: student attitudes, diligence and other personal attributes, and aptitude for self-development.

The discussion of portfolio-based assessment at the undergraduate level is no longer limited to classroom portfolios in reading, writing, and literacy. There are cases reported on using portfolios in engineering, health management education, and business administration. Undergraduate programs in teacher education embraced the idea of portfolios and started using this type of assessment extensively to meet standards of teacher certification. There are many
benefits of employing portfolios at the college level. Portfolios have successfully moved from individual undergraduate classrooms to graduate programs. Although there is not yet a body of systematic data documenting their uses or long-term consequences for students, faculty, and individual professions, there are promising possibilities of portfolios in the development and learning of graduate students.

**Portfolios in Graduate Education**

Assessment of the quality of graduate programs of higher education has been a long-standing concern of academics as well as the public. A direct implication of this concern is that assessment of higher education outcomes should become more performance-based, where affective, motivational, and cognitive aspects of desired competencies and skills will be demonstrated in action and not just in theory (Messick, 1999, NPBEA, 2002). Ohlhausen and Ford (1990) noted that the use of portfolios also helped personalize the process for graduate students, encouraged reflective thinking, provided greater authenticity and accuracy, gave better long-term perspective, and enhanced student organization and accountability. Hain (1991) considered that portfolios could integrate the final evaluative measures and previous coursework.

Mathies and Uphoff (1992) reported on the use of portfolio assessment with graduate students in the Educational Technology programs at Wright State University. Graduate students were to build their portfolios around four critical areas: professional responsibilities, content mastery, organization and management, and pedagogy. The portfolio and its oral presentation were considered to function as the comprehensive examination for the educational technology program.

Reynolds (1994) shared the experience of portfolio implementation in one of the graduate courses in English and noted that the use of portfolios in graduate classes "provides the chance [for students] to take risks since the one-shot seminar paper has been eliminated" (p. 204). Stressful "all-day-locked-in-a-room-closed-book" syndrome of many graduate comprehensive exams would not survive an exciting alternative of portfolio-based assessment.

At the Bank Street College of Education, portfolios have been used as a culminating project for master’s degree in education since 1993 (Freidus, 1998). Students were asked to identify and discuss artifacts significant for them personally and professionally, identify connections between artifacts, reflect upon these connections in order to find a unifying theme,
and examine artifacts and the unifying theme from personal and theoretical perspectives. While developing their portfolios, students communicated with their peers and faculty. An additional scaffold was provided during monthly meetings, when students got together to discuss portfolio progress. Faculty members served as mentors during these peer meetings stimulating learning and providing support. Completed portfolios included themes emerging from artifacts; six artifacts presented in various media to document four domains in teacher education: human development, educational history and philosophy, the social context of teaching, and curriculum. Brief captions explained the rational for the inclusion of each artifact and its relations to an emergent theme. Concluding statements synthesized the work included in the portfolio and described educational implications of the developed theme. Students were expected to present their portfolios publicly. According to the program faculty, portfolios were a successful practice because they involved students in conscious reflection, facilitated building of a new knowledge upon prior knowledge and values, and allowed students to construct their educational vision through active engagement with program content.

There is a growing body of literature describing successful use of portfolio assessment in various fields and disciplines of graduate studies. The increasing awareness that portfolios have the potential to provide a comprehensive picture of what a graduate student is capable of doing has prompted the use of portfolio assessment in various programs, including programs for the preparation of educational administrators.

**Portfolios in Programs Preparing Educational Leaders**

This section provides definitions of portfolio assessment in the field of educational administration, followed by an overview of the literature describing portfolio use in various programs during the past ten years. Benefits of portfolio assessment for aspiring school leaders are also described.

**Educational administrators benefit through portfolio development.** Relating to standards for educational leadership programs, NPBEA (2002) suggested a broad definition of portfolios pertaining to the field:

…accumulation of evidence about individual proficiencies, especially in relation to explicit standards and rubrics, used in evaluation of competency as a teacher or in another professional school role. Contents might include end-of-course evaluations and tasks used for instructional or clinical experience purposes such
as projects, journals, and observations by faculty, videos, comments by cooperating teachers or internship supervisors, and samples of student work. (p. 34)

As educational leadership programs are restructured and redesigned in a demand for reform and improved development of educational administrators (Morgan, Gibbs, Hertzog, & Wylie, 1997; Hoyle, English, & Steffy, 1998; Lashway, 2003; McCarthy, 1999; Murphy & Forsyth, 1999; Schneider, 1999; Van Meter & Murphy, 1997; Williamson, 2000; NPBEA, 2002), portfolio assessment appears to offer the most viable alternative to the traditional exit examination process (Barnett, 1995; Duncan, 1996; Mattocks & Drake, 2001; Meadows et al., 1998; Morgan et al., 1997). Barnett (1995) favored the idea of including portfolios in programs preparing educational leaders, as "use of portfolios provides a direct connection between pre-service preparation and on-the-job performance as well as encouraging a stronger link between theory and practice" (p. 203). Faculty in programs preparing educational leaders started to rethink how they assessed student performance. One of the trends was the use of alternative assessment that went "beyond examinations, written papers, and the accumulation of course credits as the sole measures of learning" (Barnett, 1995, p. 198). More active classroom activities (simulations, role-plays, problem-based learning) and field-based experiences (practicum or internships) were instituted. These learning activities could be viewed as a progressive step towards allowing students to demonstrate their ability to act and apply knowledge in practical situations. Barnett (1995) cautioned that the evolution of portfolio assessment in preparing programs should be a gradual process with multiple revisions resulting from feedback provided by students, faculty, and practitioners.

Portfolio development also promotes reflection, fosters professional growth, leadership skills, self-assessment skills, self-confidence, risk taking, and professional dialogue, thus preparing aspiring principals for their challenging careers (Brown & Irby, 1997). Many states are exploring opportunities for using portfolios for licensure of their school principals and superintendents (CCSSO, 1999a, 1999b, 2000a, 2002). According to Karen Hessel, program director at the Educational Testing Service (ETS), five states (Indiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Ohio) completed the field test of the School Leader Portfolio (SLP) for initial licensure of their school leaders by May, 2002 (K. Hessel, personal e-mail communication, May...
Portfolio candidates are new school leaders, typically having 1-5 years of experience. The assessment can be used with administrative interns or as an exit activity for professional degree candidates. These candidates can be aspiring or practicing building-level administrators (principals, assistance principals, or supervisors) or central office personnel, including superintendents.

The only state requiring the use of the SLP for permanent licensure is Ohio. Indiana has proposed legislation requiring the use of the SLP for relicensure (K. M. Hassel, personal e-mail communication, May 24, 2002). The portfolio is planned to allow candidates to demonstrate their understanding and implementation of the ISLLC Standards for School Leaders (ISLLC, 1996). This portfolio is designed to guide candidates through a series of structured activities that they are to perform during the course of their normal professional duties. It is believed that the portfolio construction process will permit individuals to record and document evidence of their work and, most importantly, that it will provide candidates with the opportunity to reflect on professional practice and learn and grow through these activities.

The Education Placement Consortium (2000) conducted a national survey of school executives, asking them to provide demographic details and respond to a series of questions on the selection process of new school administrative candidates. Completed surveys were received from 49 states representing nearly one third (32%) of the sample of 1003 school districts in rural, small city, suburban, and urban settings. One of the survey questions pertained to identification of screening tools in a selection process for administrative job placement in education. This study found that 40% of the school executives believed that a professional portfolio was a useful tool in the selection process. In addition, 24% of the school administrators surveyed indicated that their school districts currently request portfolios from candidates for administrative positions, and 53% of survey participants believed that university faculty should help candidates develop professional portfolios for their potential employment interviews, thus reinforcing the importance of portfolio preparation in programs preparing educational leaders.

**Portfolio assessment in Wright State University.** Mathies and Uphoff (1992) viewed portfolios as an active learning experience and assessment that "mirror program expectations in regard to learning outcomes, student achievement and best practice" (p. 9). The authors described a three-stage process of implementing portfolios within the Supervision and
Administration program of Wright State University. Portfolios were used "as a vehicle for
developing administrative reflectivity skills" and to provide "a means to analyze, synthesize and
integrate a variety of knowledge domains" in the Department of Educational Leadership
(Mathies & Uphoff, 1992, p. 6). Faculty in the program noted that portfolios served as a better
type of final evaluation than the more typical written and oral examination they had administered
before. Students were reported to provide more reflection on the implications of their work.

**Portfolio assessment in University of Central Florida.** Milstein and Associates (1993)
described the experience of the University of Central Florida program in Educational Leadership
with portfolios. Emphasis on reflection and professional growth through the use of portfolios was
one of the key aspects of the academic content and delivery along with cohort development,
significant humanities-related experiences, multiculturalism, and multifaceted evaluation. The
faculty required students to develop highly structured portfolios with the inclusion of expanded
and systematic reflections. Guide forms and sheets were distributed to students to guide portfolio
construction. After students gathered materials for their individual portfolios, small groups of
students collaborated to synthesize learning. Those group meetings were videotaped, and later
the videotapes were shared with the entire cohort of students for further synthesis of learning. At
the end of the program, students presented their portfolios to panels of educational leaders from
the area. It was noted that “…the portfolios have helped students to focus and, as a result, to get
more out of their preparation programs” (Milstein & Associates, 1993, p. 72). A current program
coordinator of the master’s degree program in Educational Leadership clarified that they “have
never had a ‘pure’ portfolio, but we have encouraged the kind of behavior and accumulation of
experiences and documentation associated with portfolios” (M. A. Lynn, personal e-mail
communication, February 25, 2002).

A current portfolio approach in University of Central Florida involves internships and
field experiences to document activities throughout a student’s educational leadership program.
Students are expected to accumulate and maintain the documentation of their administrative
experiences, enrich their portfolio of activities, and strengthen their qualifications for
administrative positions. Students also are encouraged to become familiar with any portfolio
requirements their school districts may have for prospective administrators and modify their
documentation so that it will serve them well in preparing for selection processes used in Florida
school districts. Internship supervisors review documentation with their students. The students are told that their main objective is to develop portfolios for their own benefit, use, and reference in the future. No research has been done to evaluate the effectiveness of the University of Central Florida portfolio approach.

**Portfolio assessment in University of Missouri and South Dakota State University.** Mills and Reisetter (1995) described their portfolio practices employed for assessment of students in individual educational administration courses in University of Missouri and in South Dakota State University. Students were required to submit portfolios containing professionally prepared course papers and pieces of reflective writing regarding readings and discussions. No detailed criteria for portfolio development were given. At the end of the semester, students submitted products that differed dramatically in quality. Mostly, portfolios represented what was taught by the instructor, “not what they [students] learned” (Mills & Reisetter, 1995, p. 17). The major issue was that in many portfolios there was no connection between the portfolio content and course or program goals. The following semester, the instructor spent a significant amount of time discussing expectations, format, content, structure, and appearance of portfolios. However, the submitted portfolios were still not of the desired quality, had a low level of reflection, and focused more on class notes than on the application of the content. That negative experience made the instructor change practices and include a more detailed description of expectations, a showcase of best portfolios from previous semesters, and a schedule of dates for informal reviews of portfolios during the semester. As a result, portfolios and reflectivity improved. However, there was one drawback—all portfolios looked the same, hiding the individuality of students and diminishing student creativity.

Mills and Reisetter (1995) reported that it took them several semesters to develop sound portfolio assessment practices, which they did by: (1) encouraging involvement and commitment for the use of portfolios from students and faculty throughout the program; (2) conveying broad but clear expectations for portfolio development to enable students to meet class goals and allow individual ways to demonstrate mastery; (3) evaluating portfolios effectively and efficiently on the basis of specified assessment strategies; (4) emphasizing and incorporating students self-assessment through linkage of student goals and self-set standards to general course objectives; and (5) encouraging peer-review of portfolios to promote support and feedback.
**Portfolio assessment in University of New Mexico.** Milstein (1996) described the experiences of portfolio-based assessment in the Ed. D. Educational Leadership program at the University of New Mexico. The portfolio was viewed as a central vehicle in achieving program objectives. The faculty started experimenting with portfolios in early 1990s. Portfolios contained an extensive record of progress, a collection of documented learning achievements, an overview of field experiences, and reflective statements about student academic study. Students included in their portfolios a description of educational philosophy, a plan focusing on professional goals, a synthesis of applied research efforts, a description of professional developmental activities beyond the program, leadership activities during a program of study, and a capstone research project completed at the end of the program. Students were engaged in portfolio construction process throughout their study. Student graduate committee members assisted students in establishing specific approaches to portfolios and selection of artifacts. Faculty members reviewed portfolios twice to provide feedback and assist each student in preparing the portfolio for the third review, as a final assessment in the program. Students, faculty, and members of the community participated in a final portfolio presentation. It was reported that portfolios promoted reflection, transformational leadership, and synthesis of learning. Based on the positive outcomes of portfolio assessment, the faculty made a decision to use portfolios at the master’s degree level. No data were yet reported.

**Portfolio assessment in Florida Gulf Coast University.** Valesky (1998) presented the portfolio as a part of final assessment and a demonstration of a successful completion of program objectives. Beginning in 1998, students in Educational Leadership program of Florida Gulf Coast University were to prepare two portfolios (a Learning Portfolio and a Professional Portfolio) and present them at an oral interview with a panel of faculty. The Learning Portfolio was designed to present artifacts and documentation that had served as a basis for student learning, e.g., reflective writing about program experiences, course papers and products, and academic literature review. Each artifact was to be accompanied with a short, written explanation of why this product is selected. All entries in the portfolio also were to have a written reflection. Students were expected to demonstrate competencies in accordance with ISLLC Standards, Florida State Principal Competencies, and the National Policy Board on Educational Administration (NPBEA) competencies (Valesky, 1998). The Professional Portfolio was intended to present professional
accomplishments and goals and integrate student's academic learning and experience. Portfolios were expected to include a table of content, a cover letter specifying a type of administrative position a student was seeking, a current resume, an administrative platform paper, letters of support from colleagues, supervisors, former students and parents, and artifacts which demonstrated mastery and accomplishments. No results of the portfolio assessment and implementation process have been reported yet.

**Portfolio Assessment in Auburn University at Montgomery.** Meadows et al. (1998) described the use of portfolio assessment in Auburn University at Montgomery as a culminating experience in the educational leadership preparation program. Students began working on their portfolios upon entering the program, constantly updating and revising portfolio entries as a result of their educational and professional experiences. The following components were included in the final product: (1) current resume; (2) credentials; (3) transcripts and diplomas; (4) references addressing the leadership potential of the student; (5) personal educational platform describing educational philosophy, values system, and administrative goals; (6) artifacts and evidence of leadership potential from courses, internship, and other activities to represent a variety of skills and knowledge; and (7) indicators of professional success, e.g., professional development activities, professional accomplishments, and projects.

Submitted portfolios were evaluated by the Auburn faculty on the basis of criteria and appraised as quality work, satisfactory, or unsatisfactory. Only work products of high quality were considered to fulfill graduation requirements. Other portfolios were returned to students for revision. Informal survey was administered to students and faculty in the program. Meadows et al. (1998) reported an overall positive attitude toward portfolio assessment as expressed by students and faculty in the program. No formal research was undertaken to investigate faculty perceptions. Further research was conducted to follow up on student informal findings (Meadows, & Dyal, 1999). It was reported that a written survey was developed and administered to 27 educational leadership program graduates to assess (1) the appropriateness of portfolio assessment as a measure of student performance, (2) the general effectiveness of leadership portfolio in facilitating student growth and improvement, and (3) whether the portfolio represented a significant and valuable tool in seeking employment as an administrator.
According to researchers, there was an overall positive response to portfolio assessment (Meadows & Dyal, 1999). All participants agreed that portfolio assessment measured graduate academic performance more adequately than the traditional examination. A total of 88% of the participants believed that portfolio assessment improved the quality of assessment procedures for educational leadership students. In general, there was strong agreement among respondents with each of eight statements in the survey, including improved reflectivity, greater opportunities for professional growth and development, and enhanced preparation for the employment market. Also, 77% rated their portfolio experiences as excellent and 23% indicated it was effective. At Auburn University at Montgomery, the portfolio process is evolving based on experience, practice, and input from students and faculty (Meadows & Dyal, 1999).

**Portfolio Assessment in Florida State University.** Recognizing the complexity and importance of preparing school leaders, the Florida State University program in Educational Leadership developed a competency-based approach involving six facets (Cox, Biance, & Herrington, 1999). One of the major facets was construction of a performance portfolio either in paper format or electronically to document one’s personal achievements, knowledge, and competencies in eight key domains of education leadership: transformational leadership, site-based decision making, curriculum and instruction, human resource management, technology, parent and community involvement, student development services, and political and regulatory environment. Students were introduced to portfolio concepts in the initial course, Introduction to Educational Leadership. They developed their portfolios over the entire program of studies and categorized all materials under six major sections: Personal Page, Leadership Development Plan, Visions of Excellence, Evidence of Competency and Connections, Simulations of Performance, and an Other Items section (any materials students wish to place in their portfolios such as journals or reflections on experiences in the program). Students were given general guidelines on portfolio content for each section. Each course in the program was designed to motivate students to develop projects that later could be used as portfolio artifacts and the basis for reflection and a leadership development plan. Students were expected to defend their portfolios at the end of the program. To this date, no data have been published describing aspects of portfolio implementation, student and faculty attitudes to portfolio assessment, and barriers and facilitators of portfolio assessment.
There is a growing interest in the use of portfolio-based learning and assessment in many professions. A review of the literature related to portfolios at different levels of higher education yields several important insights: portfolios can benefit students personally and professionally, and offer encouragement by allowing multiple attempts and opportunities to assess learning outcomes not easily assessed by other methods, e.g., growth, self-directedness, reflective abilities, and professionalism and by providing evidence of performance collected from a range of sources, e.g., student work over time, in a variety of settings, and in different subject areas. In addition to contributions to student assessment, portfolios also foster other significant educational aspects, such as a focus on personal growth, enhanced interaction between peers and students and instructors, effective use of reflective strategies, and expanded understanding of professional competencies. Despite a positive response to portfolio assessment, there remain some concerns that deserve to be discussed.

**Concerns about Portfolio Assessment**

The literature revealed that portfolios are generally used successfully in many programs. Portfolios in higher education represent a relatively new approach to assessing students and have become popular on college campuses. However, the use of portfolios is sometimes accepted without careful planning and critical evaluation. Since portfolios do not yet have the type of credibility enjoyed by certain other evaluation measures, some assessment experts have voiced concerns about the general psychometric categories: reliability, validity, fairness, and generalizability. Mismatches of portfolio assessment with old paradigms of standardized assessment cause significant problems of trivialization and unnecessary standardization. Another area of concern pertains primarily to implementation issues. Additional concerns about portfolio assessment are presented and summarized in Table 2.4.

**Reliability**

As with any educational evaluation and measure, reliability is important to portfolio assessment. Judgments and conclusions of student performance should be consistent when different examiners assess a student’s work, or when different examples of work are included in one’s portfolio. It was reported in several studies that inter-rater and intra-rater reliability did not reach a level that could support making a safe summative judgment (Koretz, McCaffrey, Klein, Bell, & Stecher, 1992; Pitts, Coles, & Thomas, 2001; Snadden, 1999). As Elbow (1991) stated,
“when a portfolio increases validity by giving us a better picture of what we are trying to measure (the student’s actual ability), it tends by that very act to muddy reliability—to diminish the likelihood of agreement among readers or grades” (p. xii). Often, researchers find that reliability levels are acceptable. Thus, Brennan (1995) reported a reasonable level of inter-rater reliability in the scoring of family literacy portfolios. Davis et al. (2001) observed no problems with reliability. Two internal and one external examiner saw “portfolio assessment as a robust and successful method for assessing the learning outcomes” (p. 363).

At this time, knowledge about consistency of portfolio ratings is limited. Current evidence indicates that the reliability of portfolio ratings may be low. Baume, (2001), Black (1993), Mabry (1999), Oosterhof (2001), and others suggested a number of procedures to increase portfolio reliability. One of the procedures involves a careful specification of the evaluation criteria for a student’s portfolio, by developing a scoring plan for each objective, a check list, a rating scale, a scoring rubric, or scoring protocols that might include both a numeric rating and a verbal description to direct all assessors to look for the same aspects and qualities in student work. Portfolio assessors should be briefed and trained in meaning and application of specified criteria. The latter should result in their close agreement when evaluating a portfolio. Another technique consists of the application of a scoring procedure for multiple observations of student work which increase the number and diversity of samples in a portfolio to demonstrate the achievement of an instructional objective. Increasing the number of portfolio reviewers to promote portfolio scoring consistency can also increase the number of observations. If the technical quality of portfolio assessment can be improved, such assessment can be used for a great variety of purposes in evaluation in education and outside of educational settings.

Validity

Validity refers to the soundness of interpretations based on evidence available in the assessment. A valid assessment scheme tests whether a student has achieved the goals of the course or program (Baume, 2001). Despite the abundance of literature advocating portfolio assessment, little is known about its validity as a tool for performance measurement and about its use as means of evaluation. Validity of portfolio assessment is a controversial issue. Some authors argue that the validity of portfolio assessment is doubtful (Corrigan & Loughran, 1994; Terwilliger, 1997), while others are sure that portfolios can provide valid assessment (Baume,
Mabry (1999) claimed that portfolios tend to promote more valid inferences of student achievements than standardized tests because their customized and concentrated focus on an individual over time provides a better picture about the person.

Validity of portfolio assessment, in part, depends on what a student includes in the portfolio and the quality of work samples. For a writing course, Moss et al. (1992) examined portfolios and comprehensive writing folders containing all writing completed during the year of ten students in this class. Students were responsible for selecting their portfolio artifacts, and in some cases, they failed to include samples of their work that a portfolio examiner could judge to be their best work. At the same time, Davis et al. (2001) reported no threats to validity in portfolio assessment used for 129 students graduating from medical school. However, it was noted that further work needed to be carried out to improve reliability through improvements in objectivity and identification of standardized questions that would help the portfolio examiners explore student learning against curriculum outcomes and program standards. Several students felt that examiners applied different standards. It was also noted that examiners would need training in the skilful use of these questions.

Portfolios containing work samples to demonstrate one’s skills, capabilities, and achievements should provide a true picture and inform a consequential decision about a person (Moss, 1998). Based on her extensive work on validity research, Moss (1998) advocated using not only a traditional aggregated approach in portfolio evaluation, where two portfolio examiners rate each entry independently, assign scores, and then derive a composite score to make a decision about graduation, licensure, or graduation, but also an integrative approach. An integrative approach can be implemented in two contexts: (1) when portfolios are evaluated by the outside raters who are not familiar with a candidate beyond work presented in one’s portfolio and (2) when portfolios are scored by evaluators who have a unique knowledge about a candidate beyond portfolio artifacts. The latter can enhance the validity of interpretation by providing a better understanding of the context, candidate’s perspectives and experiences. It might also threaten validity by bringing irrelevant knowledge and commitments about the candidate. More research is needed to investigate the validity of these integrative assessment practices by maintaining high rigorous standards appropriate for a high stake assessment.
To improve a validity situation, students should be guided on how to select their best work, including that which demonstrates the achievement of the instructional objectives. They also should understand the criteria to be used for evaluation and scoring of their portfolios. Oosterhof (2001) advised to separately score the quality of the portfolio and the quality of artifacts included. Further, it was noted by Oosterhof that portfolios, being employed as the only assessment tool, should be used with caution toward assessing the achievement of individual students. Therefore, at this stage of development, other assessment tools must be used alongside portfolios to make high-stake decisions, such as student graduation.

**Fairness**

Messick (1994) argued that issues of fairness are at the heart of performance assessment validity. Fairness in testing is defined in many ways. In general terms, fairness encompasses a broad range of interconnected issues, including absence of bias in assessment tasks, equitable treatment of all examinees in the assessment process, an opportunity to learn the material being assessed, and reaching conclusions based only on the evidence (AERA, 1999; Pellegrino et al., 2001).

Kimball and Hanley (1998) shared their experiences in insuring fairness of portfolio assessment at the University of Southern Maine’s Extended Teacher Education Program. Fairness in assessment starts with fairness in the learning process. Students were given an opportunity to examine program standards and outcomes and assessment criteria at the beginning of their program of study. A midyear review was conducted to evaluate student standing and level of performance against the specified standards. Students had a chance to learn and practice their skills during internship. University and school faculty provided on-going feedback. Multiple sources of evidence were considered to provide a comprehensive picture of a student’s learning and progress. Students who performed below expectations had to design and implement a mediated plan of action.

Baume (2001) presented a case study of portfolio assessment in a course on teaching in higher education and argued that portfolios can be described and perceived as fair if the process permitted students to present their own selection and their own analysis of their work completed over time with equal access to information resources.
Generalizability

Generalizability is a critical variable in assessment. Linn, Baker, and Dunbar (1991) argued that assurances should be made that assessment judgments not be limited to the specific situations laid out in the assessment, but transfer and hold up against other professional activities, e.g., instructing, assessing, reflecting, and communicating in a teaching profession. Oosterhof (2001) pointed out that due to the relatively novel nature of portfolios, knowledge about how well performance on portfolios would generalize was very limited. To deal with generalizability issues: (1) assessment should become an integral component of curriculum; (2) the assessment process should be grounded in evidence directly linked to one’s performance; and (3) assessment should promote on-going discussions, feedback, and rethinking of one’s learning and experiences (Kimball & Hanley, 1998).

Mismatching of New and Old Assessment Paradigms

More than a decade ago, Wiggins (1991) argued that standards in performance and achievement should not force standardization. However, occasions when new assessment techniques are implemented within the old paradigms of standardized assessment do happen. Several authors cautioned about such dangers of the portfolio process as possibilities for trivialization and mindless standardization (Lyons, 1998; Marby, 1999; Sculman, 1998). They warned against following lines of least resistance and documenting work that was not worthy of collecting or reflecting. Shulman (1998) was concerned about other potential portfolio problems, such as: “showmanship” (p. 34), when portfolios become a mere exhibition where style and format rather than carefully selected substance begin to take control; “heavy lifting” (p.35), when portfolio construction takes one’s time, effort, and creativity away from professional duties and work, and becoming a heavy burden; “perversion” (p. 35), when attempts to develop a sufficiently objective portfolio scoring system, portfolios will evolve as a very cumbersome multiple choice test; and “misrepresentation” (p. 35), when isolated samples of one’s best work no longer serve the purpose of presenting the total person.

Mabry (1999) summarized current mismatching in assessment paradigms that cause portfolios to be prescribed to such an extent that students and instructors have little opportunity to show their unique accomplishments. Other features of mismatch included: the predetermination of standards, criteria, or rubrics lacking any mechanism for crediting unique
Implementation Problems

Faculty members and students are most actively involved in portfolio assessment and, therefore, are most influenced by it. Inappropriate or ill-defined portfolio procedures can cause participants to resist the innovative assessment and disagree about its effectiveness and value. Research on faculty and student perceptions is important to ensure the successful implementation of portfolio assessment.

Faculty concerns. One of the most repeated concerns about portfolio assessment implementation expressed by faculty is the increased paper and work loads for faculty (Aitken, 1993; Anderson & DeMuelle, 1998; Aschbacher, 1993; Christian, 1993; Davis et al., 2001) and the increased costs in terms of evaluator time and effort (Davis et al., 2001; Prus & Johnson, 1993). In implementing portfolio assessment, need for time and resources was cited as a concern in many areas, such as: learning a new type of assessment, planning for the innovation, helping students understand the logistics and concepts necessary to use portfolios, organizing, collecting and managing portfolio contents, scoring portfolios, synthesizing the results, and evaluating assessment effectiveness (Cheong, 1993; Coutinho & Malouf, 1993; Gilman & McDermott, 1994; Hewitt, 1993; Johns & Van Leisburg, 1993; Prus and Johnson, 1993; Wolff, Chiu, & Reckase, 1999; Wolfe & Miller, 1997). Closely tied to the issue of time and resources is the need for training on how to develop and implement a new assessment. Aschbacher (1993), Bull, Montgomery, Coombs, Sebastian, and Fletcher (1994), and McLaughlin et al. (1998) noted that instructors and administrators requested more knowledge, practice, and training on portfolio assessment.

There are, however, different views concerning the significant amount of time involved in this type of assessment. Tierney, Carter, and Desai (1991) argued that according to their
experience in utilizing portfolios in teaching reading and writing, after a transitional period, the use of portfolios did not require additional time. Oosterhof (2001) noted that the preparation of a portfolio generally does not involve much additional time, since most of materials included in a portfolio would be prepared beforehand. However, regular reviewing of portfolios and conferencing with students were considered to be time consuming.

Almost any innovation appears complicated at the beginning and, thus, meets resistance. Several authors shared their concerns that some faculty members were not prepared to challenge their established practices to meet the demands of using portfolios for formal assessment (Aschbacher, 1993; Calfee & Perfumo, 1993; Milstein, 1996; Valencia & Calfee, 1991) and felt insecure in terms of using student portfolios for evaluating their teaching practices or grading system (Prus & Johnson, 1993).

Incompatibility of portfolios with existing grading systems was cited by Christian (1993) as one of the serious problems perceived by faculty. Possible plagiarism of student work and compromised originality of student projects were found to be faculty concerns in studies of Christian (1993) and Prus and Johnson (1993).

**Student concerns.** Such concerns about portfolios as time burden, lack of explicit instructions, uncertainty as to what to include in portfolios, and lack of self-reflection skills were among those more often expressed concerns by students (Davis et al. 2001; Jones, 1996; Mick, 1996; Wade & Yarborough, 1996; Zidon, 1996). Most of the available reports were non-empirical in nature. Jones (1996) noted that students in his communications class at Ball State University were resistant to an unfamiliar activity and identified portfolio assignment as a source of frustration. The basis for this concern was the students' inability to relate the assignment to any similar previous experience and lack of exposure to portfolio assessment. However, students became more enthusiastic about their portfolios when they saw the relationships between their coursework and their career objectives. "Assigning a portfolio without a careful step-by-step process of explaining it throughout the semester can lead to extreme frustration" (Jones, 1996, p. 288).

Zidon’s (1996) students in a teacher education program were overwhelmed with chores of organizing their portfolios. The students felt frustrated at the beginning of the program because they did not have enough information about portfolio assessment and did not have a
clear understanding of the process of portfolio construction beyond saving all the papers. Thus, portfolio values of reflection and self-assessment were overlooked. Students felt they would benefit from the opportunity of more frequent interactions and sharing ideas about portfolio construction with their peers and faculty. Instructions on the portfolio format, clear expectations, program standards, and coaching on self-reflection and critical thinking would be beneficial for many students, eliminating many concerns and portfolio anxiety.

Dutt-Doner and Gilman (1998) shared their findings in the portfolio assessment of 621 undergraduate teacher education students. Despite an overall positive response to portfolios, students felt they needed more time to learn about portfolio assessments. Many students were challenged by the flexibility and freedom of choice of products to include in their portfolios. Some felt that specific evaluation criteria limited their creativity. Portfolio content was one of the major issues. Some students were not sure whether their selection of artifacts would be valued as important by the portfolio examiners. Workload and time burden was the most frequently expressed student concern.

Davis et al. (2001) reported similar student concerns. Students who prepared their portfolios as a final examination did not feel confident about this type of assessment. The novel nature of portfolio assessment contributed to student anxiety. It was noted that more information on the concept of portfolio assessment beforehand might lessen the anxiety and improve student attitudes toward portfolio assessment. While many students had a sense of achievement from building their portfolios, several students had doubts about how useful the portfolio was as a learning experience and whether it helped them internalize curriculum outcomes and achieve them. Too much paperwork and work involved in portfolio preparation were also listed as concerns for students.

Diez (2001) stated that portfolios should not be viewed as “a quick answer to the call for new modes of assessment” (p. 44). The author cautioned that portfolios as a technology for assessment should meet sound assessment standards. Simply placing all papers in the notebook, not informing students about criteria, not examining portfolios until the end of the program, not providing developmental feedback, and not promoting student self-assessment diminish the value of portfolio assessment.

A summary of concerns about portfolios is presented in Table 2.4.
Table 2.4

*Concerns about Potential Problems with Portfolio*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. A focus on learning activities rather than student outcomes</td>
<td>Aschbacher (1993)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.4—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concerns</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

As the result of the analysis of the literature on portfolio assessment, I conclude that despite different interpretations as to definitions, purposes, types, and formats, portfolios have many advantages. While portfolio practices might vary among institutions, procedures for quality portfolio assessment have similar requirements: portfolio content should go far beyond a narrative of experiences, portfolios should articulate knowledge and its utilization, and portfolios should establish interconnection between theory and practice in the field. Portfolios benefit students by addressing both their strengths and weaknesses, by presenting student progress in a dynamic, multifaceted, and ongoing way, goal-setting through self-reflection and analysis, offering a way to demonstrate developing competencies that are not measured by standardized tests, and providing opportunities for continuous growth and self-renewal. Portfolios assessment allows faculty members to facilitate student learning, evaluate students based on a set of professional standards and competencies, promote reflection and dialogue about program effectiveness and their teaching, and increase collegiality and curriculum alignment. Some of the disadvantages of portfolio assessment that were discussed included: (1) problems with evaluation measures, e.g., reliability, validity, fairness, and generalizability; (2) mismatch of portfolio assessment and old paradigms of standardized assessment, e.g., trivialization and unnecessary standardization, and (3) implementation concerns as perceived by faculty and students, i.e., increased workload and burden of time, lack of skills in portfolio construction and maintenance,
lack of resources, insufficient information about portfolios and training, and reluctance to change.

Although portfolios are not new, portfolio assessment of graduates in programs preparing educational leaders is still at the developmental stage. There is much to learn, implement, and improve to make portfolio assessment effective. Despite some logistic psychometric problems, portfolios have considerable potential as vehicles for developing the professional knowledge of aspiring future school leaders.
CHAPTER 3  
METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this chapter is to present the study methodology as a set of tools and techniques used to answer the research questions outlined in Chapter 1 that pertained to portfolio assessment. I examined the characteristics of portfolio assessment in a context of Educational Leadership/Administration programs, explored how and why portfolios are used in various programs, and identified major strengths and facilitating factors that can be used to promote and improve portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders, as perceived by study participants.

Particular emphasis was placed on the following issues of portfolio assessment: (1) needs that prompted the redesigning of traditional assessment processes and lead toward portfolio assessment as an alternative; (2) purposes for portfolio assessment in a program; (3) models for portfolio assessment planning and implementation in programs preparing educational leaders, including key people, major stages, events, and unique features; (4) skills, abilities, and Educational Leadership competencies to be demonstrated by program graduates; (5) structural components of portfolios used to demonstrate specified competencies and rationale for content selection; (6) practices and strategies for portfolio evaluation; (7) lessons learned by people implementing portfolio assessment in the programs; (8) meaning and definitions of portfolios as identified by faculty and students; (9) similarities and differences in perceptions of and attitudes toward portfolio assessment among program faculty and students with the specification of strengths and weaknesses of portfolios, (10) factors that facilitate or inhibit implementation of portfolio assessment in various programs as perceived by faculty and students; and (11) potential ways to improve portfolio assessment as recognized by students and faculty.

The qualitative methodological approach incorporating multi-method survey research strategies and questionnaires, interviews, and analysis of documents and records was used for this research. This chapter contains a description of the approach to the study and its strategies,
activities facilitating preparation for a study, and findings of preliminary questionnaires, followed by a discussion of research site selection issues, procedures for collecting and analyzing the data, the rationale for merging qualitative and quantitative approaches, efforts to control research quality, and ethical issues.

Following approval of the proposal by the researcher's supervisory committee, an application and review materials were submitted to the Florida State University Human Subjects Committee for study approval. A copy of their approval is enclosed in Appendix B.

**Preparation for a Study**

Preparation for conducting any study is critical for its success (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997; Rea & Parker, 1997; Trochim, 2002; Yin, 1994). In early stages of study design and specification of research questions, it became apparent that some preliminary work should be done to identify research sites for an in-depth study and sharpen the study questions. Two portfolio assessment questionnaires were used in preliminary phases of the inquiry: in Phase I, to identify individual programs that employ portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement (Appendix C) and, in Phase II, to collect additional information on portfolio implementation in identified programs (Appendix D). Data collected in the two preliminary phases provided a better understanding of how and to what extent portfolios are implemented in various Educational Leadership/Administration programs nationwide before proceeding with a main study. Phase III involved the screening and selection of programs for in-depth study through questionnaires, interviews, and analysis of documents and records (Table 3.1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Screening techniques</th>
<th>Data collection procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase I</td>
<td>Questionnaire to 504 Education Leadership/Administration programs to identify programs possessing the desired characteristic (portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement)</td>
<td>E-mail questionnaire, Appendix C (completed September, 2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phase II</td>
<td>Questionnaire to 112 programs employing portfolio assessment to categorize programs in accordance to specified characteristics</td>
<td>Web-based questionnaire Appendix D (completed February 20, 2002)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.1—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Screening techniques</th>
<th>Data collection procedure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phase III</td>
<td>Identification of 4 programs selected by a set of criteria</td>
<td>Analysis of questionnaires leading to selection of sites for an in-depth study (completed April, 2002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In-depth study of 4 programs</td>
<td>Questionnaires, interviews, analysis of documents and records (completed February, 2003)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**E-mail Portfolio Assessment Questionnaire (Phase I)**

A purposeful sampling frame was utilized to solicit responses for the e-mail portfolio assessment questionnaire. The overall sample, identified in Phase I through the works of Lane (1998), McLeod (2001), and UCEA (2001), consisted of 504 programs of Educational Leadership/Administration in the United States. Department chairs of all 504 programs were contacted via e-mail with a brief questionnaire (Appendix C) to determine which programs use portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement for their master’s students. A total of 377 department chairs (or 75%) returned their completed surveys. The following information was derived out of obtained responses:

- 137 programs did not use portfolios and did not have plans to do so;
- 31 programs did not require portfolios but strongly considered introducing them in their programs as a graduation requirement;
- 96 used portfolios for other purposes (e.g., internship, licensure, individual courses, etc.);
- 112 programs used portfolios as a graduation requirement for their master’s students.

These data were collected by September 2001 and served as a foundation for selection of participants of the second portfolio assessment questionnaire (Phase II).

**Web-Based Portfolio Assessment Questionnaire (Phase II)**

Web-based surveying is becoming widely used in social sciences and educational research. Web questionnaires offer such advantages as low administration costs, reduced time and cost to collect and process primary data, increased response time, availability of a
questionnaire to all respondents at the same time, ease of sending advance, reminder, and follow-up messages via e-mail by customizing a previously prepared text, flexible formatting of a questionnaire layout, color, and graphics, and removal of the need for manual data entry (Kaye & Johnson, 1999; Medin, Roy, & Ann, 1999; Selwyn & Robson, 1998). Advantages for respondents include the ease of answering by clicking closed choices and automatically expanding space for typing open-ended answers.

Methodological challenges include coverage bias (Kaye & Johnson, 1999; Solomon, 2001) or the fact that some people can choose not to use the Internet or do not have access to computers (Crawford, Couper, & Lamias, 2001). Experience and comfort level with Internet-based tools such as web browsers also could be considered a potential source of bias both in response rate and the way people respond to the questionnaire (Dillman, Tortora, & Bowker, 2001). Also, the type of Internet connection, hardware, and software used to access the web-based questionnaire could impact the response rate.

The Web-based Portfolio Assessment Questionnaire was conducted in December 2001--February 2002. All 112 department chairs or program coordinators of Educational Leadership/Administration programs who identified themselves as employing portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement for their master’s students were requested to complete the second questionnaire.

**Initial development of the questionnaire.** Based on the literature review, a preliminary set of descriptive factors for portfolio assessment was developed and organized in a self-administered questionnaire. A draft questionnaire was prepared and given for review to three nationally known specialists in portfolio assessment, one of whom was experienced both in research and in questionnaire and survey instrument development.

The first reviewer was Beverly J. Irby, Associate Professor and Coordinator of Research for the Center for Research and Doctoral Studies in the Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling at Sam Houston State University, Huntsville, Texas. Dr. Irby teaches several courses in research methods and qualitative methodology. She is coauthor of three books on portfolio development and coeditor of four books on women’s issues. Her review provided insights both for questionnaire content and its format.
David Niguidula was the second reviewer of the questionnaire draft. Dr. Niguidula is an educational researcher and consultant, focusing on the use of technology to support school reform. He consults with schools, districts, and state departments of education through his firm, Ideas Consulting. Since early 1990s, Dr. Niguidula led research on digital portfolios while managing the technology group at the Coalition of Essential Schools and Annenberg Institute for School Reform at Brown University. He also helped develop projects focusing on issues of assessment, standards, accountability, and professional development. Dr. Niguidula is best known for his work with digital portfolios for students, teachers, and schools. He has worked with schools by developing the software tools needed to use portfolios and by providing professional development for students and teachers. His particular interest is in the use of the web to support new ideas in assessment and accountability. He is a founder and administrator for the digital portfolios listserv. As a portfolio assessment and technology expert, Dr. Niguidula provided valuable feedback both for questionnaire content and its format.

The third reviewer was Albert Oosterhof, professor at the Department of Educational Research at Florida State University. His specialization is educational measurement and statistics with a particular interest in classroom assessment. He teaches four graduate courses in classroom assessment, measurement and evaluation, instrument and scale development, and statistics. Dr. Oosterhof is an author of two books on assessment issues and portfolios and learning outcomes. His feedback on the questionnaire format and content was detailed and helpful.

All three reviewers provided detailed feedback. Where necessary, items were reworded to meet consistent language and literacy levels, comprehensiveness, clarity, and logical content validity. These alterations resulted in an instrument ready for programming to be used as a web-based questionnaire. The self-administered web-based questionnaire consisted of 26 questions divided into three parts for data submission (Appendix D). Part 1 consisted of seventeen questions (1-17) requiring respondents to provide multiple-choice answers. Four questions of a Likert-type four-point scale with options ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree (18-21) composed Part 2 of the questionnaire. For any of these questions, users had an opportunity to provide alternative answers or comments. The last five questions (22-26) of Part 3 were free response open-ended. Each question was presented in a conventional format similar to that normally used on paper self-administered questionnaires. Submissions of each part of the
questionnaire separately allowed preservation and collection of data in case of a computer malfunction or network problem. The estimated time for the questionnaire completion was about 20 minutes.

**Preparing the questionnaire for a web-based format.** To capture data, the questionnaire was programmed and formatted using a common gateway interface (CGI) script developed by Mr. Kenneth J. Baldauf, instructor at the Computer Science department, FSU. To avoid potential bias and increase the response rate, the web-based questionnaire was designed to accommodate users with minimum computer capabilities and a 640 x 480-dpi-screen configuration. A simple respondent-friendly design of the questionnaire was chosen to increase the load time. The use of background and text colors was restrained to maintain readability and navigation flow. The difference in the visual appearance of questions resulting from different screen configurations, operating systems, or browsers was avoided as the questionnaire was formatted to be used for different browsers, both with Internet Explorer and Netscape. To limit access to the questionnaire only to selected people and ensure confidentiality, each potential respondent was provided with an identification code sent via a personalized e-mail, and the computer program accepted only specified three-digit codes 001-112. To prevent multiple copies of responses sent by accident when a respondent hit a “submit” button more than once, the questionnaire was programmed to overwrite a previous submission for this particular code. The questionnaire was hosted by the Academic Computing and Network Services (ACNS) server at the Florida State University. All data were aggregated at the ACNS server within my e-mail directory. For back-up purposes, an e-mail message with a user code and responses was automatically forwarded to my university e-mail account when somebody completed a questionnaire.

**Administration procedures.** To increase the response rate, three days before the web-based questionnaire became available on-line, all 112 department chairs or coordinators of Educational Leadership/Administration programs were contacted by a personalized e-mail message notifying them about the results of previous questionnaire and inviting them to participate in a new questionnaire (Appendix E).

The Educational Leadership/Administration programs were arranged alphabetically by university name. Each potential participant was assigned a three-digit identification code by
his/her institutional affiliation. Department chairs were asked to identify themselves by the code assigned. The master list of names and assigned codes was available only to the researcher. Within three days after e-mailing the questionnaire intent message, a cover letter was e-mailed to all participants (Appendix F). The web-based questionnaire became available immediately. Those participants who did not complete and submit the questionnaire within four weeks were sent a personalized follow-up notice (Appendix G). For participants who preferred to complete a paper-based version of the questionnaire, the option of mailing or faxing it was made available.

**Data Collection.** Data collection was completed by February 20, 2001. The web-based questionnaire was formatted to allow automatic data compiling into text file and e-mailing individual coded responses for back-up purposes. All 112 department chairs were contacted via e-mail. Three persons preferred to complete a paper-based version of the questionnaire, and two requested the questionnaire to be sent by fax. A total of 71 responses representing Educational Leadership/Administration programs in 33 states were collected. One person refused to participate in the study. Data are summarized in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire Part</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
<th>Useable Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part 1 (Q. 1-17)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>71 (63%)</td>
<td>71 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple answer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 2 (Q. 18-21)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>71 (63%)</td>
<td>63 (56.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert-type: SA, A, D, SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part 3 (Q. 22-26)</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>71 (63%)</td>
<td>71 (63%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open-ended</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data Analysis and Findings**

The data were analyzed in February, 2002. Detailed findings in a tabular format are presented in Appendix H.
**Student categories.** All 71 Educational leadership programs use portfolio assessment for their on-campus students. About half of them (51%) also use portfolios with their distance learning students. Off-campus students, students at branch campuses, and students at regional sites also are required to prepare portfolios as a graduation requirement (28%).

**Years of portfolio use.** Regarding the length of time their portfolios are used as a graduation requirement in programs preparing educational leaders, it is evident that portfolios became popular in the past five years: 48 programs out of 71 (68%) started using portfolios in a period of 1997-2001. Nine programs (12%) started using portfolios even earlier, in a period of 1994-1996. Ten other programs (14%) have been using portfolios since 1993 and before.

**Assessment types in programs.** The questionnaire data for 71 programs revealed that the portfolio is not the only option that is used for a final assessment of graduating students: in 30 programs (42%), students are to pass comprehensive exams; in 24 programs (34%), students have an option of submitting thesis; and in 20 programs (28%), students also have to complete a research-based project, a paper suitable for a publication, a case study research, oral exam, a reflective research paper, or an action research paper.

**Portfolio format.** A paper-based format proved to be the most widely used portfolio format (65 programs or 92%). An electronic format option is offered in 25 programs (35%). However, many questionnaire participants mentioned that this option is either not used at all or used in isolated cases: “Electronic is an option but nobody selected that yet,” and “…but to date have only had 3 from about 40 in the last four years.” Several programs encourage students to accompany their paper-based portfolios with video tapes, photos, writing samples, GRE/GMAT scores, personality type indicators, leadership style questionnaires, peer assessment and group assessment reports, and other artifacts in an alternative format.

**Portfolio categories and content.** As for portfolio categories, 63 out of 71 programs (89%) use standards or competencies with artifacts to demonstrate their achievement and reflection pieces. The other most widely used category is practicum or internship projects and reflections (59 programs, 83%), followed by student personal section with vita or resume (53 programs, 75%). Five other categories are used with about the same rate: justification for selecting of each product (52%), leadership development plan (56%), student self-assessment of competencies (58%), simulation and/or other authentic project to solve a real educational
problem (58%), and introduction with an overview of a student portfolio (66%). Such categories as student program of study (38%), letters of recommendation (35%), and student transcript (20%) are used less often. Questionnaire participants also mentioned other portfolio categories: vision of a student’s ideal school, community involvement section, personal leadership platform including personal vision statement, mission statement and personal philosophy, assessment section with peer and group assessment reports, mentor assessment and internship supervisor assessment, and professional development section. Many programs organize their portfolios around their state (e.g., California, Alaska, Minnesota, and others) or national standards and competencies categories (NCATE and ISLLC).

**Areas addressed in portfolios.** Competencies in areas of parent and community relations (86%), curriculum and instruction (86%), and school law (80%) are among the most often addressed competencies in student portfolios, followed by such competency areas as diversity (77%), technology (77%), school finance (76%), political and regulatory environments (75%), human resources (73%), and ethics (73%). Areas of transformational leadership (68%), student assessment (66%), site-based management (61%), and student services (54%) are assessed in more than a half of the programs participating in the questionnaire. Portfolios in 32% of programs also address competencies in such areas as supervision, administrative principles and organizational theories, educational research, design and evaluation, management of organizational change, action research, and strategic problem solving.

**Portfolio features.** To assist their students in portfolio preparation, 87% of the programs present written guidelines to their students, 59% of the programs make mentors available to guide students in preparing portfolios, and 59% offer course or study groups to clarify portfolio preparation for graduating students. About 44% of the programs use an assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to students, and 39% use an assessment checklist given in advance to faculty members. One-third of the surveyed programs (31%) create a website or handbook where students can find answers to frequently asked portfolio questions. Peer review of portfolios is popular in 25% of the Educational Leadership/Administration programs that participated in the study. Several programs have other features: culminating exit interviews with peers, employers and faculty, faculty reviews, and assessment rubrics. One of the programs plans to initiate a review of portfolios by practitioners in the near future.
Key people in identification of portfolio artifacts. Students are responsible for determining what products to include in their portfolios in 68% of the programs (solely responsible in 18%, and together with their major professor in 13% of the programs). Faculty members in the program make decisions about portfolio content in 56% of the cases (solely responsible in 23%). Major professors are determining portfolio artifacts in 35% of the programs (solely in 4%). Graduate committee members and department chairs are equally involved in 10% of all surveyed programs. In about 32% of the surveyed programs two parties are involved, and in 15%, three or more parties are involved in the decision process about portfolio content. In several programs, the mentor principal or administrator, the internship supervisor, and members of Professional Education Advisory Board who provide oversight to certification programs are also involved in the determination of what products make up the student portfolios.

Portfolio defense. Students orally defend their portfolios in 54% of the programs. More than one-third of the programs (37%) do not require any formal portfolio defense. In other cases (7%), portfolios are presented at “checkpoints” across the program of study during which a major professor discusses progress with each student individually once each semester, as a part of a reflective seminar for all program students, as a part of a comprehensive exam, or as a one-on-one presentation in an exit interview. Graduate committee members and major professors are present at a student portfolio defense in 48% and 45% of the cases, respectively. In 21% of the programs, any faculty member can attend a portfolio presentation. In 8% of the programs, any student can attend a portfolio presentation. Potential employers attend portfolio presentations in 6% of the cases. In some programs, mentors and internship supervisors attend student presentations. Several participants mentioned that “technically everyone can attend” portfolio presentations, but they “have never been to one where anyone other than faculty and students actually did attend.”

Feedback on portfolios. Students receive feedback orally on their portfolios in 56% of the programs. Feedback in writing, either on a separate form attached to the portfolio or as comments within portfolios is given in 44% of the programs. Several other programs (14%) employ various practices: students are given feedback on both their portfolio and quality of their presentations; faculty use assessment sheets or forms not attached to the portfolio and summary letters; and some programs combine oral and written forms of feedback. In one of the programs,
feedback in writing is given only in cases when artifacts need to be replaced or if some of the components are missing.

**Evaluation strategies.** General practices (68%) include evaluating and grading of portfolios as a whole. Several programs (18%) actually evaluate and grade each competency separately. A small number of programs (7%) evaluate and grade each product in portfolio separately. Several programs use all three techniques: each product in the portfolio is evaluated and graded separately; each competency is evaluated and graded separately; and the portfolio is evaluated and graded as a whole. Many survey participants commented that they do not evaluate each product in a portfolio, because individual course instructors had already graded these artifacts.

**Portfolio grading.** The majority of programs (65%) assign pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory marks to portfolios. One-third of the programs (31%) use scoring rubrics. Other techniques include assigning letter grade equivalents (13%), grading on a scale from excellent to poor (10%), and calculating the grade in a percentage (8%). Several programs choose not to assign any grades.

**Self-assessment and portfolios.** In the majority of programs, students conduct self-assessment of competencies (91%): through written reflections enclosed in the portfolio (59%), through a self-assessment instrument that is a part of portfolio assessment (27%), and through other self-assessment practices (15%) including validation questionnaires, cross-standard reflections for each ISLLC standard, pre-assessment, and journals and peer-journals. Some programs combine self-assessment and reflection techniques.

**Various purposes of portfolio assessment.** Apart from a graduation requirement in surveyed programs, portfolios are used for various other purposes: evaluation of a practicum or internship (37%), assessment in individual courses (35%), program evaluation (35%), job placement or employment (31%), initial certification (13%), and admission to the program (11%).

Responses to questions dealing with portfolio strengths, weaknesses, facilitators, and barriers (questionnaire items 18-21, Appendix D) were informative. See Table 3.3 for a summary of descriptive statistics.
Strengths of portfolios. An analysis of portfolio strengths revealed the data to be generally consistent with the literature review and, overall, there was a positive response to portfolio assessment. All participants agreed (57% SA and 43% A) that portfolios allowed for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences. The majority, 87%, (31% SA and 56% A) supported the notion that portfolios are meaningful for various audiences. However, 13% of participating programs did not agree that portfolios are meaningful for all. Almost everybody (92%) agreed that portfolios were more powerful than single measures of student achievement. Several participants (8%) did not agree with the above statement. A total of 98% of department chairs provided a positive response (49% SA and 49% A) and supported the idea that portfolios were useful to view learning and development longitudinally. Interestingly, 2% of the participants strongly disagreed with the above statement, providing the only strongly disagreed opinion on 12 questions in the category of portfolio strengths. All respondents (60% SA and 40% A) believed that portfolios contained samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies. Almost 94% of the participants (40% SA and 54% A) accepted that portfolios develop student accountability and responsibility. The majority, 97% (46% SA and 51% A), agreed that portfolios developed student planning and organizational skills. Department chairs in 95% of the programs were certain (44% SA and 51% A) that portfolios facilitated student application of knowledge. The notion that portfolios fostered critical thinking in students was supported by 92% of the participants (35% SA and 57% A). All surveyed (46% SA and 54% A) agreed that portfolios helped students come to know themselves better. A total of 94% of the participants were of the opinion that portfolios increased student participation, independence, and self-direction and 98% believed that portfolios promoted student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis.

Comments regarding portfolio strengths were mainly positive. Some participants made the following comments: “1000 of our graduates have confirmed that the process of doing a portfolio helped them integrate their coursework and integrate their program in Educational Leadership with their life experiences in a meaningful way” and portfolios “allow longitudinal examination of programmatic indicators in delivery, methodology, sequencing of content, etc.” Some cautious participants indicated that “the portfolio likely only indicates how well the candidate presents him or herself in writing”; “It is a mixed bag. Poor students squeak by. Good
students use this as a way to show their skills and set themselves up for later application to administrative positions. As such, the portfolio gives the self-initiating student a platform to show their readiness for administration and gives mediocre students a chance to show their laziness although most still squeak by with a pass...eventually (with lots of tutoring and guidance for the underachieving students)”; “portfolios CAN do all the things noted above--They do NOT necessarily accomplish any of them, however”; and “all of above is dependent on the particular kind of portfolio and the degree of student control in determining content and organization.”

**Weaknesses of portfolios.** An analysis of portfolio weaknesses as perceived by department chairs revealed data mainly consistent with the literature review and showed that portfolio assessment, being a new phenomenon in programs preparing educational leaders and a new assessment technique in general, is still controversial and open for various interpretations. Thus, the participating department chairs did not come to agreement on the issue of portfolio reliability with almost equal numbers of those agreeing (52%) and disagreeing (48%) with the statement that portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability (9% SA, 43% A, 40% D, and 8% SD). Validity of portfolio assessment is also questioned by survey participants, 52% vs. 48%, thus proving the conflicting nature of portfolio assessment measurements (9% SA, 43% A, 46% D, and 2% SD).

People in favor of portfolios mentioned that “…in terms of validity, there is no doubt in my mind that our portfolio systems measures more specifically and broadly the state objectives required for Educational Leadership students than did the comprehensive exams of the past.” Despite reliability and validity problems, 67% of the department chairs (53% D and 14% SD) did not think that portfolio grades would be difficult to defend legally and 33% believed that this task would be difficult (5% SA and 28% A). Almost all participants (92%) agreed that portfolios were labor intensive for faculty to evaluate. A total of 63% of the participants believed that portfolios were consistent and 37% were sure that portfolios were inconsistent with current grading system in higher education. The majority (94%) believed that the statement about portfolios being not an accurate assessment of students' competencies was incorrect. Almost all participants (94%) disagreed with the notion that portfolios were not meaningful to different audiences. In the opinion of almost 71% of the department chairs, students lacked the experience of portfolio preparation. One department chair commented: “The problem is in helping students
build portfolios that truly assess learning versus ‘packing it’ with all they accomplished (Selecting best evidence).” Opinions on student submission of fraudulent work were divided almost equally: 46% agreed and 54% disagreed. One participant wrote: “Since university professors work closely with students in all aspects of their program including the portfolio documentation process, it is highly unlikely that anyone would submit fraudulent work.” The consensus was again reached that portfolios were too time consuming for students to compile and maintain: 91% of participating department chairs did not perceive it as such. One person commented: “They [portfolios] are not that time consuming if students have prepared from the start of their program to submit them. Our students talk with each other and they are getting better at preparing portfolios.” One survey participant mentioned that “…the value of portfolios is mere speculation at this time. It will take time to examine the quality of the portfolio and professional practice.”

**Support factors for portfolio assessment.** The following support factors (sorted by an agreement rate) were perceived to be of the most importance: (1) systematic and formal planning (100%); (2) availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students (98%); (3) availability of instructor's time (97%); (4) faculty commitment to the portfolio process (97%); (5) integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program (97%); (6) recognition and motivation of the involved faculty (97%), (7) administrative support (95%); (8) more detailed information about portfolios (94%); and (9) formal policy regarding portfolio assessment (92%).

Several participant noted that “even when information, training, policy, planning, reduced faculty loads and class sizes, and integration into instruction and evaluation is present, lack of commitment by senior faculty and support from administration impedes” and “Even with other factors present, faculty lack of commitment can/did damage the process.” More support factors were added to the given list: faculty commitment and coordination, equity in workload of faculty time to evaluate portfolios, and portfolios being tied to courses offered.

**Barriers to portfolio assessment.** Department chairs’ opinions on portfolio assessment barriers were of a less uniform agreement. Their agreement level varied: the majority of participants believed that lack of training for faculty (81%) and lack of training for students
(79%) were the most serious barriers; 74% of department chairs considered lack of faculty experience in grading/evaluating portfolios to be a significant barrier; 70% of survey participants agreed that lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment and faculty assumptions that portfolios were too time consuming to grade kept portfolio assessment from being an effective method for assessing students in their programs; 62% regarded resistance of faculty members to change as another barrier; and 57% deemed as a barrier faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness. Lack of administrative support (49%) and incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher education (46%) were also considered to be barriers. Faculty who fear portfolios as possible reflections of their grading practices and faculty who fear portfolios as possible reflections of their teaching ability were perceived as a lesser threat to the effectiveness of portfolio assessment implementation in the various programs (26% and 22%, respectively).

Table 3.3

*Department Chair Opinions Regarding Portfolio Strengths, Weaknesses, Facilitators and Barriers. Questionnaire Items 18-21, Appendix D*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 A. Allow for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 B. Are meaningful for all audiences (students, faculty, employers).</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 C. Are more powerful than single measures of student achievement.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 D. Are useful to view learning and development longitudinally.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 E. Contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies.</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 F. Develop student accountability and responsibility.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 G. Develop student planning and organizational skills.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 H. Facilitate student application of knowledge.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 I. Foster critical thinking in students.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 J. Help students come to know themselves better.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 K. Increase student participation, independence, and self-direction.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18 L. Promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 A. Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 B. Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 C. Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 D. Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 E. Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 F. Portfolios are not an accurate assessment of students’ competencies.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 G. Portfolios are not meaningful to students, faculty, and other audiences.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 H. Students lack the experience of portfolio preparation.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 I. Students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 J. Portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 A. Administrative support</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 B. Availability of instructor's time</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 C. Availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 D. Faculty commitment to the portfolio process</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 E. Formal policy regarding portfolio assessment</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 F. Integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 G. More detailed information about portfolios</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 H. Recognition and motivation of the involved faculty</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 I. Systematic and formal planning</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 A. Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their grading practices.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 B. Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their teaching ability.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 C. Faculty lack experience in grading/evaluating portfolios.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 D. Faculty members are resistant to change.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 E. Incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher education.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 F. Lack of administrative support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.3—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>SA %</th>
<th>A %</th>
<th>D %</th>
<th>SD %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21 G. Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 H. Lack of training for faculty.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 I. Lack of training for students.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 J. Faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 K. Faculty assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why portfolio assessment? Survey participants identified various needs that prompted their programs to move to portfolio assessment. It is worth mentioning that many programs implemented portfolio assessment to meet multiple needs. In an analysis of responses, all needs were grouped into eight categories:

1. An outside agency requirement.
3. Desire to use better assessment practices.
4. A need to facilitate and examine student learning.
5. Dissatisfaction with traditional assessment techniques.
6. A need to match assessment in graduate programs with current assessment practices at secondary schools.
7. Positive experience of others (individuals or programs).
8. Portfolio assessment being a fashion.

Need 1: An outside agency requirement was among the most frequently mentioned categories. At least 22 department chairs out of 71 shared that they had to implement portfolio assessment to meet state and national requirements for certification and accreditation:

“State-required capstone experience, accreditation-required portfolio.”

“It was a holistic approach to meeting the educational leadership standards promulgated by NCATE/ISLLC.”
“In an attempt to more closely follow ISLLC standards in both program/course planning and evaluation, incorporating portfolio evaluation with the comprehensive final examination seemed to be an appropriate way to validate our program's alignment with ISSLC standards.”

Need 2: Standard-based reform and movement toward performance-based program influenced at least 17 programs to redesign assessment practices and implement portfolios:

“Integration across courses horizontally (concurrent courses) and vertically (longitudinally).”

“Evidence of competence not just knowledge…”

“We wanted assessment based on standards and the portfolio produced this through evidence (artifacts, etc.).”

Need 3: Desire to use better assessment practices was named by at least 10 department chairs:

“Connecting theory and practice via authentic activities and authentic assessments”

“A need for more authentic assessment aligned to state standards.”

“Our department felt we were not incorporating current research and best practice in assessment into our program.”

Need 4: A need to facilitate and examine student learning and encourage reflection was named as the most significant by 13 survey participants:

“Importance of a capstone experience for the student. Opportunity to reflect and integrate the coursework for the degree. Link the coursework to the field of practice and recognized leadership competencies.”

“Student diversity and background experiences supported an assessment wherein a student could construct meaning from classes and an on-going practicum and demonstrate the knowledge and competencies gained relative to our program standards.”

“The need to have students reflect on course content at the end of the program—more than they might in preparing for an examination. The need to have them attempt to integrate theory and practice, and to personalize their knowledge.”

“A need to examine the student's development as a school leader in a more holistic manner.”

“To encourage students to reflect on what they had gained within the program.”
“Opportunity to integrate course experiences and require reflection.”

“They [portfolios] are educationally sound and help our students to become reflective, principled educators (which is what we are all about). No other form of assessment allows students and faculty to collaborate on meaningful, authentic professional development.”

**Need 5:** Dissatisfaction with traditional assessment techniques, grading system, and comprehensive examination was named as one of the most widespread reasons that influenced portfolio assessment by at least 12 survey participants:

“We felt the comprehensive exam was a task students completed and then threw away their notes or gave them to another student who was about to take the test. It did not indicate that your understood the skills needed to analyze a school and move in the right direction in the future.”

“… the need to make the "comprehensive examination" a more meaningful “exercise.”

“The feeling among faculty that traditional comprehensive exams were not effective in getting students to integrate their knowledge base and practical experiences. We have found that we more reliably score portfolios than we did with comprehensive exams.”

“…[Portfolios] made more sense as a measure of outcomes than tests and other items currently being used.”

“Comprehensive exams did not begin to assess what our students could or could not do.”

“Limitations of grading system.”

“We did not feel the typical paper that we required in the past was an authentic learning activity.”

“Our advisory committee to the program supported this method of assessment and it replaces the more traditional comprehensive exam in a masters program.”

**Need 6:** Eight programs in Educational Leadership/Administration indicated that they were motivated to implement portfolio assessment to match it with current assessment practices at schools:

“We ask students at all K-12 grade levels and new teachers coming from grad[uate] schools to have portfolios...therefore, it is logical that persons preparing to be principals and district administrators should have portfolios too.”
“Beginning principals must complete a portfolio based on the 6 ISLLC standards - our programs are aligned to the standards and it seemed a logical step to begin the portfolios in the program and continue through the first year of service.”

“Such portfolio assessment is coming to entry year principals and we feel our students have an advantage and are prepared to help their students move to that next stage.”

“We agreed that K-12 sector is moving to the use of portfolios, and this seemed a natural extension of this movement.”

“…and the faculty thought it would be helpful to students who were going into school settings where portfolios were used.”

“Employer desires.”

“Practitioner input.”

Need 7: Positive experience of others (individuals or programs) enhanced at least six programs’ motivation to initiate alternative assessment and start developing portfolios:

“… the [portfolio] system was already being successfully used in another one of our masters programs (instructional leadership).”

“One professor used portfolio assessment as the primary evaluative tool for one course, incorporating portfolio evaluation with the comprehensive final examination seemed to be an appropriate way to validate our program’s alignment with ISSLC standards.”

“Previous success in using portfolios in another department’s programs (in the School Business Administration Program).”

Need 8: Only one survey participant indicated that the program decided to move to portfolio assessment, as it was fashionable:

“It was fashionable -- a current practice -- considered a "best practice" -- our college tends to emphasize qualitative measures.”

Ways to improve portfolio assessment. Many department chairs were pleased with the way in which portfolio assessment was implemented in their programs: “We are very pleased with our portfolio assessment process. It has served the needs of students and faculty” and “We are pleased with it now. We can continue to raise the bar for quality content.” However, almost all survey participants had suggestions for improvement of portfolio assessment implementation processes in their programs. Nine categories of suggestions were identified, often interrelated
and overlapping, and they were ranked by frequency of occurrence. Thus, the areas for improvements were ranked as follows:

1. Student guidance and training.
2. Evaluation and grading of portfolios.
3. Program faculty commitment to portfolio assessment and collaboration.
4. Education and faculty training.
5. Allocation of time and resources for faculty.
6. Use of technology and development of electronic portfolios.
7. More information on portfolio assessment and wider acceptance of portfolios throughout programs and universities.
8. Continuous improvement of portfolio processes.
9. Alignment of portfolio assessment in individual Educational Leadership/Administration programs with requirements of the outside agencies.

Area 1: Improvements in area of student guidance and training were ranked as first. At least 22 survey participants indicated that more guidance in portfolio construction, content selection, standards and expectations, and reflection and self-assessment techniques would benefit students:

“More informational meetings for students regarding portfolio requirements.”
“Provide better orientation for students relative to construction of the portfolio and assessment of the final product.”
“We need to develop a skeleton for our reflective essay that insure basic requirements while allowing individual freedom of expression and demonstration of reflections. What we have found is when we become too prescriptive all portfolios and reflections look the same. Thus, we do not achieve higher level thinking and growth.”
“Students receiving more instruction on what constitutes reflective writing.”
“We continue to improve the handbook which contains information about the portfolio, and we continue to strengthen the intern seminars.”
“Additional workshops for students.”
“We have just redesigned our process by providing the students with more specificity about what is to be included, stressing the need to demonstrate integration of concepts.”
“Educate … students concerning portfolio.”
“More self-assessment and self-reflection.”
“Clear, widely disseminated student guidelines…Student training.”
“The faculty should give more time to the portfolio standards in their classes, advisors should give more time to helping students develop their portfolios.”
“Establish guidelines for amount/kind of artifacts placed in the portfolio.”
“Common standards for portfolio contents and assessment.”
“Clear, widely disseminated student guidelines.”
“Continue to work for consistency of expectations.”
“Coordinated peer support process.”
“Someone needs to design clearer guidelines and a more effective process.”

Other comments regarding students included the necessity for them to change their attitude toward portfolio assessment: “Some students don't take the experience seriously” and “…Students should take more time in developing their portfolios.”

**Area 2:** The necessity of improvements in the area of evaluation and grading of portfolios seem to be the most important for survey participants. Various suggestions were given by at least 20 department chairs to include creation and refinement of evaluation rubrics, establishment of review and evaluation criteria, standardization of grading procedures, and other:

“Continued improvement of rubric.”
“Better rubrics for the students and a scale for evaluators would help.”
“…The department should establish criteria (perhaps rubrics) for evaluating the portfolios, and the faculty should spend more time in evaluating the portfolios that are submitted.”
“Use of teams of faculty/students to assess, but logistically this is most difficult.”
“Our students would also benefit from additional written feedback on their work throughout the program, especially those dealing with developing reflective practice.”
“Improve evaluation techniques.”
“More interrater reliability work on rubrics to continually make sure students are being treated fairly by all.”
“There needs to be consensus regarding components, grading procedures, etc. among faculty who participate in portfolio assessment.”

“More explicit policy statement regarding portfolio format and review criteria.”

“Further conversation among faculty about the process and a greater commitment to thoughtful reflection about the portfolios. In some cases it has simply become a ritual---meet, talk and sign the approval form.”

“More explicit grading practices for faculty and for students.”

Area 3: Program faculty commitment to portfolio assessment and collaboration became the third category mentioned by at least 11 participants:

“Develop commitment in all faculty. Coordinate efforts and share responsibilities. View portfolios as integrated to program reform; not another add-on requirement.”

“Alignment and agreement with all faculty within and throughout the program.”

“…Faculty focus on how to help students develop their portfolio and enforced peer-review.”

“More motivated faculty!”

“Improve faculty collaboration.”

“…Real faculty commitment and a great deal of support in general on the campus.”

“Put more emphasis on it; coordinate efforts better; work to have the portfolio part of the capstone experience in practicum - to a more formalized degree.”

“Further conversation among faculty about the process and a greater commitment to thoughtful reflection about the portfolios. In some cases it has simply become a ritual---meet, talk and sign the approval form.”

“More faculty buy-in and involvement.”

Area 4: In line with the previous category, more education and faculty training became the fourth most frequently mentioned category. At least 8 department chairs mentioned the necessity of training for faculty as a means to more effective portfolio assessment:

“Educate faculty … concerning portfolio.”

“Would take education of new administration and close oversight of department to ensure compliance. Or a good house-cleaning.”
“More experience and uniform faculty focus on how to help students develop their portfolio and enforced peer-review.”

“Train the faculty.”

“Continue to train faculty so that they can do a better job of communicating effectively with their students. Provide examples over time.”

“More professional development activities for portfolio evaluators.”

**Area 5:** Allocation of time and resources for faculty also was mentioned by some survey participant as a necessary area in portfolio assessment improvement:

“It would help if at least two faculty members reviewed the final product. We have more than 100 students graduating from our program each year and have six full time faculty. Some of these faculty have released classes for other assignments or grants.”

“…And allocate work load within the course load, i.e., time to do a good job not available as an extra task.”

“Our program produces a large number of graduates. Spending so much time associated with program portfolios is extremely labor intensive for selected professors in our department.”

“Equalize workload for time to evaluate portfolios.”

“Faculty need TIME to think through strengths and problems with portfolio assessment.”

“Commitment of more human resources to manage and evaluate the portfolio process.”

Recognition for the time faculty members spend in the process of portfolio assessment was also mentioned.

**Area 6:** Several participants indicated that portfolio assessment could be greatly improved through the use of technology and development of electronic portfolios:

“More reliance on electronic rather than paper medium.”

“Make it [portfolio] electronic.”

“We are increasing our expectations regarding the electronic portfolio as a way to integrate evidence of technology.”

“We are just now moving to electronically submitted portfolios with good results. We will continue to develop in this area. A spin off of this has been increased attention to technology skills and knowledge on the part of our students.”
**Area 7:** A necessity of more information on portfolio assessment and wider acceptance of portfolios throughout programs and universities was also considered to be important among survey participants:

“We need to fully implement it throughout the university.”

“We need to have more dialogue with the staff and integrate the culminating portfolio into all of our classes.”

“Wide scale adoption and use to increase communication about improving the process.”

“…A great deal of support in general on campus.”

“Better communication with faculty and students about the strengths and value of portfolio assessment.”

“Develop more of a three way partnership between the student, faculty, and practicing administration.”

**Area 8:** Continuous improvement of the portfolio processes was a need mentioned by many survey participants:

“Plan...Do...Review/Evaluate and Design Improvements and continue the Total Quality Management and Development cycle. Our program gets better every year.”

“Continued evaluation and revision of procedures and assessments.”

**Area 9:** Alignment of portfolio assessment in individual Educational Leadership/Administration programs with requirements of the outside agencies is the next area for improvement:

“Stability in state requirements to allow us to develop and refine the product and the process.”

“More alignment with licensure standards.”

“We are aligning the courses with ISLLC Standards and the portfolios with the standards.”

“Organization of portfolios is central. Using ISLLC has helped but we still have too confusing of a program. I would just use ISLLCS categories and make students provide two documents for each category.”

“…More alignment with all coursework.”
The Phase II web-based portfolio assessment questionnaire distributed to department chairs and questionnaire responses became critical in finalizing study questions and selecting research sites for conducting case studies. Though being comprehensive and informative, the survey had several limitations.

**Limitation of the data set.** This data set is limited due to several constraints. First and foremost, the original documentation about the exact number of Educational Leadership/Administration programs offering master’s degree was unavailable. The list of 504 programs was compiled on the basis of three sources: the official Educational Administration directory (Lane, 1999), an Educational Leadership programs website list (McLeod, 2001), and UCEA membership directory (UCEA, 2001). Initially, the survey was e-mailed to 504 programs. The list of 112 programs was derived out of 377 programs that replied to the initial survey (response rate of 75%) and, therefore, is limited only to this population. In addition, the purposive sampling design limits the analysis of those programs not known to employ portfolio assessment.

Out of 112 programs, 71 participated in a web-based questionnaire representing 33 states. The response rate of 63%, being acceptable, still can be considered a constraining factor. Higher response rates and involvement of Educational Leadership/Administration from all the states would increase the likelihood that the information collected was representative of the population.

**Selection of Sites for an In-depth Study (Phase III)**

To strengthen the interpretation of questionnaire results, I decided to carry out further study. Questionnaire data provided a rich non-random sampling frame for selecting particular types of respondents for depth interviews and surveys. It was particularly complicated to select Educational Leadership/Administration programs for an in-depth study of portfolio assessment due to a relatively large number of potential candidates (71) and an abundance of data collected in Phase II revealing factual information, describing and characterizing each program, and presenting portfolio assessment issues. At the same time, availability of data and their analysis allowed more focused approaches to selecting the relevant sites. One of the important considerations was determining a sufficient number of sites to obtain data to answer research questions, yet, on a practical level, to have a realistic number of sites to handle.
The focused and purposeful selection of multiple sites was part of the initial design. According to Hakim (2000), “focused sampling involves *knowing* and *intentional* selectivity” (p. 172, italics in original). Data received as a result of the Phase II web-based questionnaire became a foundation for establishing criteria for selecting participants for further studies and clarifying methods of data collection. The following six criteria were established for research sites selection:

1. Presence of unique features in portfolio assessment.
2. Number of years portfolios were used in the programs.
5. Adoption of ISSLC Standards.
6. Carnegie Foundation classification of higher education institutions

The first selection criterion was that every potential candidate had to demonstrate the presence of some unique features in portfolio assessment. The list of eight features was incorporated into the web-based questionnaire of Phase II (Appendix D, item 9). All responses to this questionnaire item were calculated and recorded in a descending order to facilitate a selection. To proceed with selection of sites for an in-depth study, I determined and grouped programs that possessed the largest number of unique features and listed them in descending order with eight as a maximum number of features; programs possessing less than three features were not included in the list for further selection.

I also considered several other unique features, such as a recognition as being an exceptional and innovative Educational Leadership/Administration preparation program as selected by Jackson and Kelley (2002) for the National Commission for the Advancement of Educational Leadership Preparation and supported by UCEA and NPBEA: one out of four selected programs was named as exceptional and innovative based on their academic focus, application process, selection criteria, structure and delivery of courses, internship, staffing, assessment, and program effects. Another unique feature included participation of a program in ISSLC activities such as a field test for a School Leader’s Portfolio (SLP) assessment: two states out of the selected four, participated in the field test and were among five funding states.
Besides, one of the selected states required the use of the SLP for permanent licensure of school leaders (K. Hessel, personal e-mail communication, May 24, 2002; CCSSO, 2000b).

The second criterion was that the cases would cover maximum variation among programs. Thus, it was decided that differentiating participants by the number of years that portfolios were used as a graduation requirement would allow obtaining maximum differences of perception about a topic among study participants. As a result of these considerations, I sought four cases. All had to have some unique portfolio assessment features as determined by the questionnaire in Phase II of the research. Two programs would belong to the group of novices, those implementing portfolios for less than five years, in a period of 1998-2003 (total of 39 programs), and two programs would come from a group of those using portfolios for more than five years (total of 32 programs). Both groups had approximately the same number of candidates.

To identify two relevant programs in each group, I cross-referenced a list of programs by a number of unique features with a list of programs by years of portfolio experience. In many cases when a number of candidates exceeded the determined quota, I had to employ six other criteria to select four programs for an in-depth study:

The third criterion involved the presence of faculty expertise in portfolio assessment as manifested through their publications on the topic under study: faculty members in two programs out of four had published on portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders.

The forth criterion included the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) membership as a preferred factor: all four identified programs are ISLLC members (CCSSO, 2000b).

The fifth criterion was the adoption of ISLLC Standards: out of four selected states three adopted the Standards and one reported a close correlation to the Standards (CCSSO, 2000b).

The sixth criterion included a classification of higher education institutions as conducted by the Carnegie Foundation according to their degree-granting activity (Carnegie Foundation, 2000). Out of four programs, one was categorized as a doctoral/research university—extensive, i.e., this university offered a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and is committed to graduate education through the doctorate. During the period studied, it awarded 50 or more doctoral degrees per year across at least 15 disciplines. Another selected university was classified as a doctoral/research university—intensive, i.e., it offered a wide range of baccalaureate programs,
and was also committed to graduate education through the doctorate. During the period studied, it awarded at least ten doctoral degrees per year across three or more disciplines, or at least 20 doctoral degrees per year overall. And two universities belonged to a group of master’s colleges and universities I: they offered a wide range of baccalaureate programs, and they were committed to graduate education through the master’s degree. During the period studied, they awarded 40 or more master’s degrees per year across three or more disciplines. The rationale for considering this criterion was to select programs representing various categories as determined by the Carnegie Foundation (2000).

In several instances, programs had to be excluded from the list as the latter already contained a representative from the same state. Selecting more than one program from one state became a restricting criterion. Together, the four cases would have to cover some distribution of different geographic locations, number of students enrolled in programs, number of master’s graduates completing the portfolio as a graduation requirement, portfolio formats, components, Educational Leadership/Administration areas, and portfolio evaluation features. Thus, the four selected programs shared the following characteristics: all were selected on a basis of data collected in Phase II; all were selected by the same set of criteria; and all possessed some unique characteristics that were appropriate for further research and in-depth study. At the same time, selected programs varied in a number of characteristics: they represented four different states; their portfolio assessment experience varied from one to eight years; three out of four programs required portfolios for both on-campus and distance learning students; programs varied in enrollment; they graduated a various number of students; and employed different practices of portfolio assessments regarding portfolio content, assessed competencies, and portfolio evaluation. Attitudes of department chairs towards portfolio assessment strengths, weaknesses, barriers, and facilitating factors in the four selected programs also presented a diverse combination of opinions. More details about each program and portfolio assessment specifics will be given in a forthcoming chapter.

**Methods of Data Collection**

The uniqueness of qualitative research is in its incorporation of multiple methods of data collection. The aim of this qualitative survey research was to study in depth some of the results which have been obtained in the web-based questionnaire in Phase II, but the aim was also to
bring about some new perspectives and review them as they were perceived by selected study participants. Although the qualitative method chosen here was not a real case study in the traditional sense (Yin, 1993, 1994), but a series of qualitative questionnaires, interviews, and analysis of documents, integrative approaches and inspiration have been sought in the methodical approach used in connection with multiple case studies. According to Tellis (1997), no single source of data has an absolute advantage over the others. It is recommended that researchers use as many sources of evidence as are relevant and applicable to the study. An in-depth study of each program integrated the following:

1. Department chair/program coordinator interview (Appendix I).
2. Faculty questionnaire (Appendix J).
3. Faculty interviews (Appendix K).
4. Student questionnaire (Appendix L).
5. Student interviews (Appendix M).
6. Analysis of documents and records, when available.

Interviews

Interviewing is one of the most widely used methods in qualitative research. It is highly flexible, it can be used almost anywhere, and is capable of producing data of great depth. The goals of any interview are to see the research topic from the perspective of interviewees, and to understand how and why they come to have this particular perspective (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997; Rea & Parker, 1997; Trochim, 2002). In this particular study, interviews were conducted (1) to sharpen the understanding of the meaning of the phenomenon of portfolio assessment to the study participants, (2) to study the perceptions of department chairs, faculty members, and students of the portfolio processes, (3) to collect individual accounts on how portfolios were developed, (4) and to gain insights into interesting or unexpected findings, clarify particular statements, and illustrate the meaning of findings in conducted questionnaires.

All interviews had a semi-structured format. According to Gillham (2000), semi-structured interviews are “better for honing in on a particular topic also picking up specific ways of phrasing topics and questions” (p. 20). I prepared an interview guide (Patton, 1990) or potential interview questions to ensure coverage of the basic points and issues. Although similar questions were asked of participants in each group (department chairs, faculty, and students), the
interviewer was free “to respond to the situation in hand, to the emerging worldview of the respondent, and to the new ideas on the topic” (Merriam, 1998, p. 74). This format represented an effective means to elicit participant responses to preplanned questions and gain emerging insights from open-ended discussions.

I compiled a list of faculty names using departmental websites and contacted each department chair with the request to verify the list and identify full-time faculty members and their contact information. I also asked department chairs and individual faculty members to identify graduating students who prepared their portfolios as part of the program requirement. All faculty members and students were sent e-mails with an attached form with questions regarding availability for the interview, convenient date and time, contact telephone number, and authorization for audio/video taping (Appendix N). These data were used for preparing for and scheduling the interviews. Preparation activities for the interviews included reviewing the survey and identifying areas of particular interest or issues for clarification (Appendix O).

All but three interviews were conducted by phone. Three interviews were conducted via the videoconferencing technology Voice Over IP with a Polycom ViewStation H.323. (Polycom, 2003). With permission of participants, all but two interviews were audio recorded and two video interviews were video recorded to ensure the accuracy of data transcriptions and analysis. Each interview lasted approximately 45 minutes. After interviews, I thanked all participants in writing. Upon their request, written transcripts were also made available.

All interviews were transcribed and stored electronically for easier access, processing, and analysis. All interviews were also printed. The advantage of having the interviews in hard copy was that I could refer to them very quickly, make notes in the margins, study the text and reduce it as needed, re-organize interviews for analysis, and make coding notations in the margins.

**Department Chair/Program Coordinator Interviews**

Three department chairs and one program coordinator, as recommended by the department chair who participated in the Phase II web-based questionnaire from selected programs. Four people were interviewed in this category. Interview data were used to follow-up on a web-based questionnaire and to clarify some issues of portfolio assessment. Identified
individuals were interviewed to collect information primarily on portfolio implementation issues, facilitators, and inhibitors. Interview questions are outlined in Appendix I.

I contacted department chairs of the four selected programs, thanked them for participation in the previous survey, described interview procedures, explained confidentiality issues, and requested their participation in the interview. Department chairs were asked to fill out the form and provide information on how they preferred to be contacted, what date and time, and also to acknowledge their agreement to be tape-recorded (Appendix N). Interviews were scheduled at participants’ convenience and lasted from 30 to 45 minutes. Interviews were transcribed within a week of completion. Three interviews were conducted with department chairs and one interview with a program coordinator. All interviews were coded to ensure participants’ confidentiality.

Faculty Interviews

At least two full-time faculty members working with master’s level students and involved in portfolio assessment from each identified program were interviewed. A total of 13 faculty members were interviewed throughout this study. Interview data were used to follow-up faculty questionnaires, to clarify some issues, and collect additional data on portfolio assessment, its implementation, strengths and weakness, barriers and facilitators as perceived by faculty members. Interview questions are presented in Appendix K.

Faculty members who had participated in the on-line survey were contacted via e-mail that described interview procedures, explained confidentiality issues, and requested their participation in the interview. Faculty members were asked to fill out the form and provide information on how they preferred to be contacted, what date and time, and also to acknowledge their agreement to be tape-recorded (Appendix N). Interviews were scheduled at participants’ convenience and lasted from 30 to 45 minutes. Interviews were transcribed within a week of completion. A total of 13 faculty interviews were conducted. All interviews were coded to ensure participants’ confidentiality.

Student Interviews

At least three students from each identified program who had participated in on-line survey were interviewed. Participants were selected either as recommended by faculty or based on the student questionnaire results as identified by the researcher. Students were either in their
last semester and actively involved in portfolio development as a graduation requirement or graduated from the program after completing portfolios within the last year. Interview questions are introduced in Appendix M.

Interviews were conducted to verify some information and collect additional data on portfolio assessment as perceived by students. At least three students from each program were contacted and asked to participate in the interview process. Similar to department chairs and faculty members, students filled out a form (Appendix N) to confirm their availability, provide contact information, and state an agreement to be tape-recorded during an interview. Interviews were conducted at participants’ convenience and lasted from 30 to 45 minutes. Student interviews were transcribed within a week of completion. A total of nine student interviews were conducted. All interviews were coded to ensure participants’ confidentiality.

Other interviews

Two conducted interviews were not originally planned. However, in a course of study it became apparent that additional information might be helpful in answering research questions. Also, several department chairs and faculty members referred me to people who were instrumental in implementing portfolio assessment in their programs but were not members of the respective departments. Thus, a school district superintendent and a supervisor of one of the offices of the state department of education, were interviewed additionally. Those interviews provided more details and insights on portfolio assessment and promoted further collection of data through manuals, guidelines, and regulations pertained to portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders.

Questionnaires

According to Sheatsley (1983), any questionnaire should meet the objectives of the research, obtain the most accurate and complete information, and accomplish this within the limits of available time and resources. The questionnaire to survey faculty and students in the identified programs were similar in structure and layout to the department chair questionnaire on portfolio assessment used in the Phase II of this research. However, factual information about general portfolio description in the program was omitted. Instead, the major focus was on what faculty and students perceive should be involved in the portfolio assessment and how portfolio assessment can be improved.
Both faculty and student questionnaires were formatted and made available in paper and web-based formats to accommodate participants. The student questionnaire was piloted with a group of students in the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Studies at the Florida State University to check for clarity, consistency, comprehensiveness, and logical content validity. Several trial participants were debriefed. Suggestions for improvement were incorporated into the final version of the questionnaires.

**Faculty Questionnaire**

All full-time faculty members teaching master’s level students and involved in portfolio assessment from each identified program were invited to participate in the survey. The questionnaire (Appendix J) was employed to collect data on faculty perceptions of portfolio assessment and implementation. Faculty questionnaires consisted of 11 multiple-choice questions, which required participants to select answers from already predetermined options, four questions of a Likert-type four-point scale with options ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, and 3 free response open-ended questions. Faculty members also provided information about their teaching experience and years of their involvement in portfolio experience. Participants in addition, had an opportunity to include their comments in a specially formatted field after each question. The questionnaire was formatted for both paper-based and web formats. The web-based questionnaire was hosted on the server of the Florida State University Academic Computing and Network Services. All coded responses were automatically aggregated in text files and also e-mailed to me for back-up purposes.

A list of full-time faculty members and their contact information was obtained from the departmental websites and confirmed by department chairs. Faculty members were invited to participate in the study with an introductory letter explaining questionnaire purposes, format, and procedures (Appendix J). All confidentiality issues were observed by assigning each participant a three-digit identification code. Upon each faculty member’s agreement, the questionnaire was made available in the format preferred by each person. Only two faculty members opted for a traditional paper-based format. All other questionnaires were submitted on-line. Non-respondents were contacted with a follow-up letter (Appendix P). A total of 21 faculty questionnaires were collected. All survey participants received a letter of appreciation upon completion of the survey.
Student Questionnaire

All students involved in portfolio development from each identified program were invited to participate in the survey. Participants were identified as recommended by a department chair based on a current enrollment. The majority of students were registered to graduate in the semester the survey was planned for and were actively involved in portfolio development as a graduation requirement. Several students graduated from a program within the past two semesters. The number of student participants from each program varied based on enrollment and ranged from 4 to 13. The questionnaire was completed to collect data on student perceptions of portfolio assessment in their programs (Appendix L).

Student questionnaires consisted of 11 multiple-choice questions, which required participants to select answers from already predetermined options, four questions of a Likert-type four-point scale with options ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree, and two free response open-ended questions. Students also provided demographic information regarding their age, gender, status in the program, years in the program, years of teaching and administrative experience. The questionnaire was formatted for both paper-based and web formats. I contacted students via e-mail and invited them to participate in the study with introductory information explaining questionnaire purposes, format, and procedures (Appendix L). All confidentiality issues were observed by assigning each participant a three-digit identification code. All students decided to complete an on-line version of the questionnaire. Non-respondents were contacted with a follow-up letter (Appendix P). A total of 32 student questionnaires were collected. All survey participants received a letter of appreciation upon completion of the survey.

Documents, Records, and Artifacts Collection

The third major data collection technique used in this study was an analysis of documents, records, and artifacts. Broadly defined, document analysis pertains to the processing and understanding of the contents in the documents, be they in the form of papers, microfilms, faxes, web pages, or e-mails. McMillan and Schumacher (1997) defined this technique as “a noninteractive strategy …with little or no reciprocity between the researcher and the participant” (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 455). Collected documents included student guidelines for
portfolio completion, rubrics for faculty to evaluate portfolio, memos to students regarding portfolios, and portfolios themselves.

Department chairs, faculty, and students in the identified four programs were asked to submit any documentation relevant to portfolio assessment in their program. The purpose of content analysis was to develop a better understanding of portfolio assessment issues in identified programs through review and analysis of authentic artifacts. I asked participants to present certain records and documents pertaining to portfolio assessment in their programs. Documents and records were received by mail, fax, and electronically. Some of the documents were available on departmental webpages. I was able to collect the following documents: six student portfolios, three assessment rubrics, and four portfolio completion guidelines. Confidentiality issues applicable to handling, processing, storing, and destroying all documents were observed.

**Methods of Data Analysis**

Miles and Huberman (1994) defined qualitative data analysis as consisting of a concurrent flow of activities: data reduction (i.e., the processes of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting and transforming data from notes and transcriptions), data display, (e.g., through extended text and conclusion drawing) and verification. A unique feature of most qualitative studies is that the data collection and its analysis are concurrent. Analysis of collected data will be on-going. I collected and analyzed data according to the principles of qualitative research methodology (Merriam, 1988; Yin, 1984). Bogdan and Biklen defined qualitative data analysis as "working with data, organizing it, breaking it into manageable units, synthesizing it, searching for patterns, discovering what is important and what is to be learned, and deciding what you will tell others" (1982, p. 145). Data collected for this study included questionnaire results, interview transcripts, and samples and analysis of documents. The analysis relied on all the relevant evidence, included rival interpretations, and addressed the most significant aspects of the study (Yin, 1994). All questionnaires were analyzed using three techniques: (1) qualitative content analysis of open-ended responses, (2) basic descriptive statistics through reporting of percentages and frequencies, and (3) independent samples t-test to compare mean responses of faculty and student perceptions of portfolio assessment strengths, weaknesses, facilitating
factors, and barriers (items 12-15). Though the major part of data analysis was qualitative, there were some elements of quantitative analysis as pertains to questionnaire data.

**Quantitative Analysis of Questionnaires**

A part of the questionnaire data collected from department chairs, faculty, and students was analyzed using quantitative techniques (items 1-11 in the Faculty Questionnaire, Appendix J and the Student Questionnaire, Appendix L). Questionnaire responses were analyzed via frequencies and are reported in terms of percentage, using descriptive statistics. Tables were constructed to facilitate data analysis, interpretation, and presentation.

Data used in addressing faculty and student perceptions of portfolio assessment strengths, weaknesses, facilitating factors, and barriers (research questions 9 and 10), were derived from items 12-15 of both questionnaires. For these research questions, the differences in the means of faculty and student perceptions were assessed using a $t$-test. I was able to conclude that a significant difference existed between two sample means if $p < .05$ at the .05 level. As an additional measure to check for accuracy of these conclusions, confidence intervals of $t$ values were examined. Detecting that “0” does not fall within the confidence interval confirmed the decision of significant difference between the two means. At the final stage of analysis, faculty and student responses from two different groups, those using portfolios for less than five years and those using portfolios for longer than five years, were compared to determine whether there were any differences in perceptions of strengths, weaknesses, facilitating factors, and barriers of portfolio assessment between these two groups consisting of programs A and B (group 1) and programs C and D (group 2). Descriptive statistics using frequencies and percentages were also used to analyze data pertaining to perceptions of faculty and students regarding strengths, weaknesses, facilitating factors, and barriers of portfolio assessment. The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS 10, 2003) was used to assist in analyzing all quantitative data.

**Qualitative Analysis**

The qualitative analysis of questionnaire items, transcribed interviews, and data coded during content analysis of records and documents was initially analyzed as soon as transcriptions become available. Periodic review of all collected data, followed by the summary construction and formulations of yet to be answered questions, was done every two to three weeks throughout the study.
**Analysis of interviews.** The primary data of interviews were verbatim accounts of the tape-recorded interview sessions. All but two interview participants agreed to be recorded to ensure completeness of the verbal interaction that allowed me to collect materials for potential reliability checks (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997). Interview tapes were transcribed and handwritten notes were completed and typed after the interview. A final form of interview data presented accurate verbatim data and notations of nonverbal communication. All interview notes were condensed, interpreted, and analyzed to organize similar points into categories. To establish quality control of data, I also wrote “interview elaborations” (McMillan & Schumacher, 1997, p. 454) of each interview session to record my reflections, interviewee’s reactions, and any other additional information. In the final phase of data analysis, each interview was reread to check for the accuracy of the interview summary and inclusion of appropriate citations. Interviewees had a chance to reread interview data to ensure accuracy of interpretation. One of the participants requested a copy of the transcript and that was duly provided to him. Finally, the interview data was reviewed to triangulate with evidence from other data sources (questionnaires, documents, etc.).

**Analysis of questionnaires.** A qualitative analysis of questionnaires involved content analysis of two open-ended questions where no predetermined answers were given (Faculty Questionnaire, Appendix J, items 16-18 and Student Questionnaire, Appendix L, items 16-17). All answers were subjected to content analysis through the identifying categories they seemed to fall into. Responses in each category were described, interpreted, and analyzed. Demographic characteristics of student participants were also derived from the questionnaire (items 18-25).

**Analysis of documents, records, and artifacts.** According to Merriam (1988), the process of document and record analysis “involves the simultaneous coding of raw data and constructing categories that capture relevant characteristics of the document’s content” (p. 117). According to this author, document data and analysis differ from those of interviews in several ways: (1) documents are not produced specifically for research purposes, (2) documents might not fit the same categories or concepts constructed by a researcher for interviews or observations, and (3) authenticity of documents might be difficult to determine. Document analysis “helps the inquirer to maintain interest in the context and helps to ensure that research is not removed from its social, historical, and political frame of reference” (Guba & Lincoln, 1981, p. 234).
Document analysis generally involves more emphasis on the content and includes four major characteristics: (1) it is a rule-guided, repeatable process; the researcher should follow an explicitly stated procedure; (2) it is a systematic process in which the same rules are applied in the same way to each piece of data; (3) content fragments should be constantly compared by the researcher aiming for theoretical relevance; (4) document analysis should be confined to the content of the document before assumptions about values, attitudes, and motives are proposed (Guba & Lincoln, 1981). Yin (1994) summarized the following strengths of document analysis: stability and opportunity for repeated reviews, unobtrusiveness, and broad coverage over extended time span. At the same time, weaknesses included low retrievability, biased selectivity, reporting bias of a document author, and possibility of blocked access.

During the analysis of documents, records, and artifacts, it was important to identify who used them, how they were used, and for which purposes. The initial analysis of documents was conducted in accordance with guidelines of the National Archives and Records Administration (1998) by completing an analysis form for written documents (Appendix Q). Authenticity and accuracy of documents were determined to identify their meaning. In final phases, I corroborated findings of document analysis with interview data and questionnaire data when applicable. It was critical that the collected, processed, and analyzed data, findings, and conclusions meet requirements of rigorous research.

**Advantages of Proposed Methodology**

Multiple sources of data were explored to accumulate the necessary empirical data. As noted before, the important aspect of data collection is the use of multiple sources of evidence. I collected mainly qualitative data from a variety of sources: questionnaires, interviews with department chairs, faculty, and students, documents and records, on-line documents, electronic data, and physical artifacts. Responses to some items in the questionnaires provided quantitative data. The use of mixed methods was likely to increase the quality of final results and provide a more comprehensive understanding of analyzed phenomena. Thus, quantitative methods were used to embellish a primarily qualitative study. Reasons for using mixed methodology were (1) to gain a deep understanding of what had been occurring during a portfolio-based assessment implementation process; (2) to draw conclusions based on several different sources of
information; (3) to generate data rich in detail, embedded in context, and supported by various evidence types.

Among the purposes for mixed-method research design, Green et al. (1989) highlighted five major purposes that might enhance the inquiry through: (a) triangulation, where the consistency of findings obtained through different instruments is tested; (b) complementarity, when results from one method are clarified and illustrated with the use of another method providing an enriched and elaborated description of phenomenon under study; (c) development, as results from one method shape subsequent methods or steps in the research process; (d) initiation and stimulation of new research questions or results obtained through one method, and (e) expansion, by providing richness and detail to the study exploring different inquiry components through specific features of each method. In summary, the combination of different methodologies focuses on their relevant strengths. The researcher should aim to achieve the situation where “blending qualitative and quantitative methods of research can produce a final product which can highlight the significant contributions of both” (Nau, 1995) and produce better results in terms of quality and scope. Data collection strategies correlated with research questions are summarized in Table 3.4.

Table 3.4

Research Questions and Data Collection Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Data collection strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Portfolio assessment initiation</td>
<td>1.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. What needs in the program prompted initiation of portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement in a program?</td>
<td>1.2 Department chair interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Faculty questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Analysis of documents, e.g., minutes of meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. What is the purpose of the portfolio assessment in the program?</td>
<td>2.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Department chair interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Faculty questionnaire</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Data collection strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. Portfolio assessment implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How has summative portfolio-based assessment been implemented at the master's level? What were the major strategies, key players, significant stages, components of the implementation process, and unique features?</td>
<td>2.4 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Student interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are the skills, abilities, and educational leadership competencies faculty members expect graduate students to demonstrate in their graduation portfolios?</td>
<td>3.1 Department chair interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Analysis of documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the structural components of portfolios (content) used for final demonstration of knowledge and competencies in programs in Educational Leadership/Administration? What is the rationale for those content categories?</td>
<td>4.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Student interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.3 Analysis of documents, e.g., list of competencies, state and national standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. How has summative portfolio-based assessment been implemented at the master’s level? What were the major strategies, key players, significant stages, components of the implementation process, and unique features?</td>
<td>5.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Analysis of documents, e.g., guidelines, rubrics, portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. What are the skills, abilities, and educational leadership competencies faculty members expect graduate students to demonstrate in their graduation portfolios?</td>
<td>5.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Analysis of documents, e.g., guidelines, rubrics, portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What are the structural components of portfolios (content) used for final demonstration of knowledge and competencies in programs in Educational Leadership/Administration? What is the rationale for those content categories?</td>
<td>5.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Student interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3.4—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research questions</th>
<th>Data collection strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership/Administration? What is the rationale for those content categories?</td>
<td>5.3 Analysis of documents, e.g., guidelines, rubrics, portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How are the portfolios evaluated?</td>
<td>6.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 Student interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 Analysis of documents, e.g., checklists, rubrics, feedback forms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. What lessons were learned by people involved in the implementation process?</td>
<td>7.1 Department chair interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.3 Analysis of documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Perceptions of students and faculty towards portfolio assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. What is the definition and meaning of &quot;portfolio assessment&quot; as given by (a)</td>
<td>8.1 Department chair interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faculty and (b) students completed their portfolios?</td>
<td>8.2 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8.3 Student interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What are perceived strengths and weaknesses of the portfolio-based assessment</td>
<td>9.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>as defined by program faculty? By students?</td>
<td>9.2 Department chair interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3 Faculty questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.4 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.5 Student questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6 Student interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What are facilitators and barriers in the portfolio assessment implementation</td>
<td>10.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>process, as perceived by faculty?</td>
<td>10.2 Department chair interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3 Faculty questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.4 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.5 Student questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. What do students and program faculty perceive to be needed improvements in the</td>
<td>11.1 Department chair web-based questionnaire (Phase II)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>implementation of portfolio-based assessment in Educational Leadership/</td>
<td>11.2 Department chair interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration programs?</td>
<td>11.3 Faculty questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.4 Faculty interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.5 Student questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.6 Student interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.7 Analysis of records and documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality Control

There is no uniformly agreed upon set of “goodness of research” criteria for qualitative studies. Miles and Huberman (1994) paired traditional and emerging terms to produce five main criteria, often overlapping, in the area of a rigorous qualitative research:

(1) objectivity/confirmability, (2) reliability/dependability/auditability; (3) internal validity/credibility/authenticity; (4) external validity/transferability/fittingness; and (5) utilization/application/action.

An objectivity/confirmability criterion deals with “external reliability” and emphases replicability of study by other researchers (p. 278). Certain tactics were used to insure this quality: describing explicitly and in detail general methods and procedures of a study to allow following the actual sequence of how data were collected, processed, transformed, and displayed; designing and following a study protocol, linking conclusions to displayed data; recognizing and controlling for any researcher bias; and retaining the study data for reanalysis.

A criterion of reliability/dependability/auditability highlights the importance of a research process to be consistent and stable over time, researchers, and methods. The following tactics were used to follow this guideline: designing a study in congruence with clearly stated research questions; checking whether findings are meaningful and parallel across various data sources; collecting data in appropriate settings suggested by the research questions; checking the quality of data for bias and informant “knowledgeability” (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 278); and conducting peer or colleague reviews.

A criterion of internal validity/credibility/authenticity stresses the accuracy and value of interpretations that can be achieved through providing context-rich and meaningful descriptions; triangulating among various methods and data sources and explaining any inconsistencies; seeking for and explaining any negative evidence; establishing a chain of evidence by highlighting links between the questions asked, the data collected, and the conclusions drawn; and checking with key informants (department chairs, faculty, and students) on the accuracy of conclusions.

A criterion of external validity/transferability/fittingness emphasizes generalizability of findings. Following Miler and Huberman analysis (1994), the following tactics were instrumental in insuring this criterion: describing in detail the study participants, the settings, the
processes to allow adequate comparisons with other samples; discussing the limiting effects of data and findings; suggesting settings where the findings could be tested further; and assessing whether the study “replication efforts could be mounted easily” (p. 279).

An utilization/application/action criterion highlights the usefulness of research to both a researcher and study participants. The following actions helped me comply with this guideline: making findings intellectually and physically accessible to potential users; indicating and stimulating implications for further research and actions; and adding to the “usable knowledge” in the field of study (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 280). Department chairs and faculty members participated in the study requested a copy of the findings, summary of coded data for their respective programs, urged publishing study findings in professional journals, and participating in conferences.

**Human as Instrument**

Lincoln and Guba (1985) stated that the instrument of choice in naturalistic inquiry is the human being who has an advantage of being able to interact with the situation, be responsive to environmental clues, provide immediate feedback, and request verification of data. According to Hoepfl (1997), the human instrument can collect information at multiple levels simultaneously, explore atypical or unexpected responses, and process data as they become available. Due to an extensive preparatory work, I was prepared to ask good questions and interpret the answers; was able to be a good listener not misleading by my preconceptions; was adaptive and flexible to newly evolved opportunities and situation; and was unbiased and did not hold any preconceive notions. I was honest to admit any biases that set limitations to the study. All findings were reported openly and honestly. Having background preparation in research design, program evaluation, instructional systems design, survey and instrument development, and other research areas, I prepared myself for this specific study by reviewing relevant literature and various resources pertaining to the field of study. An analysis of the literature also continued during all stages of the study to enhance the understanding of events.

**Ethical Issues**

I do not foresee that my study would harm students or faculty. There were no psychological or moral implications for the participants. Any deception was avoided. I was honest about the intended use of the research and informed study participants about all
procedures. All participants in the study were assured that anonymity and confidentiality of their responses were guaranteed. Data about participants of the study were coded to ensure confidentiality. Personal information was available only to the researcher. All findings are presented in the next chapter.
 CHAPTER 4  
DATA ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS  

The purpose of the study was to investigate the process of portfolio assessment in educational leadership programs at the master’s degree level and add to the knowledge base of portfolio assessment practices in the field of educational administration. Since the focus of this study was portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement in programs preparing educational leaders and, specifically, portfolio initiation in the programs, its implementation, and perceptions of portfolios by faculty and students, the study required primarily qualitative methods to gain insights into the context of portfolio assessment at each of the four selected programs. Programs A and B have been using portfolio assessment for more than five years and Programs C and D have been using portfolios for a shorter period of time. This chapter focuses on the analysis of the data generated from the responses of Programs A, B, C, and D faculty and students to the questionnaires, their interviews, and the content analysis of relevant documents. It is worth noting that all findings in this study were limited to the perceptions of a particular subset of faculty and students in four programs.

This chapter contains two sections. The first section provides an overview of each program and participants of the study, while the subsequent sections present a description of findings in accordance with the research questions. Many faculty and student questionnaire comments, interview quotations, and excerpts from documents are included to present and support findings. To facilitate referencing, a system of coding was used: data source (faculty interview (FI), student interview (SI), faculty survey (FS), student survey (SS), content analysis (CA), programs (A, B, C, and D), and individual participant codes.

Overview of Programs and Participants

Site A

University A. This public university is located in the western part of the United States. It is one of 23 campuses of a state university system, one of the largest higher education systems in
the world. The university is accredited by the state board of education and the Western Association of Schools and Colleges (WASCSR, 2003). Enrollment in Fall 2001 was about 22,000 students. According to Carnegie classification of higher education institutions, this university is classified as Master's Colleges and Universities I (Carnegie Foundation, 2000).

Program A. The program of interest for this research is within the College of Education accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2002). According to the college mission statement, the college provides students with opportunities to develop knowledge, skills, strategies, and experiences, which allow them to serve in diverse roles and function productively in society. In the state education community, it is considered to be a center for academic excellence and collaboration in the fields of education and counseling. In 2001, the college awarded about 170 master’s degrees in education.

Program A offers a program of study leading to a Master’s of Arts degree in education with an option in administration and supervision. This program is popular among students and doubled in enrollment during the past 2-3 years. The administration and supervision option is designed to provide professional preparation for administrative positions in education, including schools, colleges, universities, agencies, and other related educational organizations. The mission statement of this program in Education Administration includes providing educational leadership for the region, the state, the nation, and the world. The Master’s of Arts in education with an option in administration and supervision is a 30-unit degree program. The Administrative Services Credential Program is a two-tier program that provides authorization to function in an administrative position in a P-12 school setting. The Preliminary Administrative Services Credential Program is a 24-semester unit program that provides basic preparation for employment in a P-12 public school administrative position. The Professional Administrative Services Credential Program is also a 24-semester unit program. The program provides individually designed advanced preparation in professional development, transformational leadership, school law, school finance, school human resource management, and other areas necessary for leadership in all education settings.

Faculty A. The department chair in Program A is an experienced person. He has worked in more than 20 universities, including being a visiting professor at Harvard University on three different occasions. He has presented at American Educational Research Association
conferences for 17 consecutive years and has published more than 50 refereed articles. His portfolio assessment experience goes back to 1989. Under his leadership, there are 6 full-time and 17 part-time faculty members employed in this program. Four full-time professors participated in the research by completing a web-based questionnaire and three instructors also participated in interviews. Adjunct faculty members were not included in the study due to lack of experience and involvement in master’s level student advising, portfolio development, and final assessment: “These professors who are part-time, only know them [students] for a semester. We do not feel they can do a good job in assessing portfolios.” All four participated professors varied in the number of years involved in teaching of master’s students in the program (from 3 to 30), in years of being in the program (from 3 to 10), and years of involvement in portfolio assessment (from 4 to 12). Please see Table 4.1 for demographic information of faculty A and a brief comparison of faculty members in Programs B, C, and D.

**Students A.** Program A had the largest number of students enrolled. In Fall 2002 it had about 330 graduate students at master’s, specialist, and doctoral level. A total of 13 master’s level students, 6 male and 7 female, participated in this study. All 13 students submitted their responses to the on-line questionnaire and three students gave their permission to be interviewed. The age of participants varied from 27 to 52. The majority of students (10) were part-time and 3 were full-time. They were involved in their program of study for various periods of time: four people joined the program a year ago; four individuals became students two years ago; and two students entered the program four years ago. Students also varied according to their professional experience in teaching and administrative areas. Teaching experience varied from 5 to 23 years and involved teaching mathematics, science, foreign languages and working with exceptional children. Administrative experience varied from no experience for almost half of Program A student participants to 3-5 years of experience for some. Students were employees of elementary, middle, and high schools. Four students indicated “other” for their type of school and did not provide any further explanation. Please refer to Table 4.2 for a more detailed presentation of student demographic characteristics and their comparison throughout Programs B, C, and D.

**Site B**

**University B.** This public university is located in the Southwest region of the United States. It is one of eight members of a large state university system serving over 57,000 students
at more than a dozen locations. Enrollment in Fall 2001 was about 13,000 students. This institution of higher education is accredited by the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACSCC, 2003). The university has the second largest enrollment of students in the state. According to Carnegie classification of higher education institutions, this university is classified as Master's Colleges and Universities I (Carnegie Foundation, 2000).

The university graduate program offers over 30 master's degrees and three doctoral degrees in criminal justice, forensic clinical psychology, and educational leadership. According to Fall 2001 data, there were approximately 1,100 students enrolled in the master's programs and 120 students in the doctorate programs (College Board, 2002). The university is the recent member of University Council for Educational Administration (UCEA, 2002).

Program B. The program of interest for this research is one of nine academic units within the college of education and applied sciences. According to the college mission statement, the college provides students with opportunities to develop knowledge, skills, strategies, and experiences, which allow them to serve in diverse roles and function productively in society. The college is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2002). As one of only ten universities in the state with accreditation from NCATE, the educator preparation programs meet the accreditation standards necessary to ensure high quality graduates. Program master’s requirement is 36 credit hours, out of which 24 are core curriculum classes and 12 are area concentration courses. In 2001, the program in Educational Administration conferred 27 master’s degrees, the largest number of graduate degrees among other education majors.

Faculty B. The department chair of this program has extensive experience in teaching and administration. She has been involved in portfolio assessment for thirteen years and published several books and articles on this issue and presented her research at professional conferences. As with other faculty members, the department chair completed a web-based survey, participated in the interview, and provided documents for analysis. A total of six faculty members completed the web-based questionnaire and three participated in the interviews. All faculty members were full-time and involved in teaching master’s degree students in the program, advising students, and evaluating their portfolios. All professors varied in number of
years involved in teaching of master’s students in the program (from 2 to 18), in years of being in the program (from 2 to 18), and years of involvement in portfolio assessment (from 1 to 18). Please see Table 4.1 for demographic information of faculty B and a brief comparison of faculty members in Programs A, C, and D.

Students B. Eight students from this program participated in the survey and three participated in the interview. One of the students provided his portfolio on a CD-ROM, six other portfolios were published on the departmental website and were available for analysis. Demographic characteristics of students were diverse: 3 were male and 5 female; their ages varied from 34 to 52; and their student status involved part-time (1), full-time (3), and four people had specialist status at the time of this research. Interestingly, all but one of the participants joined the program three years ago and only one student was in the program a year longer. Only one student had less than 10 years of teaching experience. All other participants represented a rather well experienced group with years of experience ranging from 11 to 28. Students were less diverse in their administrative experience that ranged from 2 to 7. Teaching experience involved teaching in elementary, middle, and high schools. Four participants indicated “other” for their type of school and did not provide any further explanation. Please refer to Table 4.2 for a more detailed presentation of Program B student demographic characteristics and their comparison throughout Programs A, C, and D.

Site C

University C. This accredited public state university is located in North-Central United States (NCACHE, 2003). More than 22,000 students attended the university in Fall 2001. According to Carnegie classification of higher education institutions (Carnegie Foundation, 2000), this university is classified as Doctoral/Research Universities-Intensive. The Lombardi Program on Measuring University Performance, which is based at the University of Florida, released a study in July 2000 (The Center, 2000). In this study, the authors examined American universities on 10 different measures of quality and ranked the top 100 public and private universities for each measure. This university was listed among the top 100 public universities on five measures - endowment assets (81st), national academy members (76th), doctorates awarded (75th), postdoctoral appointees (96th), and national merit and achievement scholars (77th). According to the 2001 U. S. News and World Report rankings, University C was among
only six other universities in the state that had any programs ranked in the top 25 nationally (U. S. News and World Report, 2001). The university offers more than 200 undergraduate majors and areas of study, more than 100 master's degree options, 17 doctoral degree programs, and four law degrees.

**Program C.** The College of Education hosts the educational administration program. The College was established in 1921 and is the second oldest professional school at this university. One of the state’s three largest teacher educator preparation programs, the College is designated as a "successful College of Education" by the State Department of Education. The College of Education has been continuously accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education since the organization’s inception in 1954 (NCATE, 2002). It is committed to such core components of professional practice as knowledge, technology, diversity, and ethics. The College operates seven centers and has more than 40 collaborative arrangements with state and local organizations and agencies. Its faculty and students provide important leadership for campus and community initiatives and are active in state, national, and international settings to further the university and college missions. The master's degree program in general administration is not directed toward a particular administrative or supervisory certificate.

The program in Educational Administration requirement is 33 credit hours. With the help of an advisor and approval of the graduate school, courses may be substituted and/or waived to create specialized options. Students also have an option of taking more credit hours and specializing in the following areas: educational research, educational staff and personnel administration, curriculum studies and personnel development, pupil services administration, school/community relations, superintendency, and the principalship. In Fall 2001, the program in educational administration awarded 63 master’s degrees, the largest number of master’s degrees among all education majors.

**Faculty C.** The department chair joined the department eight years ago as a graduate faculty member and became a department leader in 2001. She is actively involved in teaching graduate level courses, serving on committees, and working on grant activities. Her research interests include sociology of school organizations, sociology of teaching, curriculum development, organizational learning, and qualitative methods of research. The department chair published several books and articles devoted to educational administration.
Six faculty members completed the web-based questionnaire and three participated in the interviews. All faculty members taught master’s degree level students, advised students, and evaluated their portfolios for several years. Faculty members varied in years of being in Program C (from 4 to 11), in years of teaching master’s level students (from 1 to 8), and the number of years being involved in portfolio assessment (from 2 to 6). Please see Table 4.1 for demographic information of faculty C and a brief comparison of faculty members in Programs A, B, and D.

**Students C.** Program C had a fewer number of students that met the criteria for this study. Only a few people were preparing their portfolios in the time of this research. The department chair explained that due to the state changes in certification, the majority of students expedited their program of study and graduated earlier than planned to be able to qualify for the old certification requirements. A total of six students were available to participate in the study. Four of them completed a web-based survey and only one gave her agreement to be interviewed. Out of four Program C student participants, 1 was male and 3 female. Students were relatively homogeneous in respect to their age (from 25 to 32), their status in the program (3 were part-time and 1 full-time), and their area of school certification (3 were employed in elementary schools and 1 in middle school). Their teaching experience varied from 1 to 10 years. Only one student had three years of administrative experience. One participant joined the program a year ago, two students entered the program two years ago, and one participant became a student in this program 6 years ago. Please see Table 4.2 for demographic characteristics of Program C students and their comparison to students in Programs A, B, and D.

**Site D.**

**University D.** This public university is located in a central Midwestern part of the United States. It was founded at the end of the nineteenth century and since that time has evolved into a comprehensive university of nine colleges and schools offering more than 150 academic programs in science, technology, education, the health professions, business and the liberal arts. Approximately 9,500 students attended the university in the Fall 2001. It is an accredited institution of higher education (NCACHE, 2003). According to Carnegie classification of higher education, this University is classified as Master's Colleges and Universities I (College Board, 2002).
Program D. The college of education that hosts this educational administration program is accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE, 2002). The program’s motto is “Teaching, scholarship, and research progress with pride through high expectations of students, academic rigor, excellent instruction, provided within a relevant curriculum, through a quality program by committed faculty with credibility of character, reliability of word, and based on ethical decisions supported by research and service” (CA-D). The program offers three degrees in educational administration: Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership, Educational Specialist degree in Educational Administration, and Master’s of Arts degree in Educational Administration. The program of study with the master’s degree in School Administration develops the knowledge base, management skills and personal attributes that allow individuals to advance professionally and provides executive leadership to public schools. While able to accommodate students recently completing undergraduate studies in education, the program is especially organized to meet the professional goals of individuals desiring administrative positions in public schools. This program also is specifically designed for those individuals desiring exposure to public school administrative thought and practice who will contribute to their continued effectiveness and professional advancement. This program of study is organized to equip graduates with the knowledge, skills, and attitudes that will enhance their efforts in successfully meeting the state and national assessments requirements.

The program in school administration consists of a minimum of 36 credit hours, 28 of which must be in courses focused on school administration or supervision. Options are provided within the program for the elementary school principal, the elementary/middle school principal, the secondary school principal, the secondary/middle school principal, the special education administrator, and the vocational school director. The conceptual model that incorporates literacy, technology, globalization, and diversity guides the entire program of training for school administrators. This model views a school administrator as a caring, reflective, competent, and professional educator. Learning and leadership, ethics and integrity, professional development and collaboration are also included in the conceptual model. In the last five years, the number of students enrolled in this program almost doubled. In 2001, the program in educational administration awarded 67 master’s degrees, the largest number of postsecondary degrees among all college majors.
Faculty D. The department chair delegated the graduate student coordinator to participate in this study. The program coordinator is actively involved in teaching three graduate courses in elementary and secondary school administration, in principal's assessment, and in superintendent's assessment. He also supervises students in their internships as elementary, secondary, and vocational administrators. There are 6 full-time faculty members and 10 adjunct instructors. The following priorities are named in the faculty strategic plan: to provide top-quality academic-programs, enhance access to a wide range of educational programs throughout their service region, provide service to the region, and enhance the university community. Faculty continues the review of curriculum to meet national accreditation standards and to assure that there is consistency of curriculum content when adjunct faculty members are needed. They concentrate on student outcome assessment and develop and implement outcome assessment procedures for their respective disciplines, create and improve experiential learning activities within the course content, utilize alternative delivery systems to make department programs accessible to a wide population, and provide advanced study opportunities within their service area.

Six faculty members completed the web-based questionnaire and three participated in the interviews. All faculty members were full-time faculty members and were actively involved in teaching master’s degree level students in the program. All of them had experience in advising students and evaluating their portfolios. Faculty members varied in years of being in Program D (from 1 to 12), in years of teaching master’s level students (from 1 to 14), and the number of years being involved in portfolio assessment (from 1 to 9). Please see Table 4.1 for demographic information of faculty D and a brief comparison of faculty members in Programs A, B, and C.

Students D. A total of eight graduate students, 3 male and 5 female, participated in this study. Their ages ranged from 23 to 47. Students were diverse in terms of their years being the program (from 1 to 5), in their student status (5 were part-time, 2 full-time, and 1 specialist), and years of teaching experience (from 2 to 25). Students worked in elementary, middle, and high schools. Only one student had administrative experience. Please refer to Table 4.2 for demographic characteristics of Program D students.
Table 4.1

*Programs A, B, C, and D Faculty Demographic Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Program A</th>
<th>Program B</th>
<th>Program C</th>
<th>Program D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in portfolio assessment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in the program</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years teaching master’s students</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30+</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “-“ indicates missing data.

Table 4.2

*Programs A, B, C, and D Student Demographic Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Program A</th>
<th>Program B</th>
<th>Program C</th>
<th>Program D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Program A</th>
<th>Program B</th>
<th>Program C</th>
<th>Program D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years in Ed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin. program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.2—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Program A</th>
<th>Program B</th>
<th>Program C</th>
<th>Program D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sp. Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Lng.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Study participants, both faculty and students, represented a diverse group of people with respect to their age, professional experiences in teaching and administrative positions, number of years involved in portfolio assessment, and number of years being in the program under study. The next sections present findings in detail and provide answers to research questions.

**Description of Findings**

Department chairs, faculty members, and students in the four programs preparing educational leaders participated in this study. I collected a total of 54 responses to on-line surveys (21 faculty and 33 student), conducted 21 telephone interviews and 3 video interviews (10 faculty, 9 student, and 2 interviews with other individuals identified in the course of study), and analyzed many documents made available to me by the study participants. Refer to Table 4.3 for the presentation of sources of data for this research and the number of participants in each study activity.

Data collection through web-based questionnaires, interviews, and content analysis revealed various findings. These findings are presented in the form of responses to research questions and, similar to research questions, are grouped in three categories: “portfolio assessment initiation”, “implementation”, and “perceptions of faculty and students towards portfolio assessment strengths, weaknesses, facilitating factors, and barriers”. In the course of this study, it became apparent that all participants should be asked not only about the current...
Table 4.3

Data Collection Activities and Number of Participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Program Surveys on-line</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>Portfolio sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>St.</td>
<td>Fclt.</td>
<td>DC</td>
<td>St.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Portfolio more than 5 years)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (Portfolio less than 5 years)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: St.—students, Fclt.—faculty, DC—department chairs.

state of portfolio assessments in their programs, but also to collect their opinions on what a portfolio assessment should be. Thus, for research questions 2-6, I also present faculty and student perceptions on what they consider portfolios should consist of, which areas and competencies in the field of Educational Leadership/Administration they might need to cover, and how portfolios should be graded and presented. For research questions 9-10, I revealed individual findings for each program and also compared them between Programs A and B where portfolios are used for more than five years and Programs C and D, where portfolios are in place for less than five years. Perceptions of faculty and students were presented individually and also compared between Programs A and B and Programs C and D. Means and standard deviations were computed; differences between means were analyzed using a t-test. Major findings follow.
Portfolio Assessment Initiation

Research Question 1. What needs in the program prompted initiation of portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement in the program?

Program A Portfolio Initiation

Portfolio assessment in Program A has been used for more than five years. I asked faculty members to share why they decided to move to portfolio assessment both in the survey (Item 16) and during the interviews. The following reasons were mentioned more often than others: (1) faculty became interested in the use of portfolios in K-12 setting; (2) faculty aspired to prepare school administrators to be models to teachers and students; (3) faculty believed portfolios allow students to select and reflect on their learning while being in the program; (4) faculty felt portfolios seemed to be a better assessment practice: “It has worked, much better than any other method”; (5) faculty wanted to prepare students for job interviews and portfolios were used as a job search tool; and (6) faculty would like to use student portfolios for program evaluation at the university level. A faculty member commented:

In 1996, student portfolios were the hot topic, teacher portfolios were becoming pretty popular, and then if students do this and we require teachers do this, I think administrators need to lead the charge and be an example of having their own portfolios… I think if we are expecting teachers to do [portfolios], to document their performance, then administrators should be accountable to the same measure. That’s what sprouted it. And then I started thinking it is a valuable tool for other areas such as job interviews and performance assessment at the university level, and there were several other benefits that I saw grow from that (FI-A-3).

Another faculty member also identified similar reasons:

We felt it was important to move to portfolios assessment for two reasons … School districts would like to see the artifacts and reflections of candidates who are applying for administrative positions and it was a good opportunity to help people to prepare for that… And archival data they could use in such an interview. On the other hand, it also allowed students an opportunity to select those opportunities and those experiences that were important to them throughout the program to demonstrate their learning (FI-A-2).

Only one faculty member in Program A saw portfolios become a hot topic that encouraged faculty to reconsider their assessment practices: “Because of a fashion. It was something that people were doing. There were no other strong reasons” (FI-A-1).
Program B Portfolio Initiation

Portfolio assessment in Program B has been used for various purposes for more than seven years. A primary reason for its initiation was dissatisfaction with assessment used in the program at that time: “Our department felt we were not incorporating current research and best practice in assessment into our program” (FI-B-1). Before 1998, student participation in portfolio assessment was an option. After the Fall 1998 semester, all students entering the program to pursue the master’s, or doctoral degree, or a certification in educational leadership, were to pass a comprehensive examination and develop an academic portfolio that could be later modified to a career advancement portfolio.

Another reason for initiation of this assessment practice in their program, as identified by faculty members, was to assist students in their learning through reflection and preparation for the profession: “The students view the portfolio process as an overall positive learning experience. The feedback that we continue to get from the students in this program is positive and that this process is viewed as being both helpful and useful in enhancing their learning” (FI-B-2) and “…for a student to be able to reflect on their learning and how they will apply their knowledge in their positions as leaders” (FI-B-1). The portfolio at the master’s level, when completed, represents the formal capstone experience used by the student and educational leadership program faculty to assess an individual’s overall learning. Thus, dissatisfaction with existed assessment practices and aspirations to provide better preparation of their graduate students prompted initiation of portfolio assessment in Program B.

Program C Portfolio Initiation

Faculty members in Program C saw great benefit in portfolio assessment as it was used in other programs. At the same time professors were dissatisfied with their traditional comprehensive exam and were looking for a more authentic assessment:

We moved to portfolios about four years ago because we sort of had a traditional master’s comprehensive exam and we were very disappointed in the quality of our three-hour written exam to be able to demonstrate any applications of learning….So we were not happy with this four years ago. It did not give them [students] an opportunity to reflect on their knowledge. It also had no linkage back to any work in schools. (FI-C-1)

Another need for portfolio assessment was the desire to link program curriculum to current school practices and assessment of school leadership team members: “[Portfolio] will
eventually go in entry year principal portfolio as the way to help entry year principals to
demonstrate their competencies. So, we anticipated that and decided to add it as a graduation
requirement” (FI-C-2):

and we went to this portfolio system as a way to try to get at the notion that there was a
link, and there is a strong link, between what we are doing here at the University and
what they were doing in the [school] buildings, and the kind of administrators we want
them to become. (FI-C-1)

Successful implementation of portfolios in other programs served as a model of best
assessment practices and portfolio initiation in Program C: “teacher ed[ucation] has done that.
So, we copied from different departments and from what the state decided to do” (FI-C-2). At the
same time, in late 90s, state and national education agencies began promoting assessments
grounded in standards and performance measures and strongly encouraged assessment practices
such as portfolios: “The program decided to move to portfolio assessment as state laws were
changing. Both state laws and NCATE standards” (FS-C) and

The reason was the ISLLC standards and a notion that portfolio assessment would
become part of state principal licensure. Such portfolio assessment is coming to entry
year principals and we feel our students have an advantage of being prepared. It [a
portfolio] helps students move to that next stage.

To summarize, portfolio assessment in Program C was caused by
(1) dissatisfaction with the assessment used in the program at that time; (2) willingness to follow
best practices in assessment; (3) a connection between the program and school practices; and (4)
influence of outside state and national agencies.

**Program D Portfolio Initiation**

Similar to Program C, faculty in Program D moved to portfolio assessment in the Fall
semester 2000 to follow NCATE requirements and ISLLC standards. At the same time, several
faculty members expressed their interest in a new assessment as they felt that portfolios would
help student better understand all the complexity of school leadership and administration and
prepare for their leadership roles:

We decided to move to portfolio assessment for several reasons. First is because we felt it
will give us good evaluation, overall evaluation of a student. And also we felt that it
would help us to bring together all the information we needed for our evaluative reviews
like for program evaluations by NCATE and all those program reviews that we go
through. (FI-D-3)
We felt it gave a good picture of student knowledge, …of the various courses and also ISLLC standards. We incorporate ISLLC standards into each class. (FI-D-1)

There were several reasons: one was NCATE as we were going through accreditation process, they pretty much ask for portfolio. We have always done what you can call a portfolio, but it was much more loosely structured, then we changed to a much more structured activity…And another reason was that we felt it was the right thing to do to help prepare an educational administrator. Having them going through these structured activities would give them a better understanding of what does it really mean to be an education administrator. (FI-D-2)

All four programs indicated various reasons for the initiation of portfolio assessment. It is important to note that the initiation of portfolio assessment in programs C and D was to a great extent related to new state and national requirements of NCATE and ISLLC, whereas Programs A and B that started portfolio assessment more than five years ago, prior to the introduction of those new requirement and standards, and were driven by needs internal to the program. Dissatisfaction with current assessment practices such as written comprehensive examination, willingness to follow best practices in assessment, and an aspiration to link preparation of school administrators to their future professional careers were mentioned more often than other reasons.

Research Question 2. What is the purpose of portfolio assessment in the program?

I used responses of department chairs to the web-based questionnaire conducted at preliminary stages of this research (Appendix D Item 17) and interview data to answer this question. A primary purpose of portfolio assessment in all programs is student assessment and as a graduation requirement. Faculty mentioned various purposes for portfolios in their programs. It became important in the course of study to ask both faculty and students about additional purposes portfolios might be for used in their programs to provide full benefit of this form of assessment (Appendix J and L, Item 11).

Program A

Current portfolio purposes. Major purposes of portfolio assessment in Program A are to assess student progress and “ongoing development throughout the program” (FS-A). Faculty members also mentioned using portfolios for program evaluation purposes and alignment with state and national standards.

And you know what, at the performance assessment level they can use it for program evaluation, and they can align our state standards with NCATE standards, where we are
required to demonstrate student performance. These portfolios very clearly identify student performances in the field. If, in fact, they have that section dealing with the knowledge base or professional competencies and include those in their portfolio. It is a great demonstration of performance in the field. (FI-A-3)

You can use them [portfolios] in many ways. You can use portfolios by making a competition to find out who has the best portfolio. You could use portfolio to push students to identify areas where they have to work more. You could use portfolios to compare things and students from another country or another state. Also in presentations, job interviews, certainly. (FI-A-1)

Several faculty members consider portfolios to be useful to prepare students who are looking for potential employment and for job interviews.

…For students to develop portfolio for their professional use rather than just as a grading tool. So that’s one of the things to help administrator to celebrate the accomplishments of their professional careers. Then be able to speak about them at a job interview or professionally, on a professional meeting, to be able to discuss intelligently some of the accomplishments they have made in their career. This is kind of a main focus. (FI-A-3)

**Other purposes of portfolio assessment as perceived by Program A faculty and students.** Faculty did not consider using portfolios either for admission to the program, internship, or initial certification. Please see Table 4.4 for a detailed description of findings for Program A and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants. In addition to being a graduation requirement, a total of 67% of faculty were in favor of the already established practices of using portfolios for job placement/employment and especially for program evaluation:

I think of what we should develop some kind of a feedback mechanism where the portfolio serves not only as a measure of student progress and achievement, but also as a measure of our own progress and achievement by seeing how well we have done in conveying and in assisting students and in working with them. So, yes, I am very much in agreement with that idea [using portfolios for program evaluation]. (FI-A-2)

Students also regarded the same two purposes of using portfolios for job search and program evaluation more often than other options, 46% and 69% respectively.

**Program B**

**Current portfolio purposes.** Program B faculty members indicated that apart from a graduation requirement for completion of master’s degree in Educational Leadership and/or certification program, portfolio assessment was used for at least four other purposes in their
program: (1) student self-development, renewal and reflection, (2) admission to candidacy to master’s degree, (3) initiation of a career advancement portfolio, and (4) program evaluation.

Of course our program benefits from the portfolio, because our faculty is examining student culminating portfolios, we have a good chance to look at the portfolios and think about our program and how the students performed; if the program meets the needs that they have; if our program is aligned with state principalship standards, do the students perceive it this way, or do we …are we on target with what we are teaching, are we promoting reflection as we should be? Did the students have the understanding of the purposes of our program, their responsibilities in the program, etc.? (FI-B-1)

Other purposes of portfolio assessment as perceived by Program B faculty and students. Quite opposite to Program A, faculty members in this program indicated that portfolios should be used for admission to the program (83%) and evaluation of internship (83%). Faculty members were equally divided in their opinion on using portfolios for assessment in individual courses (50%). A total of 88% of students would prefer portfolios to be used for internships: “Excellent way of ascertaining what was accomplished in an internship” (SS-B). Using portfolios for program evaluation (86%) and assessment in individual courses (75%) would be desirable purposes for students “…when used sparingly, evaluated, discussed with the student, and meaningful”(SS-B). Please see Table 4.4 for a detailed description of findings for Program B and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

Program C

Current portfolio purposes. Apart from a graduation requirement, faculty members in Program C currently use portfolios for evaluating student internship experiences and for program evaluation. Faculty members commented:

One of the pieces we are working on now is using the portfolio to inform our own program assessment. At this point of time we are using portfolio assessment to determine how students are doing. It is a very common use of it. And we are feeling good about its ability to benefit us in telling us how students are reaching goals and objectives we are setting for them. What we are beginning to see is to really get a full benefit we need to look at those portfolios what they tell us about our courses, about those kinds of activities, assignments, opportunities we give to students. (FI-C-1)

The whole notion of using the portfolio for program assessment is a really strong benefit that we are just beginning to explore…I think we can get a really good benefit out of it, in
the long run by looking at portfolio assessment as a two-way street. Portfolios can be used as a part of program evaluation. (FI-C-1)

Portfolio can be used not only to assess students, but also to assess a program. Portfolio assessment and a use of it as one of the elements for the program assessment. It is one part. It is not by itself. It is one piece of the multifaceted program assessment plan that we have in place. (FI-C-3)

One of the faculty members also mentioned that the fact that his student portfolios are evaluated and graded by his colleagues in the program, encouraged him to evaluate his own teaching and assignment of student projects:

Just seeing your student’s work in the portfolio has a sobering effect on you. Knowing that other faculty are reading the artifacts your students produced …. I thought I was doing OK in one of my classes, and seeing artifacts coming from this class, just making sure these artifacts are crisp and clear helped me develop excellent rubrics for those papers in my class. Because I know my colleagues will see [papers] and I want them to be good. And if I know these papers will go to the portfolio as artifacts, I want to help students to produce the best artifacts. One thing is to improve individual class performance. (FI-C-2)

Using student portfolios for program evaluation also prompted curriculum alignment. Seeing deficiencies in one of the areas of their student preparation, faculty had “to design a workshop in philosophy and ethics geared toward future school leaders and administrators” (FI-C-2):

I think another thing it does…in some time you start to understand that several ISLLC standards we cover very well, and several ISLLC standards we do not cover that well. Or for this standard we do not produce any artifacts… So we see something we were not covering consistently in ISLLC standards in our courses. (FI-C-2)

Other purposes of portfolio assessment as perceived by Program C faculty and students. A total of 83% of faculty members considered that portfolios should be used for internships, 67% were in favor of using portfolios for initial certification, and 50% favored program evaluation: “Probably just to show other people the things that can go to portfolio, and probably they can also show different types of things that are covered in the curriculum, and also that they are meeting NCATE standards…they are teaching us, allowing us to experience” (SI-C-292). Interestingly, 75% of the students would like their portfolios to be used for program evaluation. Please see Table 4.4 for a detailed description of findings for Program C and also all
other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

**Program D**

**Current portfolio purposes.** According to faculty members, apart from student assessment and as a graduation requirement, portfolios were used for evaluation of internships, program evaluation, and curriculum alignment within program courses and professional ISLLC and NCATE standards. Faculty commented:

- I think portfolio assessment gives you a really good picture of a student. Not only of his knowledge, but also his desire to work and complete the degree, and do this in a professional manner. It allows us to assess our own curriculum and our own teaching techniques, be sure that we are teaching a student and also prepare them for a state and national exam. Most, well, 99% percent of our students are practicing teachers and administrators. And they are under the state mandate that a curriculum in a local school prepares their students for state exams. Just like them, so are we. It gives us a connection to those students and ensures them that what we are preparing them for and what we are providing in the classroom helps them when they do take a state test. (FI-D-1)

- I use portfolios and, because I score them, it gives me a picture of our program. It lets me see gaps where we are missing things. From feedback we get from portfolios, we are able to restructure our classes and introduce needed concepts. Because I can see course reflections, cross-reference course objectives, and ISLLC standards, I can see what things we are missing. Portfolio is a snapshot of many things. It is not just one piece. (FI-D-4)

- We have an idea what our students gained throughout the program because we see how they perceive themselves when they come to the program and then we have some information when they leave the program. We use it for our overall department evaluation...So, we are able to assess at that point what they have done at the program and what they achieved based on ISLLC standards. (FI-D-2)

**Other purposes of portfolio assessment as perceived by Program D faculty and students.** Faculty would like to continue using portfolios for internships (50%) and program evaluation (50%). All participating Program D students were in favor of using portfolios for internships and 75% would like to use their portfolios for job placement and potential employment: “I was never asked for my portfolio by an employer. I spent a lot of time on it and it was never used” (SS-D). At least two other students shared the same concern: “I believe that portfolios can be a useful assessment tool in my program. However, it does not seem to make...
sense to me that students are required to complete a labor-intensive project that is never viewed by anyone outside of collegiate academia” (SS-D). Please see Table 4.4 for a detailed description of findings for Program D and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

**How Faculty and Students Perceive Portfolios Should Be Used in Their A, B, C, and D Programs**

Both faculty and student surveys (Appendices J and L, Item 11) yielded results regarding additional purposes of using portfolios in programs preparing educational administrators. The most favored purposes were using portfolios to assess student internships (62% of all participating faculty members and 52% of all participating students) and using portfolios for program evaluation (43% faculty and 64% students). As for using portfolios for admission purposes, only Program B faculty considered that portfolios should be employed in this way. Interestingly, this idea found some support among students in Programs A, B, and C, who thought it would be appropriate for students to prepare portfolios for admission to the program. About one-third of all faculty and students (29% and 30%, respectively) would like to see portfolio assessment in individual courses. Please see Table 4.4 for a detailed description of findings by program (A, B, C, and D), group (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants. In summary, both faculty and students considered that apart from a graduation requirement, portfolios should be used for assessment of internships and program evaluation.

**Portfolio Assessment Implementation**

**Research Question 3. How has portfolio-based assessment been implemented at the master’s degree level? What were the major strategies, key players, significant stages, and components of the implementation process? What are the unique features of the portfolio assessment process in a program?**

It was rather difficult to collect information and detailed responses to this question because in at least two programs, faculty members who initiated portfolio assessment either have moved to different universities or retired and were not available for comment in time for this
study. Programs did not document their portfolio development procedures and could not provide any written agenda, meeting minutes, or publications. However, collected data allowed a determination of common trends and unique features in all four programs. Detailed descriptions of portfolio implementation in each program follow.

**Program A**

**Portfolio implementation.** Portfolio assessment in Program A started about eight years ago with one faculty member who heard about this form of assessment in some professional conference and became interested in it. With additional research, looking into various portfolio models for other disciplines, communicating with colleagues and professional in the fields, and redesigning already present assessment practices, Program A developed a model that became a prototype for their current portfolios.

In [our program], it actually started with my idea that portfolios might be good for educational administrators and nobody was talking about administrative portfolios. And so I decided to do some research. I surveyed some key personnel directors or superintendents, in the districts and got some idea of things they think might be appropriate to be included into portfolio. Then I looked at some portfolio models, I do not remember where I got them from, some models for teacher portfolios and other professional portfolios, either art portfolios, different things people would include. And so I developed kind of an outline. And then from there I moved from one university to another, brought an idea with me, and at that time when I ended up at [this university], they have already started portfolio process for administrators. We adopted my plan and my design, and implemented that. And the way it progressed we decided it should be an integral part of the entire program where we will be building it [portfolio] from one stage to the next stage, from one semester to the next, so each semester students would add new things to their portfolios and the professor at that particular semester would require certain things to be added and it would become a part of the grade. And so we started…(FI-A-3)

**Program A unique features.** Faculty members serve as mentors and guide students in preparing their portfolios. Students receive written guidelines in one of their classes on what portfolio assessment and its benefits are, portfolio sections description, and what artifacts need to be present in portfolios. Students also have a chance to see model portfolios, meet with their graduate committee members and their peers and discuss concerns and share experiences. There is also a culminating activity at the end of the program where graduating students present their portfolios and conduct exit interviews with their peers, potential employers, and faculty members.
Table 4.4

Other Purposes of Portfolios in the Programs as Suggested by Study Participants (Appendices J and L, Item 11)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission to the program</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment in individual courses</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial certification</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job placement/employment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program evaluation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Percentages are calculated based on the total number of responses.
What features of portfolio assessment should be used, as perceived by Program A faculty and students. Interestingly, 6 out of 10 features got the same recognition (67%) from faculty in this program: assessment checklist given to faculty and students in advance, mentors to guide students preparing portfolios, written guidelines for students on portfolio preparation, culminating interview, and review of portfolios by practitioners in the field of educational administration. At the same time, 85% of students would like to have a website or a handbook where they can find answers to frequently asked questions, and 85% of students also would like to have written guidelines for portfolio development. Please see Table 4.5 for a detailed description of findings for Program A and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

Program B

Portfolio implementation. Several faculty members in Program B piloted portfolios to assess students in individual courses that they were teaching and they “learned the power of reflection” (FI-B-1). They “were looking for more authentic assessment than what we had in our coursework… and felt that portfolios and reflections embedded in the portfolios helped students to assume more responsibilities for their own learning and helped them to identify what they individually have learned” (FI-B-2). This new assessment practice was discussed at faculty meetings and “…other faculty members in the programs started to see results, and we felt they were good results” (FI-B-1). Successful results prompted a wider use of portfolios in the program. Faculty members collected feedback from students, did research on portfolio assessment in their program, and published several articles on the topic. They also consulted with educational administrators in schools, superintendent’s offices, and personnel directors.

We talked to students and discussed what should be in the portfolio. Of course, the reflections and artifacts, leadership framework needed to be there because it is their first real reflection. Then we also talked to people, we did a research study talking to principals and superintendents and assistant principals, and we asked them what they thought should go into portfolio. (FI-B-1)

Throughout the years of portfolio assessment in the program, portfolio design changed to meet state and national requirements and better reflect taught curriculum and current trends in the field of educational administration.
**Program B unique features.** Portfolio assessment is included as a part of the master’s degree comprehensive evaluation. Students can review all portfolio procedures, requirements, deadlines for submission and presentation on the departmental website. It is a detailed and descriptive document of about 20 pages. Both faculty and students have a rubric given to them in advance for evaluation purposes. Students work with three committee members, two of whom are graduate program faculty members and one is a practicing school administrator. Similar to Program A, students can meet with their advisors and their classmates to discuss portfolio issues. Students present their portfolios to their committee members.

**What features of portfolio assessment should be used, as perceived by Program B faculty and students.** Similar to Program A, faculty considered that portfolios should have at least 7 out of 10 offered features with equal frequency. A total of 85% of faculty members were in favor of having an assessment checklist given to faculty and students in advance, mentors to guide students preparing portfolios, written guidelines for students on portfolio preparation, course/study group to clarify portfolio preparation for students, website and written guidelines with portfolio information, graduate committee to evaluate portfolios, culminating interview, and review of portfolios by practitioners in the field of educational administration. Students also considered it useful to have written guidelines, assessment checklists, and a website with all the portfolio information. They also mentioned that they would like to have an “ability to do electronic portfolios that can be shared on the web” (SS-B). As for peer reviews of portfolios, only about one-third of faculty and students favored this idea: “Peer review is unforgettable but you have to make time for it” (SS-B). Please see Table 4.5 for a detailed description of findings for Program B and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

**Program C**

**Portfolio implementation.** The implementation process in Program C underwent several stages and changes. Both faculty and students in the program were active participants in the portfolio design process. Written guidelines were developed and face-to-face orientation sessions were conducted to solicit student and faculty opinion and improve portfolio processes. One faculty member shared:
We sort of drew a line in the sand where we said all students accepted after [a certain semester] were doing a portfolio. For anyone admitted to the program prior to that date, we gave them the choice. They could stay with the master’s comprehensive exam because, of course, that was in the graduate bulletin when they entered the program. Or they could opt to do the portfolio instead. We held a series of portfolio orientation sessions, a couple on week nights, and then a couple on Saturday mornings for that whole first year where students were able to come, hear about what we expected, what we wanted, look at the scoring rubric. (FI-C-1)

Portfolio guidelines were presented not only during meetings but also during introductory courses in the program where students could talk to their instructors and peers about portfolio construction. Faculty also tried to evaluate their assessment practices through some research efforts:

We gave them the overview of the standards in that course and made them talk about the portfolio in that course. So we did the orientation sessions, we went through some very informal faculty workgroups together with…. I don’t want to go as far as to say we conducted interrater reliability because we really did not but it was an informal focus at what’s this profession… (FI-C-1)

**Program C unique features.** Faculty members advise their students on portfolio process through face-to-face meetings, via e-mails, and also with 7-page written guidelines that are given to students. These guidelines describe the entire portfolio process from construction to a final submission of a portfolio to committee members with a great level of detail. Students are guided on how to select and organize their artifacts in portfolio sections. An assessment rubric and rating sheet are presented to students and faculty in advance to inform them about expectations and evaluation practices.

**What features of portfolio assessment should be used, as perceived by Program C faculty and students.** Assessment checklists for faculty and students and written guidelines were among the most frequently mentioned features by faculty (83%) and students (75%). All students in this program were in favor of a graduate committee to assess their portfolios. One faculty member clarified that having “faculty advisors to guide students in preparing portfolios and in evaluating them prior to submission to other faculty members” would be more beneficial (FS-C). Please see Table 4.5 for a detailed description of findings for Program C and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.
Program D

Portfolio implementation. The portfolio assessment in Program D was initiated in Fall semester 2000: “it [portfolio] came about when we started going to national conferences and saw presentations from other educational administration departments around the country and saw what they were doing, following some presentations on NCATE and performance for portfolios” (FI-D-2). One faculty member “gathered the information from other departments throughout the country, and compiled the … manual, and got an input from the department” (FI-D-2). It took the faculty about a year to design and develop a portfolio system in their program.

Another faculty member emphasized that there was a lot of faculty collaboration to align curriculum and course objectives:

Each faculty member would develop their syllabus and utilize the ISLLC standards as a guide for each administrative course. So standards…, and then develop projects that would become a component of each portfolio that is required in each class. And then this syllabus is approved by the department and by our graduate council. So basically, there were four stages to it [portfolio implementation]. First, the instructor developing syllabus and projects and connecting those to ISLLC standards, then the department for approval, and then getting it throughout the master’s program, … so the student has a good background of the whole administrator. (FI-D-1)

Program D unique features. Guidelines to students preparing their portfolios are available on the departmental website and are also discussed in several courses. A student portfolio presentation to a faculty panel in this program counts as a comprehensive examination. Portfolio construction and presentation require students to “examine the knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators of the ISLLC standards and select one of … portfolio activities to best represent each standard” (CA-D-1). Students are advised to present their thoughts to the faculty and select a different portfolio activity (project) to represent each of the six standards. Presentations are limited to approximately 30 minutes. Then faculty and the student discuss the portfolio, its presentation, and the student’s overall competencies regarding the knowledge, dispositions and performance of a school leader. Both faculty and students are aware of expectations, criteria, and a scoring guide. Students have an opportunity to form a study group where they can share their experiences and concerns.

What features of portfolio assessment should be used, as perceived by Program D faculty and students. All faculty members considered that students need to have access to a
website or handbook where they can find information on portfolio requirements and guidelines. An assessment checklist for faculty and students, mentors, and assessment of student portfolios by a graduate committee was favored by 83% of faculty members. Students unanimously agreed that they needed to have written guidelines for portfolio construction and an assessment checklist/rubric. Website availability with portfolio information was mentioned by 88% of students. Please see Table 4.5 for a detailed description of findings for Program D and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

**Unique Portfolio Process Features as Recommended by Programs A, B, C, and D Study Participants**

Out of 10 features listed in the web-based faculty and student survey (Item 3), 3 were named as necessary with the highest frequency both by faculty and students. Thus, at least 76% of faculty and 85% of students named developing written guidelines for student portfolio preparation as a necessary and highly desirable feature. Availability of a website or handbook where students can find answers to their frequently asked questions regarding portfolio construction was named by 67% of faculty and 79% of student participants. A total of 62% of faculty and 55% of students would like to have a course/study group to clarify portfolio preparation. Peer review of portfolios was the least desirable feature in portfolio process, with only 29% of faculty members and 30% of students considering it. Several faculty participants in Program C mentioned that, although this feature is not official in their program, “students do this informally nonetheless” (FS-C). Please see Table 4.5 for a detailed description of findings by program (A, B, C, and D), groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

In summary, faculty selected the following top five feature of portfolio assessment that should be implemented: (1) assessment checklist for faculty, (2) assessment checklist for students, (3) mentor to guide students in portfolio development, (4) written guidelines, and (5) website or handbook where students can find answers to frequently asked questions. Interestingly, students selected the same top five features, though placing them in a different
order: (1) written guidelines, (2) assessment checklist for faculty, (3) website or handbook, (4) assessment checklist for students, and (5) mentor to guide students on portfolio development.

Research Question 4. What are the skills, abilities, and educational leadership competencies that faculty members expect graduate students to demonstrate in their portfolios?

I used data from a web-based department chair questionnaire and faculty interviews to respond to this question. Review and content analysis of documents made available to me by faculty members and students also provided important data. I was interested to know faculty and student perceptions regarding those areas/competencies of educational leadership that should be addressed in portfolio. I used responses of faculty and student surveys (Appendices J and L, Item 2), interviews, and content analysis of documents to answer this research question.

Program A

Addressed competencies. Faculty members encourage their graduate students to demonstrate evidence in attaining knowledge, skills, and competencies in such areas as “visionary leadership, cultural leadership, instructional leadership, managerial leadership, collaborative community leadership, moral leadership, and leadership in areas of politics, society, economics, law and culture” (CA-A-1). All of these are standards that are required by the State Commission on Teacher Credentialing to be taught in all educational administration programs. Besides, faculty members are looking for professional formatting of portfolios: “What we are looking for in portfolios: content (all that required), cleaness, organization, and particularly reflection on the materials that were required” (FI-A-1).

What competencies should be addressed in portfolios, as perceived by Program A faculty and students. Faculty unanimously agreed that such areas/competencies of educational administration as curriculum and instruction, human resources development, site-based management, and student assessment should be addressed in student portfolios. Other areas, except political and regulatory environment, received a consistent 67% level of faculty support. Students agreed that all mentioned competences should be addressed in portfolios, but put more emphasis on such areas as curriculum and instruction (92%) and school law (85%). Please see Table 4.6 for a detailed description of findings for Program A and all other programs.
Table 4.5

Unique Features in Portfolio Assessment As Recommended by Study Participants (Appendices J and L, Item 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Features</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to faculty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  B  C  D  AB  CD</td>
<td>2 67%  5 83%  5 83%  5 78%  10 83%</td>
<td>6 46%  5 63%  3 75%  6 75%  11 52%  9 75%</td>
<td>17 87%  27 82%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  B  C  D  AB  CD</td>
<td>2 67%  5 83%  5 83%  5 78%  10 83%</td>
<td>7 54%  5 63%  3 75%  8 100%  12 57%  11 92%</td>
<td>17 87%  23 70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentor(s) to guide students in preparing portfolios.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  B  C  D  AB  CD</td>
<td>2 67%  5 83%  4 67%  5 83%  7 78%  9 75%</td>
<td>9 69%  4 50%  2 50%  6 75%  13 62%  8 67%</td>
<td>16 76%  21 64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course/study group to clarify portfolio preparation for graduating students.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  B  C  D  AB  CD</td>
<td>1 33%  5 83%  2 33%  5 83%  6 67%  7 58%</td>
<td>6 46%  3 38%  3 75%  6 75%  9 43%  9 75%</td>
<td>13 62%  18 55%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website or a handbook where students can find answers to frequently asked questions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A  B  C  D  AB  CD</td>
<td>1 33%  5 83%  5 83%  6 100%  6 67%  8 67%</td>
<td>11 85%  5 63%  2 50%  7 88%  16 76%  9 75%</td>
<td>14 67%  26 79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4.5—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique Features</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written guidelines for students on portfolio preparation.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer review of portfolios.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate committee made up of professors and school administrators to evaluate portfolios.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culminating interviews with peers, faculty, and potential employers to review portfolios.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of portfolios by practitioners in the field of Educational Administration.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program B

Addressed competencies. Students in Program B start preparing their portfolios in their first course and continue through their entire program. All artifacts selected and collected for portfolios should demonstrate student understanding and personal growth in the learner-centered proficiencies for school administrators listed in the state requirements, and specifically in seven areas: values and ethics of leadership, leadership and campus culture, human resources leadership and management, communications and community relations, organizational leadership and management, curriculum planning and development, and instructional leadership and management. These proficiencies collectively represent the educational leadership program knowledge base, which forms the basis of the master’s degree and certification program in educational leadership for this university.

What competencies should be addressed in portfolios, as perceived by Program B faculty and students. All faculty in Program B agreed that such competencies as curriculum and instruction, diversity, ethics, human resources, parent and community relations, political and regulatory environment, site-based management, and technology should be addressed in portfolios. All students would like to address in their portfolios their competencies in curriculum and instruction and ethics. Abilities to work with parent and community members and exercise transformational leadership were mentioned by 88% of students. Students would like to also include such areas as ability to work with special populations and be able to demonstrate and build leadership and campus culture. Please see Table 4.6 for a detailed description of findings for Program B and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

Program C

Addressed competencies. Faculty members in Program C expect their students to progress in achieving ISLLC standards and their college and program objectives: (1) facilitating the vision as demonstrated by developing and implementing strategic plans, system theory, data collection and analysis, effective communication, and consensus building; (2) building school culture and instructional programs, (3) managing the school organization, its operations and resources, (4) collaborating with and engaging members of the community, (5) performing all
activities with ethics and integrity, and (6) understanding different publics and their political, social, economic, legal, and cultural contexts. These standards are also incorporated into the State Law as the basis for licensure and have been identified as the competencies to guide administrative practice. Professors would like to see their students “as reflective scholars and practitioners, moral, ethical, and principle leaders, decision makers, and creative problem solvers” (FI-C-1). Major competency areas also incorporate four themes of the college: ethics, diversity, knowledge, and technology.

What areas/competencies should be addressed in portfolios, as perceived by Program C faculty and students. Faculty members in Program C were less unanimous than those in Programs A and B. They mentioned diversity and ethics (both 83%) among the most important competencies to be addressed in portfolios. Curriculum and instruction, student services, technology, and school law were mentioned by 67% of student participants. Please see Table 4.6 for a detailed description of findings for Program C and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

Program D

Addressed competencies. According to faculty members in this program, they expect their graduates to be able to perform activities applicable to job responsibilities of school administrators. Since the Program D curriculum and portfolio are based on ISLLC standards, similar to Program C, students are expected to achieve all six ISLLC standards: “[our state] was one of the leading states in developing ISSLC standard and the SLE exam, National Certification Exam. We are really focused on ISLLC standards and it is exactly what our portfolio and program are built around” (FI-D-2) and “…the ISLLC standards, we feel, will be the best way to show that he has developed as an educational leader through our program. Because each standard has criteria, objectives, knowledge, disposition, and performance” (FI-D-1). Such areas are emphasized: student learning, instructional leadership, human resources management, physical resources management, fiscal resources management, public relations, principals of organization, public school law, human relations and group dynamics, teaching and learning philosophy, leadership philosophy and practices, and school culture and professional growth.
What areas/competencies should be addressed in portfolios, as perceived by Program D faculty and students. All faculty agreed that transformational leadership should be definitely addressed in student portfolios. Six other competencies received an equal support of 83%: diversity, ethics, parent and community relations, political and regulatory environment, student assessment, and student services. All students considered that portfolios should address parent and community relations. Other areas mentioned included curriculum and instruction, student assessment, technology, and school finance. Please see Table 4.6 for a detailed description of findings for Program D and all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

Perceptions of Programs A, B, C, and D Faculty and Students Regarding Educational Leadership Area/Competencies that Should Be Addressed in Portfolios

Out of 13 areas mentioned in Item 2 of the survey (Appendix J and L), the area of curriculum and instruction was mentioned by 81% of the faculty and 94% of the student participants. The second area that was considered as significant to be addressed in portfolios by 81% of the faculty and 88% of the students was parent and community relations. Technology was mentioned by 81% of faculty and 76% of students. School finance was the area with the least popularity to be addressed by portfolios. Faculty members mentioned that they realized that not all course projects would end up in portfolios or present a valuable piece of evidence of mastery. In case of school finance, it was indicated that this area should be represented by inclusion of a developed school budget rather than by a display of solved sample problems. It was also mentioned that “all of these are important. Some projects or artifacts may reflect more than one competency” (FI-C-1). Please see Table 4.6 for a detailed description of findings by program (A, B, C, and D), groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

In summary, faculty members identified the following top five Educational Leadership/Administration competencies or areas that should be addressed by student portfolios: (1) diversity and ethics, (2) curriculum and instruction, parent and community relations, technology, and transformational leadership, (3) human resources and student assessment, (4)
political and regulatory environment and student services, and (5) school law. Though placing them in a different order, students identified the same competencies and areas they thought portfolios should address.

**Research Question 5. What are the structural components of portfolios (content) that are used for the final demonstration of knowledge and competencies in programs in Educational Leadership/Administration? What is the rationale for those content categories?**

To answer this research question, I used the data from three sources: interviews, on-line surveys (Appendix D, Item 7), and documents provided by the programs. The latter included actual student portfolios, written faculty guidelines to students, and checklists. All findings are presented by program. I also include faculty and student perceptions on what should be included in portfolios (Appendices J and L, Item 1).

**Program A**

**Current components.** Faculty members advise their students both through written guidelines and course syllabi about “documents, papers, articles, certificates, projects, letters, work samples, test scores, and/or other materials which have been specifically selected for a particular purpose or need” (CA-A-1). Students begin compiling their portfolios during the first semester of course work and continue building the portfolio throughout the entire program of study with certain milestones to be achieved and certain artifacts to be developed or collected towards a future portfolio. Students are to present artifacts that represent their best work:

…The ones that make me look the best, the ones in which I was the most successful, the ones that I have an actual documentation to show what I’ve done to be able to pull the minutes of the meetings I conducted, or programs that I’d set up. Things that really define what I did, some programs that were in place in my school…. (SI-A-210)

Student portfolios in Program A contain at least four parts: (1) individual development, (2) knowledge base, (3) professional development, and (4) community involvement. An individual development section includes a resume, autobiography, and professional and personal goals. Students are provided with a template “to insure that all vital professional information about the emerging administrator” (CA-A-1) are included in their portfolios.
Table 4.6

*Educational Leadership Areas/Competencies that Should Be Addressed in Portfolios (Appendices J and L, Item 2)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational leadership competences</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th></th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>CD</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>AB</td>
<td>CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethics</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parent and community relations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political and regulatory environment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Site-based management</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 4.6—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational leadership competences</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School law</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School finance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The autobiography is used to “help trigger memories about one’s personal life which became the foundation of one’s professional self” (CA-A-1). Students are encouraged to recognize both negative and positive experiences. These student life experiences become ”strengths and confidence boosters in the emerging administrator’s professional growth and development” (CA-A-1).

Another component of this section is establishing specific, attainable, and measurable professional and personal goals for students to practice and later in their careers to be able to “identify, develop, and attain organizational goals” with their staff (CA-A-1). Faculty members mentor students while they are working on these projects. During their upcoming semesters in the program, students expand their resumes according to several samples they are given. Students “are encouraged to develop a resume style which supports their individual character, although the vital professional information” of the previously given template should be maintained (CA-A-1).

Another big piece of this portfolio section comes during students’ third semester. Students are to develop an education platform as a written representation of their practice as a professional educator. Students and faculty agree that this section is useful as it gives students an opportunity to think precisely and clearly about their values and beliefs. Later they can use this educational platform in job interviews and in their professional careers as administrators.

The second section of the portfolio contains a knowledge base, e.g., “documentation of the student professional competency” (CA-A-1) and highlights of accomplishments of the emerging administrator. Typically, students include their administrative field work, samples of professional writing, evidence of involvement in professional organizations, class and professional presentations, grant proposals, and other artifacts, which demonstrate their administrative skills:

And this is their accomplishment in the craft of administration, and included may be papers they included from the class, if they had worked up schedules in their school, anything that documented their expertise in the field. So, these are things they can take to the job interview and say: “See, I was a principal for the day and see what I did, and here I was a principal for six months and what I did, I was a curriculum director for my school, and resource teacher and here are accomplishments of what I did”. Those are administrative tasks they can document in the portfolio in the second section. (FI-A-3)
The third section deals with professional development issues. Students are expected to include in this section any documentation “of efforts the student is making toward professional growth” (CA-A-1). This section is linked to the first section where professional goals are stated. These goals “identify the types of professional activities the students and the mentor feel should become a part of their professional training and ongoing growth as an administrator” (CA-A-1). Typically students include an annotated bibliography of professional reading, professional course work, materials from attended workshops and conferences. The rationale for this section is to “demonstrate application for the student and selected audiences of a philosophy of the life long learning” (CA-A-1).

The final section of student portfolios contains evidence of student involvement in community services. Students are encouraged to provide evidence of service and community involvement beyond their scope of contractual duties. Students usually include artifacts on their coaching and mentoring children, teaching in their churches, and volunteering on building projects. Letters of appreciation for services, articles in local newspapers, or newsletters are often in this section. The rationale for this section is the notion that individuals involved in community building efforts in one community will probably be involved in similar activities in a new community. Boards of Education, who usually make final administrative hiring decisions, generally prefer candidates who will represent the school district in community building activities. (CA-A-1)

Another faculty member indicated that he tried to get across to students that if you show you were involved in your old community people would see you will be involved in a new community, e.g., work with boy clubs, girl clubs, this kind of things. So, any letters of recognition, any signs, any evidence they have to show they were involved in community, various activities would go into this section. So this [portfolio] shows a well-rounded individual. (FI-A-3)

While students progress through the program, they update portfolio artifacts, consult with faculty members regarding professional growth and improvement of portfolios. Students also have an opportunity to communicate with their peers regarding portfolios, share their concerns, and offer suggestions. In their last semester, students package their portfolio, make them presentable, prepare for the culminating presentation of their portfolios, or decide to “take select items out and create a what we call a demonstration portfolio, and they can take it to the job interview. We had several students who had done that and they were very successful” (FI-A-3).
The individual development section begins to make sense because everything students need to apply for a job is already gathered and updated. The knowledge base section provides evidence of their competency of administrative skill. Students are able to speak with profound confidence because they have evidence of successful accomplishments, which demonstrate how students in their school have benefited from their leadership. The professional development section provides specific evidence of individual learning and growth, documented and ready to present in their letter of application and as part of their job interview. Finally, students are thankful that they have begun to document and collect evidence of community involvement. This makes a strong candidate even stronger as they apply for that first administrative position. (CA-A-1)

**What structural components should be included in student portfolios, as perceived by Program A faculty and students.** Faculty members in Program A unanimously agreed that an introduction with an overview of a student portfolio, student’s program of study, student’s personal section with vita or resume, student’s transcript, simulation and/or an authentic project to solve a real educational problem, justification for selecting each product, reflection piece(s) for competencies, practicum or internship projects and reflections, and leadership development plan (goals and plan of actions for further professional development) should be included in student portfolios. Interestingly, that faculty (33%, the minimum for this item) and students (77% the maximum for this item) presented absolutely opposite opinions regarding including letters of recommendation from faculty and/or employers. Students favored least the inclusion of a justification for selecting each product (23%). Please see Table 4.7 for a detailed description of findings for Program D and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

Students also mentioned that they would like to have a section in their portfolios where they can put any artifacts of their choice:

Maybe I would put in pictures or additional projects or professional publications, other things that would highlight who I am, rather than simply what the purpose was at the university. But personal highlights of more of my work. Because I do not know where I can put that. I think it is what I am eventually going to do. Because I am going to keep this, and I then I will be able to add to that… personal accomplishments or programs I did at school, or things I want to brag about if I go for the interview. I would add personal things to it. (SI-A-203)
Program B

**Current components.** The program B portfolio represents an extensive record of student progress and growth, evidenced by a collection of carefully selected artifacts produced as original course work by the student and combined with a leadership framework, statements of five-year professional goals, and self-reflection. The leadership framework consists of seven components:

1. Philosophy of education
2. Philosophy of leadership
3. Vision of learners
4. Vision of teachers
5. Vision for the organization
   - Climate
   - Community
   - Collaboration
   - Communication
6. Vision for professional growth
7. Method of vision attainment
   - Decision making
   - Encouragement, initiation, and facilitation of change
   - Support during change

All portfolios also include a table of content, an introduction to the portfolio, and a student resume. Students have the option of creating a portfolio in a paper, electronic, or web-based format. The paper-based academic portfolio should be submitted in a three-ring binder no larger than three inches. One of the students explained how she organized the content of her portfolio:

…My portfolio had a table of contents, acknowledgements for people at the University, some quotes on what I thought my philosophy was. We put in our resumes, our vitas, our framework, the five-year professional goal, different reflections that went along with the individual goal. I put in one overall reflection that talked about the whole course [of study]. I put in the first goal reflection about that and something that I thought symbolized meeting that goal. Then I went through each of the eight goals in the program, and I would put in a reflection and one artifact from one of the classes that met
those goals for the most part. Those were papers that we wrote for that class, and the class was set to meet one of the goals. (SI-B-302)

Artifacts and reflections are the significant part of student portfolios. The rationale for including reflections was to nurture students to become reflective school administrators: “… the heart of the portfolio is the reflection. Of course, we need to have artifacts and reflections” (FI-B-1). The leadership framework “needed to be there because it is their [student] first real reflection”.

Students are expected to analyze their strengths and weaknesses and develop five-year professional goals: “We know that people who accomplish things are goal setters. So, we think it is important for students to develop a habit of thinking through what their goals are. Transforming…what it is that I am going to do” (FI-B-2). Students are encouraged to include their program of study “because we also use portfolios for entering the program for the first 12-15 hours and for culminating, the faculty, of course, would like to see student transcripts there…” (FI-B-1). One of the faculty members shared:

In one of the introductory courses, students learn how to develop a professional resume: We found that most of our students did not have any experience writing a resume. We wanted them to include the resume in their academic portfolio and it also gives us insights when we look at them and when a student presents the portfolio and talks a little bit about themselves, it kind of helps us to understand more where they are coming from, what types of leadership experiences they have. The portfolio is very individualized and it helps us to individualize our assessment of the students. (FI-B-2)

**What structural components should be included in student portfolios, as perceived by Program B faculty and students.** All faculty members in this program would like to see in student portfolios an introduction with an overview of a student portfolio, a student transcript, simulation and/or an authentic project to solve a real educational problem, justification for selecting each product, reflection piece(s) for competencies, student self-assessment of competencies, and practicum or internship projects and reflections. Similar to the Program A faculty, they favored letters of recommendation least among all other components (50%). Students, however, would like to include in their portfolios their personal section with vita or resume (100%), reflection piece(s) for all competencies required for portfolios (100%), introduction with an overview of their portfolio (88%), standards or competencies with artifacts to demonstrate their achievements (88%), justification for selecting each product (88%),
practicum or internship projects and reflections (88%), and a leadership development plan (88%). Both faculty and students in Program B split equally in their opinion regarding letters of recommendation. Please see Table 4.7 for details. The faculty recommended including a leadership framework in student portfolios. Students would like to add to their portfolios a work history and a list of duties from the past, and also letters of appreciations from parents, students, and other stakeholders: “work history, list of duties in the past, video clips of field-based experiences….Include anything one can be proud of: any developed instruments, attitudinal surveys, publications, presentations, etc.” (SI-B-300). Another suggestion from the faculty member was to include a feedback section in portfolio:

You know what I would add? It is an evaluator’s section. For whoever looks at it, like a webpage, e.g., when you go Barnes & Nobles and they say what are the comments about this book, some little evaluation section by a reader. Some feedback…it can just be something “visit my website and e-mail me what you think about my portfolio”. And you are going to get negative and positive thoughts, but it is always helpful. It alters your attitude, does not matter how many titles you have. It is attitude how you take growth on a daily basis…. (SI-B-310)

Program C

Current components. Program C portfolios are organized into seven sections. Portfolios open with an introductory section with acknowledgments and a table of content. Sections 1-6 focus on six ISSLC standards and include one-page introduction to each of six standards accompanied by artifacts to demonstrate their skills. Each artifact should “demonstrate and portray one’s growth/development in the knowledge and dispositions of the specific standard” (CA-C-1). At least one project should be selected for each standard. The recommended number of artifacts to include is 8-12. Artifacts may be referenced in more than one section. Typically, portfolios include original student materials with evident professor comments, and also might include any revised versions if required by student advisors as “evidence of continued scholarly and academic growth” (CA-C-1). As one of the students shared:

…The most decisive factor was to select papers that I knew were well done and I did not have to make many corrections on them. Also, those that had professors’ comments on them—“this is very good”, “perfect paper”, those kinds of things. Also, the different themes throughout the portfolio, broken up through ISLLC standards, determined what I was going to put into there. (SI-C-292)
Section 7 is a personal narrative that “explains and delineates student development in the core components of professional practice and scholarship” (CA-C-1). In essence, it is an essay-summary connecting ISLLC standards, college mission, program objectives, and student experiences in the program. This narrative is to be supported by references to the literature and publications and also to the introductory essays and artifacts in previous six sections. Faculty members consider reflections to be essential to portfolios as they see one of their tasks in “cultivating professional educators who are reflective scholars and practitioners” (FI-C).

Students make decisions about their artifact selections with the help of their advisors:

Students select what papers they want to put in [to portfolio]. They also meet with their advisors. They come in. I tell them bring me the best 10-12 artifacts, put a post note on them, why you think they demonstrate…just write from the top of your head why and what ISLLC standard they demonstrate and decide what folder or section of portfolio it should go in. I kind of try and challenge them saying I do not think so, what this or that has to do with this standard…sometimes they change their mind. Sometimes students are quite competent, so they will bring the folder they have already produced and I just take a look at them and say this goes better to this section. So, students select [artifacts] themselves. So, part of it is a learning process. (FI-C-2)

**What structural components should be included in student portfolios, as perceived by Program C faculty and students.** A total of 83% of the faculty members in this program considered that simulation and/or an authentic project to solve a real educational problem, standards or competencies with artifacts to demonstrate their achievement, and justification for selecting each product should be structural components of portfolios. This program was the only one where faculty members unanimously thought that neither student program of study nor leadership development plan should be included in student portfolios. In contrast, students in this program indicated that they should include both their program of study together with portfolios (100%) and a leadership development plan (75%). Students unanimously mentioned that they should include an introduction to the portfolio, standards or competencies with artifacts to demonstrate their achievement, justification for selecting each product, and reflection piece(s) for competencies. With the same uniformity, but quite differently, none of the Program C students thought they should include their transcripts. Please see Table 4.7 for a detailed description of findings for Program D and also all other programs, groups (group AB using
portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

**Program D**

**Current components.** The program D portfolio is based on ISLLC standards and students are expected to complete and present in their portfolios activities that would promote their mastery of competencies and achievement of standards. Students are encouraged to enclose in their portfolios 10 required projects, and then students can also include 10 other projects of their choice “and all of them are related to student achievement, budgeting, managing, evaluation, student activities, special education… All these components are worked out throughout the coursework and … are geared toward all components that an administrator will face in the school” (FI-D-1). Another faculty member shared:

…Some of the portfolio pieces are not just management. There is a fairly large part of the portfolio that is a school development plan and projects tied to state improvement that a state has and the development of the comprehensive school improvement plan. There is also a project on student assessment and program assessment that is very important for an instructional leader to know how to evaluate the data and decide on pieces of data, and so on…And the ever present mission of the district, and also on how to direct a meeting and lead change. (FI-D-3)

Students include “…projects…into portfolio and they are also quite reflective in nature. They do some activities and then they reflect back what they did particularly well and what they could have done differently” (FI-D-2). I reviewed two portfolios prepared by students. Both contained projects in the following areas: planning and enabling, pupil management, conflict analysis and resolution, use of technology, budget, staffing/scheduling, personnel selection, vision, physical plant, health and safety, and conducting performance evaluation. Each section of the portfolio opened with a brief description and value of the project that contained some elements of student reflections. All these areas are linked and referenced to ISSLC standards. One of the students shared how she approached the development and selection of artifacts for her portfolio:

…Basically, this [development of artifacts] is the thing in my school I felt needed to be changed. That is the first thing I looked at. Because so much of our stuff was outdated… I worked very closely with my principal and they have let me to everything. I was able to step in those shoes, and do everything—this is how I wanted my course book to look like,
this is how I wanted the master schedule to look like. I did it at some personal standpoint with the understanding that it was my high school. (SI-D-271)

What structural components should be included in student portfolios, as perceived by Program D faculty and students. All faculty members would like to see student transcripts in the portfolios. They also felt that an introduction with an overview of a student portfolio, justification for selecting each product, reflection piece(s) for competencies, student self-assessment of competencies, and practicum or internship projects and reflections should be also included in portfolios. Similar to Programs A and C, these faculty members were least interested in letters of recommendations. All students were sure that they should include a personal section with vita and resume and, similar to students in Programs B and C, reflection narratives for competencies. These students also indicated that the inclusion of their transcripts would not be essential for portfolios, similar to students in Program B (38%).

Perceptions of Program A, B, C, and D Faculty and Students Regarding Structural Components in Portfolios

When I asked faculty and students about their opinion on structural components of portfolios, I realized that the most important for 90% of the faculty and 82% of the students was a written justification for selecting each product in one’s portfolio. Reflections for addressed competencies were mentioned by 81% of the faculty and 85% of the students. A total of 86% of the faculty and 79% of the students agreed on the significance of inclusion of an introduction with an overview of a student portfolio. One of the students in Program B clarified that this introduction needs “to provide an overview of each individual student portfolio and how it is unique to him/her” (SS-B). Letters of recommendation from faculty and/or employees were considered to be necessary only by 29% of the faculty and 61% of the students.

As for the inclusion of other items, some reflections connecting student learning and performance to “institutional conceptual framework” (FS-C-33) and program objectives were mentioned more often by faculty members. Students would like to include in their portfolios “work history and a list of duties in the past” (SI-B-300), “thank you notes from parents, students, etc.”, and “other types of organizational pieces like a table of contents” (SS-B-308).

In summary, the faculty perceived that the following top five structural components should be included in portfolios: (1) simulation or authentic project to solve an educational
problem and justification for selecting each product, (2) introduction with an overview of a
student portfolio and student transcript, (3) reflections on competencies, (4) standards with
artifacts demonstrating their achievement and practicum/internship projects and reflections, and
(5) student self-assessment of competencies. Students added to this list a student personal section
with vita or resume and letters of recommendations. Please see Table 4.7 for a detailed
description of findings by program (A, B, C, and D), group (group AB using portfolios for more
than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all
faculty and student participants.

**Research Question 6. How are the portfolios evaluated?**

Interviews and content analysis of documents provided answers to this research question. I also inquired what perceptions faculty and students had regarding portfolio evaluation, grades assigned to portfolios, formal portfolio defense/presentation, and people that should attend these presentations. A series of questions (Appendices J and L, Items 5-10) in the faculty and student web-based questionnaires and interviews provided data for this important question. Survey findings on portfolio evaluation by program (A, B, C, and D), group (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants are presented in Tables 4.8-4.12.

**Program A**

**Portfolio evaluation.** Though almost all artifacts in Program A portfolios have been graded by individual instructors, student portfolios are evaluated as a whole:

At this point we evaluate pretty much as each individual professor assigns the topics. For example, the individual development section, a good part of that happens during their first semester where they develop their resume, gather their information, and they are actually graded on that part of it. In their second semester, they write for one of the professors a journal article and they write their autobiography. And they begin developing their course work and artifacts, and coursework. In my semester, when they do an [education] platform. I grade the platform. It is kind of graded as they go along, but not every single thing. In student final semester, that’s when I read the portfolios also and ….my job is to give them a complete feedback on this. On what I did, I gave them informal feedback. And all I did I gave them credit/not credit. Everybody basically got credit because everyone has done all the work. And I just wanted to make sure that the portfolio looked good. Now we are moving towards a more of a rubric model. (FI-A-2)
Table 4.7

Recommended Structural Components of Portfolios as Perceived by Faculty and Students (Appendices J and L, Item 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendations for structural components of portfolios</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction with an overview of a student portfolio.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s program of study.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s personal section with vita or resume.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student’s transcript.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulation and/or an authentic project to solve a real</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>educational problem.</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards or competencies with artifacts to demonstrate</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their achievement.</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justification for selecting each product.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflection piece(s) for competencies.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student self-assessment of competencies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practicum or internship projects and reflections.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership development plan</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letters of recommendation from faculty and/or employers.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Point equivalents to a letter grade are assigned to reviewed portfolio (5 = A+; 4 = A; 3 = B). Faculty members grade portfolios on a basis of three criteria: (1) appearance and organization, (2) content, and (3) reflection. “Each criterion is assessed using these references:

N. I.--needs improvement
3--Good technical competence
4--Above and beyond technical competence
5-- Evidence that the student has extraordinary technical competence and has social purposes larger than her or his own” (CA-A-4). Students have a formal presentation of their portfolios.

One of the faculty members mentioned that

[I] personally check each page, each word. And I pay particular attention to reflections. I am asking for reflection for the whole portfolio. I used to ask for reflection on each section of portfolio and I got away from that. I only require reflection for the whole portfolio and I read it very carefully. They receive feedback throughout the year. Each item in the portfolio has a deadline for returning to me. I look into this and I tell students you need this or you need another thing. I praise something that is very good. At the very end, when I receive everything, I provide feedback in writing. I write directly in portfolio in my handwriting and I write a document addressing each particular item in quantitative and qualitative ways. (FI-A-1)

How portfolios should be evaluated, as perceived by Program A faculty and students. All faculty members agreed that portfolios would be graded as a whole and either a pass/fail or satisfactory/unsatisfactory grade (both 67%) should be assigned to portfolios. A total of 77% of the students also were in agreement with grading portfolios as a whole. Students and faculty had less agreement on whether students formally should be present their portfolios: 100% of the faculty and only 23% of the students were for this idea. As for those who should attend a formal presentation, 100% of the faculty suggested that committee members, major professor, and potential employers are significant. The majority of 67% of the faculty mentioned that feedback to students should be given in writing within the portfolio, while 62% of the students were more in favor of receiving feedback in writing, but on a separate form attached to the portfolio. The majority of faculty (67%) and students (46%) indicated that students should take part in the assessment of their competencies and should conduct a self-assessment through written reflections enclosed in student portfolios. Please see Tables 4.8-4.12 for a detailed
description of findings by program (A, B, C, and D), group (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

Program B

**Portfolio evaluation.** Similar to Program A, portfolios in this program are graded and evaluated as a whole. Students are responsible for preparing and scheduling with their committee a day for a formal oral presentation of their portfolios. The committee, comprised of two faculty members and a practicing administrator, “grade the portfolio based on a rubric established by the faculty” (CA-B). The rubric and grading sheet are presented in Appendix R. The following criteria are taken into consideration: (1) quality of writing and content, as demonstrated by a correct APA formatting of all the documents, (2) relevance and documentation of artifacts and reflections to the specified standards, (3) meaningfulness, as evidenced through reflections including specified components, and (4) relevancy of all content to “current theory and sound philosophy” and “maturity of thought” (CA-B-2). As one of the faculty members shared:

> We have developed a rubric and we think it is really critical and very helpful. The students have a copy of it from the very beginning. So, they know exactly how their portfolios will be evaluated. We think it is critical, and as we use it for entry level portfolios and culminating portfolios, we just use the rubric that the students receive in their very first course, in what we call “Master’s Handbook”. They know how this portfolio is going to be evaluated at the very moment they begin the portfolio and it is very important to them—they need to know that. (FI-B-1)

There are four options for assigning the grade to student portfolios: pass without the revision, pass with minor revisions by date indicated, pass with major revisions by date indicated, and no pass. A practicing school administrator also completes a review form and provides suggestions for improvement, as needed. He/she can make recommendations to the committee to accept a student portfolio, accept after recommended revisions are completed, or not accept a portfolio at all. A final form is completed by the committee chair with a brief report on when the portfolio presentation took place, what recommendations were made, and whether the student passed, passed with major/minor revisions, or did not pass.

Students present their portfolios as a part of their comprehensive examination. Committee members and any faculty member in the program can attend portfolio presentations. A typical presentation of a portfolio consists of a brief oral description by the student of the artifacts and
reflections “contained in the portfolio, followed by a discussion with faculty regarding the student’s personal learning, and future development plans” (CA-B). Students are advised to limit their presentations to 20 minutes. Students are given feedback orally during the defense and in writing on separate forms filled by the committee chair (Appendix S) and a practicing school administrator (Appendix T). The committee may request retaining a copy of one’s portfolio in the department. Immediately after their portfolio presentation, students complete a form to evaluate themselves and the program (Appendix U).

**How portfolios should be evaluated, as perceived by Program B faculty and students.** Only 1 faculty member and 2 students in Program B considered that each product in the portfolio should be evaluated and graded separately. Approximately one-third of both faculty and students agreed that each competency should be evaluated and graded separately. All faculty and 63% of the students thought that portfolios should be graded as a whole. One student mentioned that “the grade for a portfolio really cannot be bad because of the different backgrounds we all have. Organization is the key, and the more creativity in organizing the portfolio should be considered” (SS-B). A total of 67% of the faculty members would like to assign a pass/fail grade for student portfolios. However, 63% of the students thought that they would prefer to be evaluated on a scale, e.g., from excellent to poor. Both faculty and students unanimously agreed that portfolios should be formally presented. As one of the students mentioned, “I think that it is important for a student to have an opportunity to verbalize reflections about the portfolio” (SS-B).

A majority of faculty (83%) and students (75%) were sure that committee members should attend student presentations and give feedback to students during their defense (100% of the faculty and 88% of the students). A majority of faculty (85%) would like students to conduct a self-assessment through a self-assessment instrument that is a part of their portfolio. However, the majority of students (88%) indicated that students should take part in the assessment of their competencies and should conduct a self-assessment through written reflections enclosed in student portfolios. Please see Tables 4.8-4.12 for a detailed description of findings by program (A, B, C, and D), group (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.
Program C

**Portfolio evaluation.** As one faculty member in Program C mentioned, they really use three types of evaluation: each product in the portfolio is evaluated and graded separately, each competency is evaluated and graded separately, and, finally, the portfolio is evaluated as a whole: “Really all three. Advisors work with students to get the best artifacts and assist students in getting those artifacts to support competencies and provide an overall quality to the portfolio” (FS-C). Before other committee members see a student portfolio, it is thoroughly checked by a student advisor and discussed with a student. A pass/fail grade is assigned to student portfolios. One of the faculty members took the initiative and developed a rubric for evaluating student portfolios. The current rubric (Appendix V) is the second version of the initial one: “The first one we were using was too light, too general. So we have developed a rubric that all evaluators use for evaluation of …master’s portfolios” (FI-C-3).

This rubric and rating sheet are modeled after ISLLC standards and “…something similar with ETS rubric they sent together with entry level principalship materials” where there are “…rubrics for each standards and they break it down into components”. It is a model that is used “…to help administrators to think how to evaluate site-based administrators. Several districts in the area use this template for district evaluations” (FI-C-2). Students are evaluated against the ISLLC standards and their knowledge, dispositions, and performance can be rated either as rudimentary, developing, proficient, or accomplished. Each of these ratings has the following checklist items:

- understands this standard
- has connected the College of Education themes and this standard
- has envisioned application of this standard in performance/practice
- has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).

When this is done, each faculty member assessing a portfolio is to complete a summary rating for Sections 1-6. Section 7 of a portfolio, which is personal narrative, is also evaluated as other sections, but on the basis of evidence “that the student demonstrated growth and commitment to the core components of professional practice and scholarship: knowledge, technology, diversity, and ethic” (CA-C-2). A “little evidence” is considered as rudimentary,
“limited” as developing, “clear” as proficient, and “clear, convincing, and consistent” as accomplished.

Academic conventions are rated on the basis of spelling, punctuation, usage, grammar, capitalization, and paragraphing, and the number of errors in the text. Each faculty member is to complete an overall rating of the portfolio, sign, and date the rating sheet. The summary rating of the portfolio can be considered as one of the following:

- **Rudimentary**—demonstration of professional development and/or demonstration of only rudimentary growth.
- **Developing**—demonstration of professional development and/or demonstration of some, limited growth.
- **Proficient**—demonstration of professional development to a clear level of proficiency in professional knowledge, disposition, and performance.
- **Accomplished**—demonstration of professional development to a clear, convincing, and consistent level of proficiency in professional knowledge, disposition, and performance.

**How portfolios should be evaluated, as perceived by Program C faculty and students.** All faculty members, but only 25% of the students, considered that each competency should be evaluated and graded separately. At the same time, all students would prefer to have their portfolios evaluated and graded as a whole. Both 75% of the faculty and students agreed that overall portfolios should be evaluated as pass/fail. A total of 83% of the professors thought that students should not orally present their portfolios: “We rejected this option due to potential unavailability of reviewers, scheduling problems, too many students, too little time for oral defenses. Besides, they have orally defended with their major professor already” (FS-C).

Half of the students would not like to present their portfolios formally. None of the students thought that they would like to have any student or potential employers present during their portfolio presentation. At the same time, one of the students mentioned that “… it is important to have opinions from all stakeholders” (SS-C). As for feedback given to students, 83% of the faculty members would prefer to give feedback to students in writing, on a separate form attached to a portfolio. Students (75%) would prefer to receive feedback either on a separate form attached to a portfolio or as comments within the portfolio. A majority of faculty
(67%) and students (75%) indicated that students should take part in the assessment of their competencies and should conduct a self-assessment through written reflections enclosed in student portfolios. Please see Tables 4.8-4.12 for a detailed description of findings for Program C and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.

**Program D**

**Portfolio evaluation.** Portfolios in Program D are evaluated by a faculty panel usually consisting of three people. They examine student portfolio, discuss student progress and achievements, and make a decision about student knowledge, dispositions, and performance indicators based of the ISLLC standards. Each standard is scored separately (Appendix W) and the following points can be assigned:

- 3--clear, consistent, and convincing
- 2--clear, but possibly uneven in depth and scope
- 1--limited in depth and scope
- 0--little or no evidence.

As the master’s program coordinator mentioned,

…We follow a rubric and it starts with completion, evidence of completion, how well organized it is, what information is there... We want a variety of samples of work. We want a good writing. We want to be sure that they have a reflection part at the beginning of the project, a reflection sheet of their thoughts when they finish it. Wholeness of the portfolio, appearance, spelling, of course, professionalism, evidence of each of the projects and each of the activities. (FI-D-1)

Additionally, a portfolio is scored on a scale from 1 to 5 (5 –exceptional, 4—above average, 3—average, 2—below average, 1--poor) using the following criteria (Appendix X):

- Evidence provided on competency completion
- Well-organized
- Includes appropriate information on school improvement project
- Includes a variety of work (forms, memos, agendas, etc.)
- Shows clarity of writing
- Shows conciseness of writing
Uses correct grammar
Is persuasive
Uses correct spelling
Looks neat and professional
Materials are current
Supportive evidence for narrative is provided

After a student presentation, the major advisor is to file a form (Appendix Y) to verify that the student has “successfully completed the Master’s Comprehensive Exam over knowledge, dispositions and performance standards that school leaders must possess” (CA-D-4). All professors who “served on the review panel and concur that the candidate successfully completed the exam” sign this form (CA-D-4).

How portfolios should be evaluated, as perceived by Program D faculty and students. A total of 83% of the faculty members and 100% of the students considered that portfolios should be evaluated and graded as a whole. There was no consensus among faculty or students regarding what grade system to be used for portfolios. Both faculty (100%) and students (75%) mentioned that portfolios should be orally and formally presented. All faculty members and a majority of students (75%) indicated that committee members should attend portfolio presentations. A total of 83% of the faculty would prefer to give students feedback in writing on a separate form attached to the portfolio. However, 63% of the students would like to get it orally during their portfolio defense. A majority of faculty (83%) would like students to conduct a self-assessment through written reflections enclosed in student portfolios. However, half of the students indicated that they should take part in the assessment of their competencies and should conduct a self-assessment through a self-assessment instrument that is a part of portfolio assessment. Please see Tables 4.8-4.12 for a detailed description of findings for Program D and also all other programs, groups (group AB using portfolios for more than five years and group CD using portfolios for less than five years), and total responses of all faculty and student participants.
How Portfolios Should Be Evaluated, as Perceived by Programs A, B, C, and D Faculty and Students

A majority of faculty (76%) and students (82%) supported the idea that portfolios should be evaluated and graded as a whole. There was no consensus among faculty and students regarding what grades should be assigned to portfolios: 57% of the faculty would prefer a pass/fail system and 36% of the students would like to be graded on a scale from excellent to poor. A majority of professors (76%) were in favor of oral portfolio defenses/presentations. Only 55% of students supported this practice. Faculty (76%) considered that committee members should attend portfolio presentations. Only 48% of the students would like this to happen. Many students mentioned that they would like to invite practicing school administrators to review their portfolios and their presentations and receive their feedback. A total of 76% of the faculty and 58% of the students thought that feedback on student portfolio should be given in writing, on a separate form attached to a portfolio.

In summary, all faculty and students considered that portfolios should be evaluated and graded as a whole, student should formally present their portfolios with a major professor and graduate committee members present, feedback should be given in writing, on a separate form attached to the portfolio, and students should conduct a self-assessment of the achieved competencies through written reflections enclosed in the portfolio. The only area that faculty and students differed in their opinions was grades to be assigned for student portfolios; faculty thought that a pass/fail grade would be appropriate and students would like to see a more differentiated grade on a scale, e.g., from poor to excellent. None of the faculty members indicated that there should be no self-assessment practices, though several students (15%) would like to avoid self-assessment.

Research Question 7. What lessons were learned by people involved in the portfolio implementation process?

According to interviewees, it was one of the most challenging questions of the interviews. I asked this questions to both faculty and students. Faculty members were asked to share their lessons learned as they would share them with a colleague who is exploring opportunities for portfolio implementations in his/her program. Students were asked to give advice to their hypothetical fellow student who was just about to start working on his/her
### Table 4.8

**Perceptions of Faculty and Students Regarding Student Oral Portfolio Defense or Presentation (Appendices J and L, Item 5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oral Portfolio Defense</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td>AB CD</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td>AB CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3 6 1 6</td>
<td>9 7</td>
<td>3 6 2 5</td>
<td>9 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>75% 52% 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0 0 5 83%</td>
<td>0 0 5 42%</td>
<td>0 0 2 23%</td>
<td>0 0 2 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4.9

**Perceptions of Faculty and Students Regarding People Attending Student Portfolio Defense (Appendices J and L, Item 6)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendees</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td>AB CD</td>
<td>A B C D</td>
<td>AB CD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee members</td>
<td>3 5 2 6</td>
<td>8 8</td>
<td>3 6 2 5</td>
<td>9 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 83%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>75% 50% 63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major professor</td>
<td>3 3 1 4</td>
<td>6 5</td>
<td>5 2 2 4</td>
<td>7 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 50%</td>
<td>17% 67% 67%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>50% 50% 50% 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any faculty</td>
<td>2 3 3 0</td>
<td>5 3</td>
<td>1 4 2 0</td>
<td>5 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67% 50%</td>
<td>50% 56% 25%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100% 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any student</td>
<td>1 3 0 3</td>
<td>1 3</td>
<td>3 3 0 0</td>
<td>1 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33% 50%</td>
<td>11% 25%</td>
<td>8% 38%</td>
<td>19% 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential employers</td>
<td>3 0 3 1</td>
<td>0 2</td>
<td>0 1 2 1</td>
<td>0 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100% 17%</td>
<td>100% 33%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
<td>100% 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anybody can attend</td>
<td>1 0 1 1</td>
<td>1 1</td>
<td>0 0 0 0</td>
<td>2 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.10

Perceptions of Faculty and Students Regarding Feedback on Portfolios Given to Students (Appendices J and L, Item 7)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Orally during their defense.</td>
<td>2 67%</td>
<td>6 100%</td>
<td>1 17%</td>
<td>4 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 89%</td>
<td>5 42%</td>
<td>2 15%</td>
<td>7 88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 25%</td>
<td>5 63%</td>
<td>9 43%</td>
<td>6 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13 62%</td>
<td>15 45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In writing, on a separate form attached to the portfolio.</td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>5 83%</td>
<td>5 83%</td>
<td>5 83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 8%</td>
<td>4 50%</td>
<td>3 75%</td>
<td>3 50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4 16%</td>
<td>3 58%</td>
<td>7 43%</td>
<td>9 67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19 19%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In writing, as comments within the portfolio.</td>
<td>2 67%</td>
<td>2 33%</td>
<td>4 67%</td>
<td>1 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 44%</td>
<td>4 42%</td>
<td>5 31%</td>
<td>4 38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4 33%</td>
<td>7 58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.11

Perceptions of Faculty and Students Regarding Portfolio Evaluation /Grading (Appendices J and L, Item 8)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Each product in the portfolio is evaluated and graded separately.</td>
<td>0 17%</td>
<td>0 11%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
<td>2 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 14%</td>
<td>3 14%</td>
<td>3 8%</td>
<td>0 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each competency is evaluated and graded separately.</td>
<td>1 33%</td>
<td>2 33%</td>
<td>6 100%</td>
<td>1 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 58%</td>
<td>3 38%</td>
<td>1 25%</td>
<td>0 19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 48%</td>
<td>1 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.11—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A B C D AB CD</td>
<td>A B C D AB CD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio is evaluated and graded as a whole.</td>
<td>3 100% 5 83% 3 50% 5 83% 8 89% 8 67% 10 77% 5 63% 4 100% 8 100% 15 71% 12 100% 16 76% 27 82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12

*What Grades Should Be Assigned for Portfolios as Perceived by Faculty and Students (Appendices J and L, Item 9)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A B C D AB CD</td>
<td>A B C D AB CD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pass/Fail</td>
<td>2 67% 67% 3 38% 6 67% 6 50% 2 23% 1 13% 3 75% 3 38% 3 14% 6 50% 12 57% 9 27%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>2 67% 17% 0 25% 2 33% 3 17% 4 31% 2 25% 0 22% 2 6 17% 2 25% 5 24% 8 24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On a scale (e.g., from excellent to poor)</td>
<td>1 33% 17% 1 25% 1 25% 2 22% 3 25% 4 31% 5 63% 1% 2 25% 43% 25% 3 24% 5 36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In percentage (out of 100%)</td>
<td>0 25% 0 8% 0 25% 1 17% 2 25% 5% 2 8% 1 5% 10% 2 17% 2 10% 3 9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Letter equivalent</td>
<td>0 13% 0 8% 1 13% 0 10% 0 8% 1 5% 1 9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
portfolio. Some of the lessons learned came in the form of recommendations of things to avoid or reinforce and will be presented later is this chapter.

**Program A Lessons Learned**

Most often faculty members mentioned that portfolio assessment is a demanding process in terms of advising students on portfolio development and portfolio evaluation: “Number one is that it is very tiresome. Very demanding for faculty to read them all” (FI-A-1) and “My first semester I decided to read every single portfolio … I spent … What did I have in total? …. It took me about 35 hours to read them…” (FI-A-2).

A person who was involved in the initiation of portfolio assessment in Program A learned by his own experience that faculty commitment is imperative for the success of portfolios in the program: “Probably the first thing that comes to mind is to have all faculty on board. And to be able to communicate the purpose and get buy in from all the faculty. Because if you have 2-3 people doing this, another part not, then it is not successful. This is probably the most important thing” (FI-A-3).

As one of the faculty members summarized, there cannot be “one-fits-all model for students on how to develop portfolios: … some people want a recipe list on what to include. And I refuse to give that to them because it takes away the creativity and individuality from the process” (FI-A-3). Another faculty member mentioned that students should take charge of their portfolios: “it [portfolio assessment] is something valuable and very good to display part of the responsibility in evaluation toward the students. They feel that they are not bounded to one single day, panel, they have something theirs, valuable and they can add things out of their initiative” (FI-A-1).

Students also had something to share about their experiences and lessons learned. Saving all the projects and collecting all information were most important: “Save every piece of paper you get. I had a file set up ahead of time. Know that you need to collect [artifacts]. There is nothing more frustrating than trying to locate where is this thing I did last September. I would just keep an on-going file” (SI-A-210). Another frequent piece of advice was to stay focused and develop one’s portfolio over time, rather than immediately before the end of the program:

… Start the first semester and keep up with it. I had some friends that got behind and they tried to catch up things from the last semester… I do not know how to keep up with it if you do not stay up to date with it, with your course work. What I did, I started the first
semester they showed them [portfolios] to us, and I kept up with it every semester, and I think it made it meaningful for me, rather than doing it …later in the course. And may be each semester’s advisors or professors review the portfolio, it will force the student to keep up with it and make it meaningful to them, when they are doing their reflections to the 12th standards or putting the highlights of the class in there, you know, looking at the goals. You have to be really organized, stay updated with the program you are going through. Update your portfolio. (SI-A-203)

**Program B Lessons Learned**

Similar to the faculty in Program A, these faculty members learned that the portfolio process is a time consuming and a labor-intensive process. It is important to talk to students, explain benefits of portfolios to them, and get their commitment:

Time involved in this process, and we are clear about this upfront, it is labor and time intensive process to develop a portfolio. The more experience you have writing your reflections and putting your portfolio together, the easier it gets. It is time and labor intensive. Once in a while we have students who say to us, is it really worth the effort, is it really going to benefit me that much …Because it is time consuming. Of course, we are convinced it is worth it, students are convinced in it at the end, at least 90% are convinced at the end in its usefulness, and how it helped them, and how they feel they learned, etc. … (FI-B-1)

The most important lesson learned by the faculty in Program B was to constantly teach students to develop portfolios and be reflective: “The more experience you have writing your reflections and putting your portfolio together, the easier it gets” (FI-B-2). The same lesson about reflections was shared by one of the students: “a person [developing portfolio] is accountable only to self—need to be proactive and sincere in acknowledging internal weaknesses. Need to know how to reflect and act upon the reflection” (SI-B-300).

**Program C Lessons Learned**

One of the faculty members mentioned that “Portfolio process is confusing to students, they do not understand it” (FI-C-3). Lessons learned by the faculty in Program C can be summarized as follows: have assessment rubric and clear expectations, build faculty commitment, nurture students about portfolios, get student agreement to use their work for demonstration purposes, and have samples of exemplarily work. A faculty member remarked that:
You’ve got to have clear rubric and clear expectations. And faculty need to sit around with samples and decide what’s good and not good, and talk to resolve the disagreement, and agree upon that is what we expect and the quality we expect. (FI-C-2)

Lessons learned by students in this program were similar to lessons learned by students in all other programs: stay focused, be organized, and communicate often with your major professor. One student said:

Stay organized, keep all your work together, and at the beginning I think I was stressed, … keep in mind you will be doing this portfolio at the end, just start filing your different types under different sections of ISLLC standards. This way, when you come to the end, you can pull out that folder and pull out papers you are going to use for this particular section in your portfolio, and all you then have left is to decide what you are going to use for each section, rather than pulling through each class folder and deciding what you are going to use, and how this relates to ISLLC standard and how that relates to ISLLC standard….Also, it is also good to keep in contact with your major professor. Even once a year….(SI-C-292)

Program D Lessons Learned

Similar to the faculty in all other programs, faculty members in Program D learned that commitment and training for the entire faculty is significant for the success of portfolio assessment. One faculty member commented:

…Keep all your instructors and professors connected to the total project, and we have to ensure that students have the opportunity to have information that is needed…And when we change staff, bring those new people in, do professional development for them to get a full understanding of it. If you have one weak teacher that shows up, you have an end result not only on end product—portfolio, but also at a student assessment at a state and national level. That’s critical for staff to be continually brought in for professional development where we improve and look at our state assessment. (FI-D-1)

Students in this program learned the same lesson as students in all other programs, as reflected in this comment: “…I would have started my portfolio in class one. And gradually put it together. When you graduate you have an end product. Instead of just doing a portfolio in [one semester]” (SI-D-271).

In summary, both faculty and students in Programs A, B, C, and D shared their experiences in portfolio assessment and were willing to communicate the lessons they learned in the process. In an imaginary situation of sharing their advice with colleagues considering implementation of portfolio assessment in their programs, faculty members mentioned such issues as setting realistic expectations, realizing the time and effort involved in the process,
developing faculty commitment, motivating students, and teaching students to be reflective. Students learned their lessons by experience and offered the following advice to other students: save all projects and papers, stay focused and organized, do not procrastinate, and have fun while developing your portfolio.

Perceptions of Students and Faculty towards Portfolio Assessment

Research Question 8. What is the definition and meaning of "portfolio assessment" as given by (a) faculty and (b) students completing their portfolios?

I asked both faculty and students in Programs A, B, C, and D to define portfolio assessment and explain what it meant to them. The rationale for this question was to solicit participants’ perceptions of the meaning of portfolio assessment to them and its ultimate goal. Though people answered this question from different angles, all responses contained a positive connotation towards portfolio assessment.

Program A Portfolio Meanings and Definitions

Faculty A viewed portfolio assessment as a “collection of evidence set in an organized matter to verified achieving of certain objectives” (FI-A-1), “a technique … to gather artifacts and reflections for a part of the final assessment of the student throughout the program” (FI-A-2), and to identify student “…competencies based on performance and an opportunity for students to document areas of their professional life that would normally be not recognized available to selected individuals otherwise; it is an opportunity for students to provide a snapshot of their life. Actually, more like a video of their life, their professional life to a select audience” (FI-A-3).

Students came up with a similar definition for portfolio assessment being a tool for instructors to make sure that students met specified standards and for students to know their strengths and weaknesses. One of the students mentioned that

portfolio assessment means a more well rounded approach to assessing my strengths and weaknesses rather to opposing to standardized tests or verbal interview; a good opportunity for me to put in my portfolio a broad range of different experiences, perhaps things I published or responses from colleagues or programs I put in place. It gives me an opportunity to put my best foot forward and the way I like it. (SI-A-210)

At the same time, student definitions and meanings of portfolio assessment were more elaborate; for some students, a portfolio was also a job interview tool and organizational tool: “…It’s more of an interview tool or a place to keep all our archives and work … and
organizational tool where all our [papers] are together, our transcripts, our letters of recommendation, and our goals, some student work, some projects we have done that we can show off” (SI-A-203).

**Program B Portfolio Meanings and Definitions**

Faculty in Program B defined the portfolio assessment more in terms of an assessment tool used by departmental faculty for making decisions regarding student admission to the program and readiness for graduation:

We have 2 ways we use the portfolio assessment. This is the first benchmark in terms of entering the individual into the program. And then, there are self-assessments that are conducted through the first course and will be included in this entry level academic portfolio. And then the students track this throughout their program. And at the end of their 36 hours master’s program the portfolio is submitted along with their comprehensive exam responses to the questions. (FI-B-1)

Similar to the students in other programs, the Program B student perspective on portfolio meaning was more descriptive, process-oriented, and grounded on objectives and individual growth. One student mentioned:

Portfolio assessment means putting together a collection of work that’s representative of knowledge that was gained during the course, particularly representing a sample of knowledge that met the objective for a particular course. And that information, in turn, would be used for assessing or assigning a grade for the student and the professor to get an idea of how the student had mastered the curriculum. (SI-B-302)

Portfolios…I loved them… What I enjoyed about portfolio assessment is that [it is] a true application, it is a way to bring in your experiences through objectives or goals. (SI-B-310)

Portfolio assessment—a good reflective practice for an individual to assess what was accomplished and what needs to be done to become better—individual growth. (SI-B-300)

**Program C Portfolio Meanings and Definitions**

Faculty members in Program C gave a definition of portfolio assessment that incorporated both portfolio product and process. They focused on the student’s ability to perform duties of a school leader, collect and select artifacts that support their achievement of competencies and mastery of skills, and reflect on their learning: “Portfolios are written documents that show quality work mainly to document student skills which are two-dimensional
and more useful than traditional tests or a traditional thesis option” (FI-C-2). One faculty member presented the portfolio assessment as a multi-faceted phenomenon:

This [is] collection and selection of items that represent their [students] understandings and applications of standards for administration. We use standards, as well as their ability to show some reflection on both the knowledge and activity that they have been engaged in. So for me portfolio assessment means not only being able to kind of…, it’s more than a scrapbook, and it’s not only the collection of artifacts from classes. It’s a collection of things, application kind of exercises that they do related to their field, kinds of work that they do in their buildings that complement more academic classroom work and then, in turn, gathered and described and reflected upon in terms of what they have learned, how they know they have learned it, and how well they think they have learned it. (FI-C-1)

Students considered the portfolio to be a tool to demonstrate their achievements and to be evaluated by faculty: “…compilation of your best work and it is evaluated by professors” (SI-C-292).

**Program D Portfolio Meanings and Definitions**

For faculty members, the portfolio assessment is a tool that allows faculty to see whether students are able to work successfully as school administrators:

…It is meant to evaluate and determine how well a student can accomplish tasks that they have to encounter when they begin administration [program] in elementary administration or secondary administration in public schools …It is meant to see how well they can work into the actual administrative environment they are going to be put into. (FI-D-3)

Students in Program D also perceived portfolio assessment to be an evaluation tool:

…Portfolio assessment is the means the university is assessing if you got the knowledge, if this knowledge is ..how it turns out on paper form, on hard copy. It is the university process of evaluating you ….They basically do the state requirement now. (SI-D-271)

In summary, both faculty and students in Programs A, B, C, and D constructed meanings and definitions of the portfolio assessment based on their experiences and knowledge of portfolios. Two major definitions of portfolio assessment involved portfolios being an instructional strategy to enhance student learning and an evaluation tool to identify student progress and growth. Students considered portfolios to be a tool to collect and organize evidence to form a comprehensive picture about themselves. They saw a portfolio being not only an evaluation and organizational tool, but also a job search tool that allows them to present their competencies to potential employers.
Research Question 9. What are the perceived strengths and weaknesses of the portfolio-based assessment as defined by program faculty? By students?

A total of 21 faculty members and 33 students participated in the survey, provided responses, and identified major strengths of the portfolio assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration programs. I also asked this question during the interviews with both faculty and students. It appeared that it would be more beneficial to display data for all participating programs and identify any differences in perceptions of faculty and students in Programs A and B (group 1--implementing portfolios for more than five years) and Programs C and D (group 2--implementing portfolios for less than five years) then present data for each individual program. An independent-samples t-test was used to compare the means of these two groups and also to examine differences in means between all faculty and all students participating in this study.

Perceptions of Faculty in Programs A, B, C, and D Regarding Portfolio Strengths

All faculty members supported portfolio assessment. Out of 14 major identified strengths listed in the survey (Appendix J, Item 12), I will indicate the top five strengths, as mentioned by faculty. Means and standard deviations were computed. Please see Table 4.13 for mean responses of faculty in participating programs and by group. The most important strength of portfolios was the notion that portfolios contain samples of student work that present more authentic evidence of student competences, as strongly agreed by 71.4% and agreed by 28.6% of the faculty. A total of 61.9% (SA) and 38% (A) of the participating faculty mentioned that portfolios are more powerful than single measures of student achievement. Such features of the portfolio assessment as facilitation of student application of knowledge, helping students to know themselves better, and promotion of student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis were marked as SA by 57% and A by 43% of the faculty.

Comparisons were made between the faculty members in Programs A and B and C and D on the perceptions of portfolio assessment strengths. There was no difference in perceptions of faculty members in the programs working with portfolios for more than five years (A and B) and those who used portfolios for less than five years (C and D).

One of the instructors in Program A mentioned, “…the largest strength is that they [students] are forced to reflect on that process of who they are and how this represents them” (FI-
A-2). Another one admitted: “I like portfolio as it requires students to focus on skills, knowledge, dispositions, performance capabilities that are pretty much expected from educational leaders today” (FI-C-3). One of the faculty members added that portfolio assessment is a form of assessment that makes students feel more confident and less stressed:

…Lack of anxiety. The options that used to exist—writing a thesis, which they see as a hundred page document they are going to hassle with. Another option was taking the test all day long… I think they felt better taking just …putting [portfolio] together in a privacy of their own home. But I think what they enjoyed most was the opportunity to reflect, and I think it is very good. (FI-C-2)

A faculty member in Program D summarized that

…strengths far outweigh the weaknesses. And it gives a student a chance to attack a problem with help from a mentor, then evaluate what happens…. find solution to this problem; data gathering for this problem; it also has a very large reflective piece; the student for each problem has to go back and reflect on value of the exercise. (FI-D-3)

Table 4.13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 12—Portfolio Strengths</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences.</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>.59761</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are meaningful for all audiences (students, faculty, employers).</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>.48305</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Are more powerful than single measures of student achievement.</td>
<td>3.6190</td>
<td>.49761</td>
<td>3.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are useful to view learning and development longitudinally.</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>.59761</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies.</td>
<td>3.7143</td>
<td>.46291</td>
<td>3.7778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop student accountability and responsibility.</td>
<td>3.2857</td>
<td>.64365</td>
<td>3.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop student planning and organizational skills.</td>
<td>3.3000</td>
<td>.65695</td>
<td>3.4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Foster critical thinking in students.</td>
<td>3.4762</td>
<td>.51177</td>
<td>3.4444</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.13—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 12—Portfolio Strengths</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Help students come to know themselves better.</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>.50709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase student participation, independence, and self-direction.</td>
<td>3.2857</td>
<td>.71714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis.</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>.50709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Serve as a self-evaluation tool that help students to document areas of strength and to become aware of areas of weakness.</td>
<td>3.5238</td>
<td>.51177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide students with the opportunity to set appropriate goals for themselves.</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>.65828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A number in parentheses indicates a rating of the feature as determined by frequency of occurrence. “Group 1 (n=9) is comprised of Programs A and B that use portfolios for more than five years, and Group 2 (n=12) consists of Programs D and C that use portfolio assessment for less than 5 years.

**Perceptions of Students in Programs A, B, C, and D Regarding Portfolio Strengths**

Similar to faculty members, 97% of the students considered the major strength of portfolios is their capability of containing samples of student work that present more authentic evidence of student competences (46% A and 51% SA). Such strengths of portfolios as usefulness to view learning and development longitudinally, helping students come to know themselves better, promoting of student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment and self-analysis, and serving as a self-evaluation tool to document student strengths and become aware of areas of weakness were positively acknowledged by more than 90% of all students. Please see Table 4.14 for mean responses of students in all participating programs and by group.

It was mentioned by a student that “…an important factor is that the portfolio is a visual representation of the student in all aspects. A multiple choice exam uses tricks and does not fully represent the students' abilities” (SS-B). One of the students, though admitting that working on
reflections was not his most favorite part, considered reflections to be the most beneficial experience in portfolio process:

Having this [reflection] in my portfolio as a part of the process, knowing where my weaknesses are, even now when I am done with the program, I still know what I need to work on. So, that was the most helpful. Just knowing what my strengths and weaknesses were. We had to do that [a reflection] and put it in a portfolio. It was a couple of pages and what I did, I listed my strengths and weaknesses; why I thought certain areas were my strengths and why I thought some areas were my weaknesses, and then, summarized that and talked about … That was very thoughtful and was put in the portfolio. It also paved the way into the program for me. (SI-A-203)

Students in Program B supported the idea that reflections promote student growth and development: “providing a reflective component that would enable students to get a view of how that work that they had completed tied in to similar work in the past and what they might change or alter to apply to future use or future applications” (SI-B-302). Another student focused on benefits of reflecting on one’s learning and performance and shared:

The reflection element [is the strongest point] because you are able to pull the theory, to pull your class notes, colleague’s notes or peer reviews, whatever…But when you actually start to reflect on how you are going to use it, how you have used it or how you propose to use it…It is really good. I might look on one objective and somebody else might look at the same objective…and through their career path they might have addressed it differently. It is really an individualized type of self-diagnostic. You know when you diagnose yourself with …no, wait a minute, there is something I need. And you focus on your stuff and what you need to do, what you have done, and it makes you feel good. And there are things you can work on. (SI-B-310)

One of the students, though, mentioned that reflections were not that helpful:

[Faculty] require us to do the reflection after we do the activity; you know how we feel while doing this…. Somehow for administration I just wanted to do the project. Then the feedback for me would come from the university advisor, a professor who would look at it and say it was good, or you need to do this or you need to do that…For me reflecting back “wow, it was not useful, it was really hard”-- it was not helpful at all. (SI-D-271)

Comparisons were made between students in Programs A and B and C and D on their perceptions of portfolio assessment strengths. Means and standard deviations were computed. Differences between means were analyzed by use of a $t$-test. Further analysis of available data revealed that significant differences existed in the perceptions of students who were in Programs A and B ($M=3.1667$, $SD=.38925$), where portfolios have been in place for more than five years, and those in C and D ($M=3.2500$, $SD=.63867$), using portfolios for less than five years,
regarding such a strength of portfolios as helping students to know themselves better, \( t (51) = 2.293, p < .05 \).

Table 4.14

**Mean Responses of Students Regarding Strengths of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 12—Portfolio Strengths</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(3) Allow for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences.</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td>.83351</td>
<td>.9237</td>
<td>-0.502</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are meaningful for all audiences (students, faculty, employers).</td>
<td>3.0625</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0500</td>
<td>.68633</td>
<td>.28868</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Are more powerful than single measures of student achievement.</td>
<td>3.2188</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>.85070</td>
<td>.57735</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Are useful to view learning and development longitudinally.</td>
<td>3.3125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td>.76777</td>
<td>.52223</td>
<td>-1.194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies.</td>
<td>3.4687</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.5833</td>
<td>.51493</td>
<td>-0.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop student accountability and responsibility.</td>
<td>3.0938</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>.62158</td>
<td>-0.878</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Develop student planning and organizational skills.</td>
<td>3.2188</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td>.76777</td>
<td>.57735</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Facilitate student application of knowledge.</td>
<td>3.2188</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2000</td>
<td>.62158</td>
<td>-0.882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Foster critical thinking in students.</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1000</td>
<td>.78807</td>
<td>-0.273</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students come to know themselves better.</td>
<td>3.0938</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1667</td>
<td>.38925</td>
<td>.63867</td>
<td>2.293*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Increase student participation, independence, and self-direction.</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0833</td>
<td>.38925</td>
<td>.81273</td>
<td>-0.254</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis.</td>
<td>3.3125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4500</td>
<td>.51042</td>
<td>1.957</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Serve as a self-evaluation tool that help students to document areas of strength and to become aware of areas of weakness.</td>
<td>3.3125</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0833</td>
<td>.51493</td>
<td>1.233</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.14—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 12—Portfolio Strengths</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide students with the opportunity to set appropriate goals for themselves.</td>
<td>3.0625</td>
<td>.61892</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A number in parentheses indicates a rating of the feature as determined by frequency of observation. Group 1 (n=21) is comprised of Programs A and B that use portfolios for more than five years, and Group 2 (n=12) consists of Programs D and C that use portfolio assessment for less than 5 years; * Significant at p < .05

Comparison of Perceptions of Faculty and Students in Programs A, B, C, and D Regarding Portfolio Strengths

Table 4.15 presents data regarding portfolio strengths as perceived by faculty and students in all four programs. Means and standard deviations were computed. Comparisons of group means were conducted using a t-test. The data revealed that there was a significant difference in perceptions of faculty and students regarding portfolio strengths on four accounts: portfolios are more powerful than single measures of student achievement; portfolios facilitate student application of knowledge; portfolios foster critical thinking in students; and portfolios help students come to know themselves better (significant at p < .05). Please see Table 4.15 for mean responses of faculty and students in all participating programs.

Table 4.15

Mean Responses of Faculty and Students Regarding Strengths of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 12—Portfolio Strengths</th>
<th>*Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>.59761</td>
<td>944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>.71842</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are meaningful for all audiences (students, faculty, employers).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>.48305</td>
<td>1.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0625</td>
<td>.56440</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.15—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 12—Portfolio Strengths</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are more powerful than</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6190</td>
<td>.49761</td>
<td>2.150*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>single measures of student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2188</td>
<td>.75067</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>achievement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are useful to view learning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>.59761</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and development</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3125</td>
<td>.69270</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>longitudinally.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contain samples that present</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7143</td>
<td>.46291</td>
<td>1.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more authentic evidence of</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4688</td>
<td>.56707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student competencies.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2857</td>
<td>.64365</td>
<td>.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accountability and</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0938</td>
<td>.77707</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>responsibility.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop student planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3000</td>
<td>.65695</td>
<td>.414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and organizational skills.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2188</td>
<td>.70639</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>.50709</td>
<td>2.079*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>application of knowledge.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2188</td>
<td>.65915</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foster critical thinking in</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4762</td>
<td>.51177</td>
<td>2.063*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>students.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>.65991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help students come to know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>.50709</td>
<td>3.050*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves better.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0938</td>
<td>.58802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase student</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2857</td>
<td>.71714</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>participation, independence,</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1250</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and self-direction.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote student self-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>.50709</td>
<td>1.759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>improvement through</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3125</td>
<td>.53506</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>reflection, self-assessment,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and self-analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serve as a self-evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5238</td>
<td>.51177</td>
<td>1.339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tool that help students to</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3125</td>
<td>.59229</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>document areas of strength</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and to become aware of areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of weakness.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide students with the</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3333</td>
<td>.65828</td>
<td>1.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>opportunity to set</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0625</td>
<td>.61892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appropriate goals for</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>themselves.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. aGroup 1 (n=21)—faculty in Programs A, B, C, and D, Group 2 (n=33)—students in Programs A, B, C, and D; *Significant at p < .05.
Perceptions of Faculty in Programs A, B, C, and D Regarding Portfolio Weaknesses

Item 13 of faculty and student questionnaires (Appendices J and L) and interview data provided responses to this question. Faculty (52% A and 24% SA) identified the strongest portfolio weakness as being labor intensive for them to evaluate. Interestingly, almost 95% of the faculty did not agree that portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain. The second most frequently mentioned weakness was students lacking experience in this form of assessment (52% A), followed by such weaknesses as doubtful reliability and validity of portfolios. Opinions split almost in half regarding such weaknesses of portfolios as lack of demonstrated reliability (52% D and 38% A). The same disagreement among faculty members was present for validity concerns (43% D and 43% A). A majority of faculty (96%) did not think that portfolios would be difficult to defend legally. Faculty members in Program B were sure that their evaluation process was objective:

One thing that is really important is that students and the professors need to maintain their objectivity. And I think that helps that because the reflection cycle certainly standardizes what we are looking for. It helps us to make a portfolio judgment. We are not just comparing apples and oranges… Reflection cycle has a standardized format, so we have a standardized judgment. And also, we are using standards. What is expected to go in the portfolio—district standards, state standards, or national standards in terms of leadership. Using standards also allows standardizing portfolio as well. Rubric and guidelines of what should be included in the portfolio was also helpful to students. (FI-B-2)

Similar inconsistency of responses was observed regarding a notion that students lack the experience in portfolio preparation (42% D and 52% A). A total of 71% of the faculty members did not think that in portfolio assessment there is a chance that students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios. Comparisons of group means were conducted using a t-test. The data revealed there was a significant difference between group 1, Programs A and B, (M=3.5556, SD=.52705) and group 2, Programs C and D, means (M=2.5833, SD=.51493) in terms of such potential portfolio weakness as portfolios being labor intensive for faculty to evaluate. This difference was significant, t(19)=4.239, p < .05. Please see Table 4.16 for mean responses of faculty regarding portfolio weaknesses.
Table 4.16

Mean Responses of Faculty Regarding Weaknesses of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 13—Portfolio Weaknesses</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability.</td>
<td>2.4286</td>
<td>.67612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity.</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
<td>.71714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally.</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate.</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education.</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>.73030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios are not an accurate assessment of students' competencies.</td>
<td>1.8095</td>
<td>.60159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios are not meaningful to students, faculty, and other audiences.</td>
<td>1.7143</td>
<td>.71714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Students lack the experience of portfolio preparation.</td>
<td>2.4286</td>
<td>.67612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios.</td>
<td>2.0500</td>
<td>.68633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain.</td>
<td>1.7143</td>
<td>.56061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A number in parentheses indicates a rating of the feature as determined by frequency of observation. Group 1 (n=9) is comprised of Programs A and B that use portfolios for more than five years and Group 2 (n=12) consists of Programs D and C that use portfolio assessment for less than 5 years; *Significant at p < .05

Perceptions of Students in Programs A, B, C, and D Regarding Portfolio Weaknesses

Students considered that submitting fraudulent work might be the strongest weakness of portfolio assessment (59% agreed and 41% disagreed). At least two students in two different
programs commented: “Portfolios are often duplicated off of someone else or better yet, I have had students complete portfolios for others. How do you evaluate someone else's work if there are limited guidelines in place?” (SS-B) and “Yes, it is exactly what I meant [about plagiarism]. There are many documents in school, being in a faculty handbook or e-mail from the district, or from the state website…. It is easy to take this document and put your name on it…. With no input” (SI-A-210). The same concern was voiced again in the survey: “That is my only gripe with portfolios...when someone takes someone else's program or work and submits it without question” (SS-A).

Students lacking experience in portfolio preparation came next with 56% agreeing and 44% disagreeing, difficulties to defend portfolios legally (53% agreed and 47% disagreed), being labor intensive for faculty to evaluate (53% agreed and 44% disagreed), and inconsistency of portfolio grading with current grading practices in higher education. The notion that portfolios might be not meaningful to students, faculty, and other audiences was marked by 84% of students with the highest frequency of disagreement. There was no significant difference in perceptions between two groups of students, those studying in Programs A and B, where portfolios are in use for more than five years, and those in Programs C and D, with portfolios being in practice for less than five years. Please refer to Table 4.17 to review mean responses of students regarding portfolio weaknesses.

During interviews, students always mentioned the amount of time devoted to portfolio assessment as one of the most difficult issues for them:

Ideally, the portfolio as the concept of collecting all these artifacts, and reflecting on them, and compiling them is absolutely great. But the time commitment that it does it for me is totally not practical, very time consuming. I have a whole file of artifacts going to a portfolio to put together to compile the whole thing, to complete. To go further from that that we had at school to try to put the whole thing together – will I ever get around to do it? I don’t know. I seriously doubt it. Just because of the time consumption. (SI-B-302)

Another student in Program A mentioned time constraint was a serious factor, though elaborating more on this issue: “…it was very time consuming. But it does not mean it was not helpful. Because sometimes you need to take that time to reflect and to figure out what it is” (SI-A-203). One of the students in Program B was rather cautious: “Portfolios are an indicator of
competencies but not conclusive. They may not begin to assess the totality of competencies needed in order to be a true predictor of future success” (SS-B).

Table 4.17

Mean Responses of Students Regarding Weaknesses of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 13—Portfolio Weaknesses</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability.</td>
<td>2.3750</td>
<td>.70711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity.</td>
<td>2.4063</td>
<td>.71208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally.</td>
<td>2.5625</td>
<td>.91361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate.</td>
<td>2.6774</td>
<td>.70176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education.</td>
<td>2.5806</td>
<td>.71992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios are not an accurate assessment of students’ competencies.</td>
<td>2.0625</td>
<td>.84003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios are not meaningful to students, faculty, and other audiences.</td>
<td>1.9375</td>
<td>.71561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Students lack the experience of portfolio preparation.</td>
<td>2.6563</td>
<td>.74528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios.</td>
<td>2.6875</td>
<td>.89578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain.</td>
<td>2.4063</td>
<td>.94560</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A number in parentheses indicates a rating of the feature as determined by frequency of observation. Group 1 (n=21) is comprised of Programs A and B that use portfolios for more than five years and Group 2 (n=12) consists of Programs D and C that use portfolio assessment for less than 5 years.
Comparison of Perceptions of Faculty and Students in Programs A, B, C, and D Regarding Portfolio Weaknesses

Comparisons of group means were conducted using a $t$-test. The data revealed that faculty and students differed in their opinion regarding three portfolio weaknesses: portfolios being difficult to defend legally, submission of fraudulent work, and portfolios being time consuming for students to compile and maintain (significant at $p < .05$).

Table 4.18

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 13—Portfolio Weaknesses</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4286</td>
<td>.67612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3750</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
<td>.71714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4063</td>
<td>.71208</td>
<td>-.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5625</td>
<td>.91361</td>
<td>-2.388*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6774</td>
<td>.70176</td>
<td>1.621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
<td>.73030</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5806</td>
<td>.71992</td>
<td>-1.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios are not an accurate assessment of students' competencies.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8095</td>
<td>.60159</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.0625</td>
<td>.84003</td>
<td>-1.192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios are not meaningful to students, faculty, and other audiences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7143</td>
<td>.71714</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9375</td>
<td>.71561</td>
<td>-1.110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students lack the experience of portfolio preparation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4286</td>
<td>.67612</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6563</td>
<td>.74528</td>
<td>-1.128</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both faculty and students acknowledged multiple strengths of portfolio assessment. Faculty highlighted such issues as ability of portfolios to contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies and being more powerful than single measures of student achievement. Faculty valued portfolios as they facilitate student application of knowledge, help students come to know themselves better, promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment and self-analysis, serve as a self-evaluation tool that help students to document areas of strength and become aware of areas of weakness, and foster critical thinking in students. In addition to portfolio strengths mentioned by faculty, students pinpointed such issues as portfolios being useful to view learning and development longitudinally, allowing for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences, and developing student planning and organizational skills.

As for the weaknesses of portfolio assessment, faculty members identified the following top five: (1) portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate; (2) portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability and students lack the experience of portfolio preparation; (3) grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education; (4) portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity, and (5) portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally. Students added the following to this list: students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios and portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain.

Table 4.18—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 13—Portfolio Weaknesses</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0500</td>
<td>.68633</td>
<td>2.6875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7143</td>
<td>.56061</td>
<td>2.4063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *Group 1 (n=21)—faculty in Programs A, B, C, and D, Group 2 (n=33)—students in Programs A, B, C, and D; *Significant at p < .05
Research Question 10. What are the facilitators and barriers in the portfolio assessment implementation process, as perceived by faculty? By students?

Item 14 of both faculty and student questionnaires and interview data provided responses to this question. Knowing facilitating factors and barriers is important in implementation of portfolio assessment in any program. I will present findings regarding faculty and student perceptions throughout all four participating programs and identify whether there are any differences in perceptions among faculty and students and also those in group 1 (Programs A and B) and group 2 (Programs C and D).

Facilitating Factors of Portfolio Assessment as Perceived by Faculty in Programs A, B, C, and D

All faculty participants were asked to express their level of agreement with the 10 facilitating factors identified through the literature review and a study done in preparation for this research. Faculty commitment was identified as the strongest by 96% of the faculty members (29% agreed and 67% strongly agreed). Several faculty members noted: “faculty commitment is paramount” (FS-A) and “…faculty commitment. People in higher education have their own commitments, their own goals, this kind of things…sometimes it is a little harder to convince them of the value of a new idea” (FI-A-3)

Availability of instructor time to advise students on portfolios and evaluate them was listed as the second strongest factor with 33% agreeing and 62% strongly agreeing. A total of 90% of participants considered a presence of formal policy regarding portfolio assessment in the program and training and a portfolio handbook for faculty as great facilitating factors. Such supporting factors as availability of mentors or peer support groups to guide students in portfolio development, integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program, and systematic and formal planning for portfolio assessment that would make portfolio assessment more effective were considered by 90% of the faculty. There was no significant difference between perceptions of faculty members in Programs A and B using portfolio assessment for more than five years and Programs C and D, where portfolio assessment is in use for less than five years. Please refer to Table 4.19 to see mean responses of faculty regarding facilitating factors of portfolio assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration programs.
Communication of expectations of portfolio assessment to both faculty and students were mentioned consistently by many faculty members:

The communication piece is extremely important. And clarity… Understanding the standards, you know, really sitting down and making sure that we all think that standards are set for particular thing, and not just believing that everybody knows these things just because they have a doctorate. I think the big pieces of success have been communication, and communication is truly not so much about process and product but really about content. I think that was really valuable, and that really set us up for success. (FI-C-1)

Training for students and professors was emphasized several times by faculty: “Faculty and student training on portfolio assessment—we advise all the students in their very first course to review the master’s guidelines book. We use it as a type of training for the students. And professors continue this training. It seems we can never get enough [training]…” (FI-B-1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14—Facilitating Factors</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>3.1429 .85356</td>
<td>1 3.1111 .78174</td>
<td>2 3.1667 .93744</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Availability of instructor's time</td>
<td>3.5714 .59761</td>
<td>1 3.6667 .50000</td>
<td>2 3.5000 .67420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students</td>
<td>3.4286 .67612</td>
<td>1 3.2222 .83333</td>
<td>2 3.5833 .51493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of mentors and/or peer support group to guide students in portfolio preparation process</td>
<td>3.3810 .58959</td>
<td>1 3.3333 .70711</td>
<td>2 3.4167 .51493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Faculty commitment to portfolio assessment</td>
<td>3.6190 .58959</td>
<td>1 3.5556 .72648</td>
<td>2 3.6667 .49237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Formal policy regarding portfolio assessment</td>
<td>3.4286 .81064</td>
<td>1 3.2222 .109291</td>
<td>2 3.5833 .51493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program</td>
<td>3.3810 .66904</td>
<td>1 3.2222 .66667</td>
<td>2 3.5000 .67420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) More detailed information about portfolios</td>
<td>3.2857 .56061</td>
<td>1 3.1111 .60093</td>
<td>2 3.4167 .51493</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.19—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14—Facilitating Factors</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>M  SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and motivation of the involved faculty</td>
<td>3.2381  .53896</td>
<td>3.3333  .50000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Systematic and formal planning</td>
<td>3.3810  .66904</td>
<td>3.2222  .83333</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A number in parentheses indicates a rating of the feature as determined by frequency of observation. *Group 1(n=9) is comprised of Programs A and B that use portfolios for more than five years and Group 2 (n=12) consists of Programs D and C that use portfolio assessment for less than 5 years.

Facilitating Factors of Portfolio Assessment as Perceived by Students in Programs A, B, C, and D

All students mentioned availability of training and/or a portfolio handbook for faculty and students as one of the most important facilitating factors (56% agreed and 44% strongly agreed). Students also highly regarded availability of instructor’s time for mentoring, advising on portfolios, and evaluating portfolios and more detailed information given to students regarding portfolios as important facilitating factors (50% agreed and 44% strongly agreed). Similar to faculty members, they considered systematic and formal planning to be very helpful to the success of portfolio assessment in their programs (66% agreed and 34% strongly agreed). Please see Table 4.20 for mean responses of students regarding facilitating factors of portfolio assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration programs. There was no difference in perceptions of students in Programs A and B and C and D regarding facilitating factors that would make portfolios a more effective method of assessment.

One of the students indicated, “Modeling is the best example. At [our program], the professors also had portfolios and this made it is living proof that they did not ask us to do something that they have not done” (SS-B). Another student also mentioned that seeing his professors’ portfolios helped him not only understand concepts of portfolios assessment, but also promoted better professional relationships:
They [faculty] need to know and understand… and this is one thing why I really respect them—they have to do their portfolios. And it’s cool. And we have to learn about the teachers…and when I found out that Dr. L. collects Harley Davidsons, and we knew this all through the program. And it is kind of cool. I know that they are little details but these little details make good relationships and make good trust…and they make respect (SI-B-310).

Table 4.20

*Mean Responses of Students Regarding Facilitating Factors of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14—Facilitating Factors</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(4) Administrative support</td>
<td>M 3.3125</td>
<td>SD .47093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 3.3500</td>
<td>SD .48936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3.2500</td>
<td>SD .45227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Availability of instructor's time</td>
<td>M 3.3750</td>
<td>SD .60907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 3.2500</td>
<td>SD .63867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3.5833</td>
<td>SD .51493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students</td>
<td>M 3.4375</td>
<td>SD .50402</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 3.3500</td>
<td>SD .48936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3.5833</td>
<td>SD .51493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of mentors and/or peer support group to guide students in portfolio preparation process</td>
<td>M 3.1563</td>
<td>SD .62782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 3.1000</td>
<td>SD .71818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3.2500</td>
<td>SD .45227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty commitment to portfolio assessment</td>
<td>M 3.1935</td>
<td>SD .54279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 3.2500</td>
<td>SD .63867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3.0909</td>
<td>SD .30151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal policy regarding portfolio assessment</td>
<td>M 3.1563</td>
<td>SD .44789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 3.2000</td>
<td>SD .52315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3.0833</td>
<td>SD .28868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program</td>
<td>M 2.9032</td>
<td>SD .74632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2.9474</td>
<td>SD .77986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2.8333</td>
<td>SD .71774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) More detailed information about portfolios</td>
<td>M 3.3750</td>
<td>SD .60907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 3.4500</td>
<td>SD .51042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3.2500</td>
<td>SD .75378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Recognition and motivation of the involved faculty</td>
<td>M 3.2500</td>
<td>SD .56796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 3.3000</td>
<td>SD .57124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3.1667</td>
<td>SD .57735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Systematic and formal planning</td>
<td>M 3.3438</td>
<td>SD .48256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 3.3500</td>
<td>SD .48936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 3.3333</td>
<td>SD .49237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A number in parentheses indicates a rating of the feature as determined by frequency of observation. *Group 1(n=21) is comprised of Programs A and B that use portfolios for more than
Comparison of Faculty and Students Perceptions in Programs A, B, C, And D Regarding Facilitating Factors of Portfolio Assessment

A comparison of group means was conducted. The data revealed that significant differences existed between faculty and students in their perceptions of two facilitating factors: faculty commitment to portfolio assessment and integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program (significant at p< .05). Please see Table 4.21 for mean responses of faculty and students in Programs A, B, C, and D regarding facilitating factors of portfolio assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration programs.

Table 4.21
Mean Responses of Faculty and Students in Programs A, B, C, and D Regarding Facilitating Factors of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14—Facilitating Factors</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrative support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.1429</td>
<td>.85356</td>
<td>-.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3125</td>
<td>.47093</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of instructor's time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.5714</td>
<td>.59761</td>
<td>1.157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3750</td>
<td>.60907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>.67612</td>
<td>-.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4375</td>
<td>.50402</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of mentors and/or peer support group to guide students in portfolio preparation process</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3810</td>
<td>.58959</td>
<td>1.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1563</td>
<td>.62782</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty commitment to portfolio assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6190</td>
<td>.58959</td>
<td>2.679*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1935</td>
<td>.54279</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal policy regarding portfolio assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.4286</td>
<td>.81064</td>
<td>1.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.1563</td>
<td>.44789</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.21—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 14—Facilitating Factors</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3810</td>
<td>.66904</td>
<td>2.359*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9032</td>
<td>.74632</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More detailed information about portfolios</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2857</td>
<td>.56061</td>
<td>-.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3750</td>
<td>.60907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition and motivation of the involved faculty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2381</td>
<td>.53896</td>
<td>-.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.2500</td>
<td>.56796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic and formal planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.3810</td>
<td>.66904</td>
<td>.220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.3438</td>
<td>.48256</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. aGroup 1 (n=21)-faculty in Programs A, B, C, and D, Group 2 (n=33)-students in Programs A, B, C, and D; *Significant at p < .05

Faculty Perceptions Regarding Barriers to Successful Implementation of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

Item 15 (Appendices J and L) of the questionnaire and interview data provided responses to this question. A total of 10 barriers to successful implementation of portfolio assessment were identified through the literature review and during the initial study that laid foundations for this research. Again, faculty members saw portfolios to be too time consuming to grade as the greatest barrier (48% agreed and 19% strongly agreed): “scoring of portfolios…it is very time-consuming” (FI-D-4). It is worth noting, though, that about one-third of faculty members did not consider this to be a barrier. The second strongest barrier mentioned was faculty lack of experience in grading and evaluating portfolios (52% agreed and 14% strongly agreed). Lack of training for faculty was mentioned as one of the strong barriers by 67% of faculty members, followed by lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment (63% agreed). Faculty resistance to change was included within the five strongest barriers to successful implementation of portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders (57% agreed): “…And I can be very sincere with you… we have some senior faculty that are resistant to that evaluation method, but I very much believe that as retirements occur, we would be able to move to this [portfolio] model more easily” (FI-A-2).
There were no differences in perceptions between faculty members in Programs A and B, where portfolio assessment is used for more than five years, and those in Programs C and D, where portfolios are in place for a shorter period of time. Please see Table 4.22 for mean responses of faculty members regarding barriers to successful implementation of portfolio assessment.

Such factors as student procrastination and lack of student commitment, lack of faculty commitment, and lack of an evaluation instrument or mechanism, i.e., rubric, were mentioned as additional barriers. One faculty member was particularly vocal about student attitude and commitment:

The barriers at some level are student attitude and student commitment. And we are trying to be much more upfront about it with them about what this really entails. We are the state that requires the master’s degree within the first three years. So, many of them go taking master’s degree in administrations as an insurance policy because they want to be a principal. Many are 23 years old. They don’t know what they want to be when they grow up. The commitment to actually doing the work is a real barrier. When we get a more mature student who maybe taught for 10 years or so and really is committed to becoming a school leader we have far fewer barriers because they have been much more thoughtful and have had the opportunity to be much more thoughtful. When you are in the second year of teaching you are still shriveling with some things in the classroom. You don’t have a chance to step back and look at the organization. And the portfolio in particular gives them the opportunity to stand back looking at the big picture, synthesizing it, and that’s a lot for early career academic teacher to be doing. So, communication is a real strength, a real success, and the barriers, at least at this point, are student body that probably looks like student body across the nation. They are trying this out. (FI-C-1)

Another faculty member clarified his opinion why lack of commitment might be a strong barrier:

…The biggest barrier is the poor communication. Poor communication, poor clarification of expectations. We have some documents we send to students, some guidelines and suggestions and I hand out in addition some example of sections of some exemplarily [quality]. Students know what is expected and we communicate to each other what we are looking for. So, this is the best thing. And the barrier to it is when we stop talking about it. Or we do not clearly communicate to students. We now try to make sure that every student is really on target… And I do not mind reminding them again. Like when they are in their final semester and almost ready to graduate and prepare their portfolio, I send them guidelines again, just to make sure they have it. And they will just e-mail to me their examples/samples. And they ask if that is what I am looking for? I return it back to them and it helps them to know what it is expected. So, communication in written
form, and clear guidelines, and oral communication. I see the barrier is a poor response to e-mail request, poor telephone response back, lack of written comments to a student when they submit their stuff. This is what it breaks down into…. (FI-C-2)

A faculty member in Program A thought that neither student commitment, costs, nor labor involved in portfolio assessment were barriers in his program. He mentioned that lack of a good assessment rubric was an issue:

…Cost was not an issue, amount of work was not an issue. It was not really a barrier…but we did not have a rubric established to grade it on, so we were looking at them [portfolios] differently. But you see, if you have a rubric, there are certain things you absolutely have to include there. They have to be put in a certain way. Then you get into this cookie-cutter mode that I am not sure is the best thing anyway. So, one of the criticisms we did receive during the presentations in other places is the fact that we do not have a rubric and we do not have a consistent way of grading. But I think that we do. But it requires somebody to be able to think creatively and randomly. And some people cannot think this way. (FI-A-3)

As many programs would like to retain student portfolios either for NCATE reviews or as exemplarily portfolios for their future students, storage space became an issue at many programs: “This barrier…might sound funny—is the storage space. We keep all portfolios. They become part of our program assessment and accreditation” (FI-D-4).

Table 4.22

Mean Responses of Faculty Regarding Barriers of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15--Barriers</th>
<th>All Faculty Groups</th>
<th></th>
<th>Groups M SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their grading practices.</td>
<td>2.0000 .44721</td>
<td>1 1.8889 .33333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2.0833 .51493</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their teaching ability.</td>
<td>1.8571 .57321</td>
<td>1 1.8889 .33333</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1.8333 .71774</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Faculty lack experience in grading/evaluating portfolios.</td>
<td>2.7619 .76842</td>
<td>1 2.8889 .78174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2.6667 .77850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Faculty members are resistant to change.</td>
<td>2.5714 .67612</td>
<td>1 2.5556 .52705</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2.5833 .79296</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher education.</td>
<td>2.0476 .66904</td>
<td>1 2.0000 .70711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 2.0833 .66856</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.22—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15--Barriers</th>
<th>All Faculty</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M  SD</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support.</td>
<td>2.0476 .74001</td>
<td>2.2222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.</td>
<td>2.6190 .80475</td>
<td>2.4444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Lack of training for faculty.</td>
<td>2.7143 .71714</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training for students.</td>
<td>2.4000 .75394</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.</td>
<td>2.2857 .64365</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Faculty members assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.</td>
<td>2.8095 .81358</td>
<td>2.7778</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. A number in parentheses indicates a rating of the feature as determined by frequency of observation. aGroup 1 (n=9) is comprised of Programs A and B that use portfolios for more than five years and Group 2 (n=12) consists of Programs D and C that use portfolio assessment for less than 5 years.

Student Perceptions Regarding Barriers to Successful Implementation of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

A total of 78% of the students considered that lack of training for them was the biggest barrier (56% agreed and 22% strongly agreed). Faculty members being resistant to change came as the second biggest barrier (41% agreed and 16% strongly agreed), followed by lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment (47% agreed and 9% strongly agreed) and faculty skepticism about portfolio assessment (50% agreed and 6% strongly agreed). Lack of training for faculty and faculty members assumptions that portfolios were too time consuming to grade were included among the five biggest barriers, as identified by students. There were no differences in perceptions of students in Programs A and B and those in Programs C and D. Please see Table 4.23 for mean responses of students.
Lack of structure, unclear expectations, and inconsistency among professors was mentioned several times during the student interviews:

So it was all new, and I was very open to it, and I guess it was just maybe most problems with it were just not clear instructions, maybe from the professors on what was expected. I am a type A person and I want everything to be done correctly and the best I can. And sometimes they [faculty] leave it open and I needed more structure. Not having a structure and telling us how to put it together. And every professor maybe was a little different and there was some inconsistency. (SI-A-203)

Table 4.23
Mean Responses of Students Regarding Barriers of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15--Barriers</th>
<th>All Students</th>
<th>Groups</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their grading practices.</td>
<td>2.200</td>
<td>.48423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their teaching ability.</td>
<td>2.3750</td>
<td>.60907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty lack experience in grading/evaluating portfolios.</td>
<td>2.4688</td>
<td>.62136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Faculty members are resistant to change.</td>
<td>2.7187</td>
<td>.72887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher education.</td>
<td>2.5667</td>
<td>.56832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support.</td>
<td>2.5667</td>
<td>.72793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.</td>
<td>2.6250</td>
<td>.70711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Lack of training for faculty.</td>
<td>2.5625</td>
<td>.66901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Lack of training for students.</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.67202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.9167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.</td>
<td>2.5938</td>
<td>.66524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Faculty members assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.</td>
<td>2.5625</td>
<td>.71561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note. A number in parentheses indicates a rating of the feature as determined by frequency of observation. Group 1 (n=21) is comprised of Programs A and B that use portfolios for more than five years and Group 2 (n=12) consists of Programs D and C that use portfolio assessment for less than 5 years.

Comparison of Faculty and Student Perceptions Regarding Barriers to Successful Implementation of Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

A comparison of group means was conducted using a *t*-test. The data revealed that there were at least four issues where perceptions of faculty and students differed significantly: faculty fear portfolios as possible reflection on their teaching ability, incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher education, lack of administrative support, and lack of training for students (significant at p< .05). See Table 4.24 for mean responses of faculty and students regarding barriers to successful implementation of portfolio assessment.

Table 4.24

*Mean Responses of Faculty and Students Regarding Barriers to Successful Implementation of Portfolio Assessment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15--Barriers</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their grading practices.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.44721</td>
<td>-1.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.2000</td>
<td>.48432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their teaching ability.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.8571</td>
<td>.57321</td>
<td>-3.098*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.3750</td>
<td>.60907</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty lack experience in grading/evaluating portfolios.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7619</td>
<td>.76842</td>
<td>1.529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.4688</td>
<td>.62136</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members are resistant to change.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.5714</td>
<td>.67612</td>
<td>-.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.7188</td>
<td>.72887</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher educ.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0476</td>
<td>.66904</td>
<td>-2.984*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5667</td>
<td>.56832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.24—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item 15—Barriers</th>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lack of administrative support.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0476</td>
<td>.74001</td>
<td>-2.489*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5667</td>
<td>.72793</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.6190</td>
<td>.80475</td>
<td>-.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.6250</td>
<td>.70711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training for faculty.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>.71714</td>
<td>.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5625</td>
<td>.66901</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of training for students.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.4000</td>
<td>.75394</td>
<td>-2.989*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0000</td>
<td>.67202</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.2857</td>
<td>.64365</td>
<td>-1.670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5938</td>
<td>.66524</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty members assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.8095</td>
<td>.81358</td>
<td>1.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.5625</td>
<td>.71561</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* A number in parentheses indicates a rating of the feature as determined by frequency of observation. *a* Group 1 (n=21)-faculty in Programs A, B, C, and D, Group 2 (n=33)-students in Programs A, B, C, and D; *Significant at p < .05

In summary, faculty identified the following top five facilitating factors: (1) faculty commitment to portfolio assessment, (2) availability of instructor's time; (3) availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students and formal policy regarding portfolio assessment; (4) integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program and systematic and formal planning, and (5) more detailed information about portfolios. Students additionally added the following two facilitators to this list: administrative support and recognition and motivation of the involved faculty.

As for barriers to successful portfolio assessment, faculty highlighted the following: (1) faculty members assumed that portfolios were too time consuming to grade; (2) faculty lacked experience in grading/evaluating portfolios; (3) lack of training for faculty; (4) lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment; and (5) faculty members were resistant to change. Students added the following to this list: lack of training for students and faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.
Research Question 11. What do program faculty and students perceive to be needed improvements in the implementation of portfolio-based assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration programs?

The information gained from this study indicated that the portfolio process could be improved in a variety of ways. Both interview data and responses to the faculty and student questionnaires (Appendices J and L, 17 and 16 respectively) provided answers to this question. I will present data separately for each program as suggested by faculty and students.

Program A

Faculty recommendations. In the opinion of faculty members, developing a “more definitive program policy on portfolios” (FS-A) and implementing measures to increase faculty commitment to portfolio assessment were the most urgent needs in the program. One of the faculty members mentioned the importance of commitment not only from colleagues in the department, but also practicing school administrators: “…to get local superintendents to buy into the requirement to the need for students to have these portfolios available during their job interviews. Because it will give a level of credibility to the process, where students develop portfolios and never get to use them…” (FI-A-3). In the opinion of this person, student buy-in was also critical for the success of portfolio implementation:

I think may be who is thinking whether to use these portfolios…. It is actually to bring students who have used their portfolios to come back and talk to our program students. And that was very helpful because they actually used them and showed them, and talked about the value of them. And students get pretty excited about that. So, this can be another recommendation that you have to complete the circle. (FI-A-3)

Development of a better portfolio evaluation mechanisms and designing rubrics for assessment were consistently recommended by Program A faculty: “…I think that what we probably need to do is to get a good sample of portfolios, those that we worked with, and come through and look through them…. I can see that as we develop the rubric and look through sample as we benchmark. I think it will be a very good exercise to go through” (FI-A-2).

Another faculty member indicated a strong need for research on portfolio assessment in their program:

I recommend we go back to the research. We have not been back to the research for 5-6 years…We need to go and look into this research before we do any modifying of any sections of our portfolio. We also need to look into what the state is going to require, and
make sure that what we do meets the needs of our students and future of education in our particular state as a realistic and useful model for our students to follow. (FI-A-2)

**Student recommendations.** Students in Program A would like to have “a handbook and/or samples of what distinguishes acceptable from excellent in terms of grading” (SS-A) with “clear-cut guidelines” (SS-A). Similar to the faculty members in this program, they think it is “necessary to have a rubric or standard by which all portfolios would be judged” (SS-A) and that faculty commitment is important: “All the faculty should consider portfolio assessments in order for it to be effective” (SS-A). They also think that, though some faculty members in their program “do a great job asking us to meet certain criteria when doing a portfolio” (SS-A), a “…more systematic approach to develop the portfolio with more ‘stop and check’ points” (SS-A) could really make portfolio assessment in the program more effective and successful. “…It seems that all of a sudden you are at the end [of the program] and no one has been talking about your portfolio development. You know it has to be done but more guidance throughout the program is needed” (SS-A).

Though students requested more structure in the portfolio process in their program, there were some who would like to see more flexibility in selecting artifacts and an opportunity for creativity given to students. A chance to collaborate with their peers on portfolio development was also mentioned:

…and also a little more collaboration between the students and perhaps have them to double check each other; and part of the program would be if I am working with this person, we are collaborating on portfolios and part of my job would be taking an afternoon off and going to their school and see “OK, you have a document here that shows that you put together a study field program. Can you show me what it’s like?”. I think that just a pressure to have to prove that you have actually done this… It is easy to put it on paper rather than make it happening. If you had somebody just checking up on you…. (SI-A-210)

One of the students in Program A shared her rather disappointing experience with the portfolio presentation when she felt she was “over-prepared”, was not challenged by faculty members, and did not have enough time to present her portfolio and her achievements:

…The presentation—I think the culminating activity was weak at our program, I think it was easier for me and I should not have complained, but it is not what I expected it to be. So, I think if we are to change something about portfolio program then maybe we will sit down together with the professors from the program, and present maybe one-on-one, if
possible. Because in a group setting, when there are 10 people you cannot do a lot. It is
not valuable. I think that this will be the thing that concerns me the most. This
culminating activity and process…. (SI-A-203)

Program B

Faculty recommendations. In general, faculty members in Program B were satisfied
with the way portfolio assessment was implemented in their program: “Works well as is” (FS-B-
40) and “Effective as is!” (FS-B-42). Similar to Program A, however, recommendations included
building student commitment and faculty buy-in into portfolio assessment:

…Faculty has to be committed to this process. Faculty has to believe that students in the
program will benefit from the portfolio process, that the reflection is very important for
students and all of us. So buy into the reflection and you will certainly buy into the
portfolio. So in the first place, professors have to be convinced so it is worth the time, the
effort, and the trouble such is that. The same is for students. I think if professors are
enthusiastic, the students will see the importance of reflection. I suppose it will be very
important.

Training for faculty and students regarding portfolio assessment was recommended by
many professors: “Continued professional development for faculty and students” (FS-B-46) and
“More training for faculty who are resistant to change” (FS-B-51). It was expected that through
training “expectations and processes [become] clear to all students and faculty” (FS-B-45) and
students would get a better “guidance throughout the process” (FS-B-46).

Student recommendations. Students were very active offering recommendations that
ranged from uniformed portfolio expectations and guidelines for portfolio construction to
portfolio evaluation: “Standards should follow one source and all should agree on the necessary
components therein” (SS-B-300) and “…examples of appropriately developed portfolios
(exemplary) should be provided. Quality, rather than quantity, should be enforced” (SS-B-303).
Recommendations to improving the evaluation process and providing more detailed “additional
feedback upon completion [of portfolios]” (SS-B-306) were mentioned often: “Portfolios need to
be assigned with a purpose in mind and have at the core the objective of providing to students
feedback about strengths and weaknesses. This can only be accomplished if faculty review
portfolios with students” (SS-B-302). One of the students was particularly disappointed with the
lack of feedback:
I don’t even know if those [portfolios] are even evaluated, to tell you the truth… I don’t even know if anybody reads them or looks at them, if you really want to know the truth. …There was absolutely not one single comment, not a mark. You could not even tell if it had been opened… not any feedback as far as, you know, growth or… not any feedback like that. Not anything that you would consider to be a critique for how well the work was done or how well the reflection tied in – really no critique of any kind… As far as the biggest thing I would change, if you have people do it – read it. (SI-B-302)

Similar to faculty members, students in Program B believed that “more training, not only on the method, but the reason why portfolio assessment is so powerful”(SS-B-308) would promote more successful portfolio assessment in the program and would make portfolios “a tool that is a continuum reflection/self-assessment for growth and long range goals” (SS-B-304) and improve faculty understanding of portfolio assessment and increase their commitment:

I don’t even know if the professors really understand what the true portfolio component is. Dr. A. and Dr. B., those people who really have worked a lot with portfolios, they do understand the format and the purpose behind it, but a lot of other professors I think they do it because they are told that is the thing to do. (SI-B-302)

Recommendations to provide training on how to evaluate portfolios seemed to be of high importance: “Training for faculty in evaluating portfolios. ‘Evaluation’ has negative connotation. Performance indicators should be used instead. A program has a rubric developed. Portfolio should become a document to learn by, grow, develop, and become better” (SI-B-300).

Several students recommended that portfolios should become more technologically advanced and creative: “I think we can go from a binder into more electronic portfolios and maybe create three-dimensional types of portfolios” (SI-B-310) and “make them electronic, put on the web, add voice, make links, make them portable for various purposes, make them a ‘Wow!’ experience. Electronic version will help wider distribution” (SI-B-300).

Program C

Faculty recommendations. Faculty members mentioned that, though they were “pretty good at it, after four years” and after they have already revised it twice, they “still need to tighten up [their] expectations” about portfolios (FS-C-33). One faculty member mentioned that continuous improvement was important for them: “We are trying to get to the quality that really helps students to reflect in ways that are useful and meaningful in the context of school in [our
state]. And I think there is another issue: just constantly maintaining the bar that we set and
doing it the way it is not purely academic exercise” (FI-C-1).

Another recommendation was to align course requirements and portfolio standards and
continue working on portfolio improvement and better evaluation through faculty training and
discussions: “Periodic faculty discussion of a small sample of portfolios to help develop
consistency in directions given to students and in use of the scoring rubrics” (FS-C-34). As one
professor shared, “…the process for improving the portfolio is to do formative evaluation
process set up by faculty members, to do assessments on the various stages of portfolio, and from
that, from data, to determine what weak points are and enjoy discussion on how to deal with
those weak points” (FI-C-3).

Having examples of portfolios to share with students was also recommended:
Other thing—you’ve got to have some samples. We need to ask students to agree to use
their work as samples. For example, table of content, some nice table of content that I
photocopy and give it to students when they start the program. I tell them: “here is an
example of a nice table of content, a nice introductory essay, here are some good
examples of concluding essays. So here are the examples of what we are looking for”.
Exemplarily work…. (FI-C-2)

Moving to electronic portfolios was recommended several times:
I like to figure out how we can do it electronically. It will be a nice edition. I am not quite
ready for that. We make them [students] put their original work so we can see the
comments of their professors. And this helps a lot to understand their growths. Especially
if they had to rewrite the paper. But I do not know, I guess electronic would be the next
big move. (FI-C-2)

**Student recommendations.** One of the recommendations was for faculty to be more
flexible in their requirements and allow students to make decisions about the content and be
more creative:

I think basically, probably a little blurb that goes in front of each section, a little
introduction to each section--not to have so many constraints “you have to do one page”,
“you cannot go over one page” [mimicking]. So it should be more flexibility and
creativity, yes. If you think you should put more than one page, you should be able to put
more than one page. If you can do it in a paragraph, you should be able to do it in a
paragraph, two paragraphs…. Instead of just saying one page does it. (SI-C-292)

A need in improvement regarding advising on portfolio development was voiced several
times: “If every advisor could offer guidance and direction for the student the process would be
more beneficial (SS-C-290); “I would have liked more of an explanation about how to construct a portfolio. It would have been helpful if my major professor would have met with me” (SS-C-294); and “give more instruction on what is expected” (SS-C-295). Students would also like to discuss portfolio development with faculty and know “…a useful reason of why the portfolio is necessary” (SS-C-292).

Program D

Faculty recommendations. The faculty in Program D realized that they could make the portfolio process more effective if they improved their practices in advising students and providing a more detailed feedback: “permit supervisors more time for monitoring students” (FS-D-20) and “[portfolio] being read by a committee would be an improvement. Now we only give limited feedback due to time constraints on faculty. We need a better feedback procedure” (FS-D-21). Similar to other programs, there was a recommendation to develop “a more concise set of criteria or program objectives. The portfolio would then be an assessment of the level of student learning as measured by the objectives” (FS-D-22). The faculty also suggested that “more training for students and staff members” (FS-D-25) would greatly improve effectiveness of portfolio assessment implementation:

…[There is a] need to keep all your instructors and professors connected to the total project and we have to ensure that students have the opportunity to have information that is needed… And when we change staff, bring those new people in, we do professional development, for them to get a full understanding of it….If you have one weak teacher that shows up, you have an end result not only on the end product—portfolio, but also at a student assessment at a state and national level. That’s critical for staff be continually brought in for professional development where we improve and look at our state assessment… The first thing we would do differently—at the beginning of each school year in August we will have at least one or two days training for all adjunct professors and all instructors and go through each course material to be sure that we know what we are all doing. We need to have more in-service with all of the instructors. (FI-D-1)

Students should be nurtured to become reflective practitioners; they should be taught how to write reflectively and act upon their reflections:

And I do think it is important for students as part of their portfolio process to learn how to write reflectively. I do not know how students in your program are, but there is something that we have to teach ours. What we found in our early portfolios, students were very good in telling us what they did, but they struggled to tell us what it caused them to do. And we had a little work on reflective writing. I would encourage everybody
who goes into portfolios to make sure that students know how to write reflectively. To me, this is really very important. (FI-D-4)

Faculty members realized they should follow changing state requirements and prepare their graduates to become successful educational leaders. They thought it could be achieved through constant communication with various educational agencies, being up-to-date with current practices and requirements, and conducting their own research on portfolio assessment and its ties to state and ISSLC standards: “We always have to be aware of any new guidelines from the state department, from the federal government, and professional association we deal with;… try to keep up a portfolio process current, and …a new research and new requirements” (FI-D-3). Involving local practicing school administrators in shaping portfolio programs in Educational Leadership/Administration programs could be a valuable experience: “I would strongly encourage that anyone who wants to do portfolios will sit down with local administrators and discuss with them what they believe needs to be a part of portfolios. I think this feedback is important and will help guide portfolios through it” (FI-D-4).

**Student recommendations.** Similar to their professors, students in this program would like to see improvements in evaluation practices and feedback mechanism: “I would like an oral defense of my portfolio and immediate evaluation from the committee as well as a formal evaluation attached to the portfolio” (SS-D-271). Again and again, providing more information about portfolio development was recommended: “I believe that faculty and students need more information on how to compile and develop the portfolio in a systematic process. In my program, professors are very confused and so are the students” (SS-D-274).

Students also recommended a review of portfolio guidelines, making them more precise and structured and eliminating repetitive information: “Avoid repetition of information requested” (SS-D-268) and “I think our program had a lot of useful projects, but I think there was a lot of paperwork involved. I found myself repeating and restating things I had said over and over” (SS-D-272). Peer review of portfolios was recommended as one of the suggestions for improvement. Similar to faculty members, students in this program would like to see current school leaders be more involved in the portfolio process in their program: “I believe that portfolio assessment effectiveness could be improved greatly if potential employers were more supportive of this method of assessment. If graduate students are to see the portfolio as being
valuable, they have to be convinced that it is…” (SS-D-273) and “I believe that portfolios can be a useful assessment tool in my program. However, it does not seem to make sense to me that students are required to complete a labor-intensive project that is never viewed by anyone outside of collegiate academia” (SS-D).

Major areas needing improvement, as identified by faculty and students, were advising and guiding students in portfolio development, portfolio expectations, evaluation, and feedback mechanisms, involvement of practicing school administrators and representatives of state and national agencies, training for faculty and students, peer review of portfolios, and research of portfolio assessment effectiveness in the program.

This chapter presented major research findings. The next chapter will provide discussions of findings, conclusions, recommendations, and implications for practice and research in the field of Educational Leadership/Administration.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR PRACTICE AND FUTURE RESEARCH

Study Overview

This chapter uses the research findings described in Chapter 4 as the basis for discussion, conclusions, recommendations, and implications for practice and research. The purpose of the study was to investigate the process of portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders at the master’s degree level and add to the knowledge base of portfolio assessment practices in the field of educational administration. This research was conducted in several stages and included (1) a survey of 504 Education Leadership/Administration programs in the United States (Appendix C) to identify programs possessing the desired characteristic of the portfolio assessment being a graduation requirement; (2) a survey of 112 programs employing portfolio assessment to categorize programs in accordance with specified characteristics (Appendix D); (3) a selection of four programs by a set of criteria; and, finally, and (4) an in-depth study of these four programs. Faculty members and students who varied in gender, age, professional experience, and years of involvement in portfolio assessment participated in this study. Eleven research questions guided the inquiry and selection of the data collection and data analysis methods. The in-depth study consisted of web-based surveys of faculty and students (Appendices J and L), telephone and video interviews (Appendices I, K, and M), and content analysis of documents. I examined and analyzed four sets of written portfolio guidelines, three assessment rubrics and rating sheets, eight paper-based and electronic portfolios. The following sections present the summary of major findings, conclusions, and recommendations for practice and research in the field of Educational Leadership/Administration.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The results of this study support the premise that the use of portfolio assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration has a great potential for preparing educational leaders.
Although the current study does not allow for a generalization of findings, it will still provide an important contribution to the literature and research on portfolio assessment for several reasons. First, it is the first study of portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders of this scope. Second, it is one of few studies comparing perceptions of faculty and students regarding portfolio assessment. Third, this study provides a good resource for Educational Leadership/Administration programs that are considering portfolio assessment implementation or planning improvements in their current portfolio models. Significant findings and conclusions are presented in the following sections.

**Research Question 1. Needs for Portfolio Initiation**

Though various needs might initiate portfolio assessment, faculty aspirations to prepare their students for their educational leadership careers and the necessity to follow state and national requirements for accreditation seemed to prevail (see Table 5.1 for a summary of needs in programs A, B, C, and D).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Needs and Reasons of Initiation of Portfolio Assessment in Programs A, B, C, and D</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Program A** | (1) Faculty became interested in the use of portfolios in K-12 setting  
(2) Faculty aspired to prepare school administrators to be a model to teachers and students  
(3) Faculty believed portfolios allowed students to select and reflect on their learning while being in the program  
(4) Faculty felt portfolios seemed to be a better assessment practice  
(5) Faculty wanted to prepare students for job interviews and portfolios to be used as a job search tool  
(6) Faculty would like to use student portfolios for program evaluation at the university level |
| **Program B** | (1) Faculty dissatisfaction with existed assessment practices  
(2) Faculty aspirations to provide better preparation for their graduate students |
| **Program C** | (1) Faculty dissatisfaction with assessment used in the program  
(2) Faculty willingness to follow best practices in assessment  
(3) Faculty aspiration to connect their program and school practices  
(4) Influence of the outside state and national agencies |
| **Program D** | (1) Necessity to follow NCATE requirements and ISLLC standards  
(2) Faculty understanding that portfolios help student better understand all |
Table 5.1 –continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the complexity of school leadership and administration and prepare for their leadership roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Faculty believed that portfolios were a better assessment practice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparison of reasons why four programs initiated portfolio assessment revealed that Programs A and B moved to portfolio assessment more than five years ago primarily due to intrinsic motivation: individual faculty interest, desire to improve assessment practices, aspiration to prepare students to be more successful in their professional careers, etc. However, the faculty in Programs C and D that initiated the portfolio assessment less than five years ago, though also focusing on the continuous improvement of student learning, were encouraged by accreditation requirements of NCATE and ISLLC and in response to the national movement toward standards-based education and assessment. It might be suggested that more and more programs will redesign their portfolio models to establish a closer connection with ISLLC, NCATE, and other professional standards in the near future. The ISLLC standards (Appendix A) offer an integrated view of an exemplarily school leader.

For each of these standards, administrators must develop a deep understanding of what must be improved and skill in how to do it; must believe in, value, and be committed to their importance and implications; and must facilitate processes and engage in activities to ensure that the goals are met. Many more leaders will become effective if these skills and knowledge are explicitly taught. To meet these worthy goals for what school leaders should know and do, society must provide them with better professional development. (National Staff Development Council, 2000, p. 4)

In many states, these standards provide a framework for leadership development serving as the basis for preparation program approval, national program accreditation, individual certification and licensure, and professional development. As the ISLLC criteria become widely accepted, they will undoubtedly be incorporated as guiding principles in many administrator preparation programs. Standards alone, however, are probably not enough to reshape leadership programs. John Norton (2002) noted that standards-based redesign is too often "a paper-and-pencil game that requires players to match course titles and content with the adopted higher
standards." To be most effective, these standards should lead to a fundamental shift and rethink- ing of content, delivery, and assessment.

Research Question 2. Purposes of Portfolio Assessment

Preparation for and implementation of portfolio assessment encourages faculty members to explore new assessment techniques, examine their teaching practices, and align program curriculum to meet professional standards. Currently, portfolios are used as a graduation requirement for the completion of a master’s degree in all four programs. Besides, student portfolios are also used as an element of program evaluation to show interested audiences, inside and outside the program, activities and achievements in the program, program objectives alignment with curriculum and assessment, and final products of graduate students as evidence of their mastering of competencies. Portfolios might serve other purposes in a program: assessment in individual courses and of internships, and preparation of students for their job search and interviews. See Table 5.2 for a summary of purposes of portfolio assessment in Programs A, B, C, and D.

Table 5.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purposes of Portfolio Assessment in Programs A, B, C, and D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Program</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Program A | (1) Program evaluation  
(2) Curriculum alignment with state and NCATE standards  
(3) Potential employment and job interviews |
| Program B | (1) Student self-development, renewal and reflection  
(2) Admission to candidacy to Master’s degree  
(3) Initiation of a career advancement portfolio (job search tool)  
(4) Program evaluation |
| Program C | (1) Evaluation of internship  
(2) Program evaluation  
(3) Curriculum alignment |
| Program D | (1) Evaluation of internship  
(2) Program evaluation  
(2) Curriculum alignment within program courses and professional ISLLC and NCATE standards |
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Use of portfolios for program evaluation seems to be one of the most frequently mentioned purposes and is consistent with literature on the topic (Borthwick, 1995; Olds & Miller, 1997; Prus & Johnson, 1993). It is suggested that portfolio assessment for program evaluation can be used systematically to define and refine program objectives through forming portfolio criteria, to collect evidence for accountability purposes, and to communicate program impact to those outside of the program. It is also assumed that the use of portfolio assessment for program evaluation might lead to changes in course content, addition/deletion of courses or changes in course sequences, use of assessment information to facilitate curriculum discussion by faculty, and use of assessment information to further refine the existing assessment methods or to implement new ones.

**Research Question 3. Implementation Strategies and Unique Features of Portfolio Assessment**

**Implementation strategies.** There are different paths that faculty members could take while implementing portfolio assessment in their individual programs. Selecting and developing the best model for one’s program through research, following best assessment practices, collaborating with colleagues in the program and practicing educators, communicating with students, and soliciting opinions of all stakeholders form a foundation for the success of portfolio assessment implementation in the program. Please refer to Table 5.3 for a summary of implementation strategies used by programs A, B, C, and D.

### Table 5.3

**Summary of Implementation Strategies in Programs A, B, C, and D**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Implementation Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program A | (1) One faculty member interest prompted portfolio initiation  
(2) Conducted research and search for the best model  
(3) Faculty collaborated and met to discuss portfolio options  
(4) Published to share experience |
| Program B | (1) Piloted a portfolio model in individual courses  
(2) Faculty collaborated and met to discuss portfolio options  
(3) Conducted research on faculty, student, and practicing administrators’ perceptions  
(4) Published to share experience |
Faculty commitment. Building faculty commitment and encouraging collaboration were mentioned in all four programs as important components. Much of the literature regarding assessment notes the importance of collaborative efforts in all stages of portfolio assessment design and implementation (Black, 1993; Hamp-Lyons & Condon, 1993; Lopez, 1999). According to Lopez (1999, p.9),

in order for assessment to become an integral permanent component of campus culture, faculty would need to recognize its potential value, be committed to its inclusion in the regular on-going processes of their institution, accept ownership and responsibility for the assessment program, and participate fully in all its components.

It is suggested that involving faculty and building commitment would prevent misunderstandings about the nature and purpose of student assessment and promote positive attitude to portfolios. Lopez (1999) mentioned that faculty members might resist alternative assessment as they have negative reactions to the concept of measuring learning and lack the information and technical skills required to understand and implement assessment. Thus, it might be suggested that providing undecided faculty members with the information showing them that portfolio assessment allows students to achieve a high level of competence and professional growth might open them to the possibility of accepting a new form of assessment and promote faculty involvement, collaboration, and commitment.

Research and evaluation efforts. Many studied programs indicated that research was critical for their programs during portfolio assessment development and implementation stages. Research on portfolio assessment might provide multiple benefits: it (1) allows programs to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Implementation Strategies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program C | (1) Faculty and students participated in development process and design of portfolio model  
(2) Presented portfolio guidelines during orientation sessions, introductory courses in the program, and written materials  
(3) Conducted research on portfolio effectiveness |
| Program D | (1) Faculty followed best portfolio practices presented in the conferences  
(2) Conducted research and search for the best model  
(3) One faculty member compiled a manual on portfolios  
(4) Faculty collaborated and met to discuss portfolio options |
make informed decisions about best implementation models; (2) informs programs about progress and areas for improvement; and (3) facilitates diffusion of information regarding portfolio assessment through publications and presentations at conferences (Worthen, Sanders, & Fitzpatrick, 1997).

**Unique Features of Portfolio Assessment**

While developing a portfolio assessment in their programs, faculty members incorporated various unique features their portfolio assessment process to make it more effective. Thus, developing written guidelines, making portfolio information available on-line, using assessment rubric for evaluating portfolios, and holding a culminating presentation activity seemed to be the most common ones. Please see Table 5.4 for a summary of features used in the portfolio assessment process.

Table 5.4

*Current Unique Features of Portfolio Assessment in Programs A, B, C, and D*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Unique Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program A | (1) Faculty as mentors  
| | (2) Written guidelines  
| | (3) Use of exemplarily model portfolios  
| | (4) Opportunity for students and faculty to discuss portfolio issues  
| | (5) Culminating presentation activity |
| Program B | (1) Website on portfolio requirements  
| | (2) Written guidelines  
| | (3) Assessment rubric  
| | (4) Review of portfolios by a school administrator  
| | (5) Opportunity for students and faculty to discuss portfolio issues  
| | (6) Culminating presentation activity |
| Program C | (1) Written guidelines  
| | (2) Assessment rubric and rating sheet  
| | (3) Opportunity for students and faculty to discuss portfolio issues |
| Program D | (1) Website on portfolio requirements  
| | (2) Written guidelines  
| | (3) Students can form study groups to work on portfolio  
| | (4) Assessment rubric and rating sheet  
| | (5) Culminating presentation activity |
It might be suggested that programs considering portfolio assessment implementation or improvement of current processes, perhaps should consider using a combination of mentioned features to make portfolio assessment in their programs more effective.

**Research Question 4. Educational Leadership Competencies Addressed by Portfolios**

Program objectives, state and national standards, and established professional competencies can be addressed in portfolios. A current trend is to use ISLLC and NCATE standards for competencies addressed in portfolios. Programs that started using portfolios more than five years ago, though moving to these standards, also incorporated their state educational leadership competencies and standards into portfolio assessment. Modern standards-, outcomes-, and performance-based movements in education encourage faculty members to align program curriculum and instructional strategies with specified standards and assessment. Portfolios seem to be one of the techniques that can be used both as an instructional strategy and as a technique to assess the mastery level of various professional competencies.

**Research Question 5. Structural Components of Portfolios**

Depending on the selected format, portfolios might include various sections, such as student individual sections with vita and resume and artifacts sections to support the achievement of standards, reflections, and professional goals. Please refer to Table 5.5 to see structural components of portfolios in Programs A, B, C, and D.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Current components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Program A | Artifacts demonstrating  
(1) Individual development  
(2) Knowledge base  
(3) Professional development  
(4) Community involvement |
| Program B | (1) Artifacts  
(2) Leadership framework  
(3) Statements of five-year professional goals  
(4) Self-reflection  
(5) Table of content  
(6) Introduction to the portfolio  
(7) Student resume |

Table 5.5

*Structural Components of Portfolios in Programs A, B, C, and D*
Table 5.5—continued.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Current components</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program C</td>
<td>(1) Sections 1-6 to demonstrate achievement of six ISLLC standards through artifacts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Personal narrative (overview/summary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program D</td>
<td>(1) Self-reflection in the form of description and values of the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Portfolio evaluation criteria and rating sheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Sections with referencing to ISSLC standards and artifacts: planning and enabling,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pupil management, conflict analysis and resolution, use of technology, budget, staffi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ng/scheduling, personnel selection, vision, physical plant health and safety, and con</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>conducting performance evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The faculty valued student reflections in portfolios and considered them to be one of the most important elements of portfolio assessment. Many students shared the same opinion and thought that reflections helped them to learn better and know their weaknesses and strengths. Actually, learning through portfolio reflection and self-analysis was mentioned as one of the greatest strengths of portfolio assessment by both faculty and students.

In line with other research (Barton & Collins, 1993; Brown & Irby, 2001; Falls, 2001; Marcoux, 2002), this study shows that reflections were valuable for students as they assisted them in identifying areas of strengths and weaknesses and impacted their leadership effectiveness, their professional development as school administrators, and reflective practices. According to Brown and Irby (2001), leaders who were reflective (1) viewed self-assessment and reflection as priorities for school improvement; (2) recognized that external and internal challenges result in growth, (3) intentionally engaged in activities to challenge the current set of beliefs and to expand their understanding of practices; (4) realized that change was inevitable; (5) were aware that chaos often accompanied change; and (6) shared understandings with colleagues.

There is an understanding that reflection is not an automatic process (Brown & Irby, 1997, 2001; Duncan, 1996) and must be taught as any other skill. Thus, the authors suggest a five-step reflective cycle to be used for reflective writing:

1. Selecting: The student must first select the artifacts most representative of each of the standards that he/she is to demonstrate.
2. Describing: A description of the circumstances, situations, and events related to the selected classroom or field-based activities.

3. Analyzing: This step involves "digging deeper." The "why" of the selection of the artifact and the "how" of its relationship to the activities, leadership issues or beliefs, circumstances, and/or decisions.

4. Appraising. Actual self-assessment occurs as the student interprets the experience gained through the activity and evaluates the impact of the learning on his/her future practice.

5. Transforming. This step holds the greatest opportunity for growth, as the student uses insights gained from reflection in developing plans designed to improve and transform their practices.

Perhaps this or other models of reflective writing and practice might be useful in various Educational Leadership/Administration programs to help students to learn how to write reflectively, analyze their learning and actions, identify areas for potential improvement, and develop plans to close the gap in performance.

**Research Question 6. Portfolio Evaluation**

Programs use various evaluation strategies for student portfolios. The general trend is to evaluate portfolios as a whole, though in Programs C and D using ISLLC standards, students’ grades were based on the assessment of each individual standard or competency. Programs use different formats for their assessment rubrics and rating sheets (Appendices R, T, U). It might be useful to assess separately the quality of portfolio and mastery of standards. In this study, scoring rubrics were the common technique. Rubrics seem to work well with portfolios as a type performance assessment, thus supporting the works of AAHE (1999), Oosterhof (2001), and others.

**Scoring rubrics.** Consistent with the literature on performance assessment, this study suggests that rubrics are effective in a holistic description of performance. One of the explanations of this might be that a rubric is more common because it is faster than analytical scoring and “it is quicker to obtain an overall impression than to make a series of judgments” (Oosterhof, 2001, p. 224). With portfolio assessment, rubrics might provide a series of holistic descriptions of student mastery, for example, of each ISLLC standard or an individual writing sample. It is critical to note that all portfolio raters should have a clear understanding of
assessment criteria and should be adequately trained to maximize the accuracy of scoring (AERA, 1999). Consistency of scoring might also be improved by averaging the scores assigned by several portfolio raters.

However, it is important to remember the cautions of Lyons (1998), Marby (1999), and Sculman (1998) regarding over-standardization of portfolio assessment and mismatching of old assessment and alternative assessment paradigms. Perhaps programs considering rubrics for assessment should accompany them with individualized, detailed feedbacks.

**Feedback.** Feedback is a vital process in any learning context. Students indicated that detailed written feedback on their portfolios would be valuable to them for interpreting their portfolio grade and the accompanying rubric, for creating a plan for further professional growth, and even as a reference document during job searches. It might be suggested that improvement of both quality and quantity of feedback would encourage students to improve their performance and meet the specified standards. Using preformatted forms and perhaps technology tools can improve opportunities for rich and rapid feedback without an increased workload associated with portfolio assessment. Peer feedback might also bring benefits. In addition to providing students with another perspective of their work, peer feedback can help students learn cooperative social skills and teach students how to evaluate their own and others’ efforts.

**Research Question 7. Lessons Learned in Portfolio Assessment Implementation**

The advice that faculty offered was consistent with the literature on the topic and included the following:

- Have realistic expectations about time and effort involved.
- Build faculty commitment.
- There is no recipe book for portfolio assessment. Create one for your program.
- Encourage students to take charge in the portfolio process.
- Motivate students and convince them in portfolio benefits.
- Teach students to be reflective.

There was no prior research reporting student recommendations and lessons learned from portfolio assessment. In this study, the advice that students offered included the following:

- Start as early as possible so you can gain full benefit of the portfolio assessment and avoid end-of-program stress. Don’t wait until the last minute.
• Save every project.
• Take control of the process and the end product.
• Stay focused and develop one’s portfolio over time.
• Be proactive.
• Realize that you compile a portfolio for your own benefit, not for the faculty.
• Be sincere in acknowledging your weaknesses.
• Have fun with your portfolio.

Research Question 8. Portfolio Meanings and Definitions

Responses provided by study participants to this question were consistent with the literature on the subject. Meanings and definitions of the portfolio assessment involved portfolios being an instructional strategy to enhance student learning and an assessment tool to identify student progress and growth. Students additionally considered portfolios to be a tool to collect and organize evidence to form a comprehensive picture about this work and accomplishments. They also saw a portfolio being not only an evaluation and organizational tool, but also a job search tool that allows them to present their competencies to potential employers.

Research Question 9. Portfolio Assessment Strengths and Weaknesses

Portfolio strengths. Findings of this research are consistent with the literature on portfolio assessment and the findings of the web-based questionnaire conducted in the preliminary stages of this study. Both faculty and students in Programs A, B, C, and D saw major strengths in portfolio assessment as portfolios contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies; serve as a self-evaluation tool that help students document areas of strength and become aware of areas of weaknesses; and foster critical thinking in students. Please see Table 5.6 for a list of other strengths of portfolio assessment mentioned by faculty and students.

While there were no significant differences among Programs A and B (group 1) and C and D (group 2) faculty members’ perceptions regarding portfolio assessment strengths, a comparison of student perceptions revealed significant differences in such aspect as portfolios helping students to know themselves better between group 1 and group 2 students. Also, there
Table 5.6

The Top Five Strengths of Portfolios as Perceived by Program A, B, C, and D Faculty and Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios</td>
<td>Portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies.</td>
<td>(1) Contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Are more powerful than single measures of student achievement.</td>
<td>(2a) Are useful to view learning and development longitudinally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3a) Facilitate student application of knowledge.</td>
<td>(2b) Promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3b) Help students come to know themselves better.</td>
<td>(3c) Serve as a self-evaluation tool that helps students to document areas of strength and to become aware of areas of weakness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3c) Promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis.</td>
<td>(4) Serve as a self-evaluation tool that helps students to document areas of strength and to become aware of areas of weakness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Serve as a self-evaluation tool that helps students to document areas of strength and to become aware of areas of weakness.</td>
<td>(3) Allow for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Foster critical thinking in students.</td>
<td>(4a) Develop student planning and organizational skills.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4b) Facilitate student application of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5a) Foster critical thinking in students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5b) Increase student participation, independence, and self-direction.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

were significant differences in perceptions regarding portfolio strengths among Programs A, B, C, and D faculty and students in four areas: portfolios (1) are more powerful than single measures of student achievement; (2) facilitate student application of knowledge; (3) foster critical thinking in students; and (4) help students come to know themselves better (significant at p < .05). Discussions of these finding are in the forthcoming sections.

Portfolio Weaknesses. Both faculty members and students believed that portfolio assessment had some weaknesses, in particular: portfolios were labor intensive for faculty to evaluate; grading of portfolios was inconsistent with current grading system in higher education; and portfolio assessments lacked demonstrated validity. Please see Table 5.7 for the list of the top five weaknesses of the portfolio assessment as perceived by faculty and students in Programs
A, B, C, and D. The data revealed that there were significant differences between group 1 (Programs A and B) and group 2 (Programs C and D) faculty members in terms of the potential portfolio weakness as portfolios being labor intensive for the faculty to evaluate. This difference was significant at p < .05.

There were also significant differences among the faculty and students regarding three portfolio weaknesses: (1) portfolios being difficult to defend legally, (2) submission of fraudulent work, and (3) portfolios being time consuming for students to compile and maintain (significant at p < .05).

Table 5.7

The Top Five Weaknesses of Portfolio Assessment as Perceived by Faculty and Students in Programs A, B, C, and D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate.</td>
<td>(1) Students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2a) Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability.</td>
<td>(2) Students lack the experience of portfolio preparation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2b) Students lack the experience of portfolio preparation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education.</td>
<td>(3a) Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity.</td>
<td>(3b) Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally.</td>
<td>(4) Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5a) Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5b) Portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 10. Portfolio Assessment Facilitating Factors and Barriers**

Data collected during this study revealed that several factors function as facilitators or as barriers in the assessment process. It is suggested that knowing facilitators and barriers is important and critical for successful portfolio assessment. Identification of these factors
influences the strategy of portfolio implementation through removing the barriers and enhancing the facilitating factors. The impacts of these factors, as they serve to facilitate or impede assessment, are interdependent. Findings in the area of portfolio assessment facilitating factors and barriers in programs preparing educational leaders are consistent with the literature on portfolio assessment in other education and non-education programs.

**Portfolio assessment facilitating factors.** Both the faculty and students considered the importance of facilitating factors, such as the availability of training and/or a portfolio handbook for the faculty and students, availability of the instructor's time to guide students and evaluate portfolios, systematic and formal planning of the portfolio assessment process, and more detailed information about portfolios. Please see Table 5.8 for a list of the top five facilitating factors of portfolio assessment implementation as perceived by the faculty and students in Programs A, B, C, and D.

Data revealed that significant differences existed between the faculty and students in their perceptions of two facilitating factors: (1) faculty commitment to portfolio assessment and (2) the integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program (significant at p< .05).

Table 5.8

*The Top Five Facilitating Factors of Portfolio Assessment Implementation as Perceived by Faculty and Students in Programs A, B, C, and D*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Faculty commitment to portfolio assessment</td>
<td>(1) Availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Availability of instructor's time</td>
<td>(2a) Availability of instructor's time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2b) More detailed information about portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3a) Availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students</td>
<td>(3) Systematic and formal planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3b) Formal policy regarding portfolio assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4a) Integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program</td>
<td>(4) Administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4b) Systematic and formal planning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) More detailed information about portfolios</td>
<td>(5) Recognition and motivation of the involved faculty</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consistent with other findings of this study, the faculty commitment to portfolio assessment was listed by faculty as the most important facilitating factor once again. Perhaps programs should re-examine their processes and increase the faculty involvement and commitment through involving professors in systematic planning of portfolio assessment in their program, sharing information on portfolio assessment benefits, providing adequate training and learning opportunities on portfolio processes and evaluation, and motivating faculty members.

**Portfolio assessment barriers.** The adoption of portfolio assessment requires a shift in instruction, assessment, and program culture (Aschbacher, 1993; Wolfe & Miller, 1997). Both the faculty and students also shared what they considered to be the barriers to a successful implementation of the portfolio assessment. Such factors as faculty members’ assumptions that portfolios are too time consuming to grade, lack of training for the faculty, and lack of information about the advantages of portfolio assessment were agreed upon by both the faculty and students. Please see Table 5.9 for a list of the top five barrier to successful implementation of portfolio assessment as perceived by faculty and students in Programs A, B, C, and D.

Data revealed that there were at least four issues where perceptions of the faculty and students differed significantly: (1) faculty fear of portfolios as a possible reflection on their teaching ability, (2) the incompatibility of portfolios with other assessment approaches in higher education, (3) lack of administrative support, and (4) lack of training for students (significant at p< .05).

Concerns about portfolios being time-consuming for faculty to grade were reported in the literature on numerous occasions (Aitken, 1993; Anderson & DeMuelle, 1998; Aschbacher, 1993; Davis et al., 2001) and were once again proved by findings of this study. Perhaps programs should re-examine their portfolio evaluation practices and facilitate this process for the faculty through developing a clear rubric, a checklist, or evaluation forms. Providing clear guidelines to students on portfolio components and limiting the number and volume of portfolio entries might help students be more focused and selective in assembling their portfolios, thus eliminating unnecessary paper and reducing time faculty spend on reviewing and grading portfolios.
Table 5.9

*The Top Five Barriers of Portfolio Assessment Implementation as Perceived by Faculty and Students in Programs A, B, C, and D*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Faculty members assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.</td>
<td>(1) Lack of training for students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Faculty lack experience in grading/evaluating portfolios.</td>
<td>(2) Faculty members are resistant to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Lack of training for faculty.</td>
<td>(3) Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.</td>
<td>(4) Faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Faculty members are resistant to change.</td>
<td>(5a) Lack of training for faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5b) Faculty members assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Research Question 11. Recommendations for Portfolio Assessment Improvement**

The information gained from this study indicated that the portfolio process could be improved in a variety of ways. Both the faculty and students involved in this study made recommendations about improving portfolio assessment in such areas as advising and guiding students in portfolio development, portfolio expectations, evaluation and feedback mechanisms, involvement of practicing school administrators and representatives of state and national agencies, training for the faculty and students, peer review of portfolios, and research on portfolio assessment effectiveness in the program. Please see Table 5.10 for a list of recommendations as given by the faculty and students in Programs A, B, C, and D.

**Electronic portfolios.** The faculty and students in several programs mentioned that they would like to incorporate technology into portfolio assessment and make portfolios electronic. Researchers agreed that electronic portfolios have advantages over traditional paper portfolios because besides being easy to update and store, they are interactive, transportable, and allow multiple media for developing artifacts and showcasing achievements (Bartlett, 2002; Batson,
Table 5.10

Recommendations of Faculty and Students Regarding Improvement of Portfolio Assessment in Programs A, B, C, and D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Faculty Recommendations</th>
<th>Student Recommendations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Program A</td>
<td>(1) Develop a more definitive program policy on portfolios. &lt;br&gt; (2) Increase faculty commitment to portfolio assessment &lt;br&gt; (3) Build commitment of practicing school administrators. &lt;br&gt; (4) Get student buy-in through talking to students and highlighting portfolio benefits. &lt;br&gt; (5) Develop a better portfolio evaluation mechanism. &lt;br&gt; (6) Design a rubric for assessment. &lt;br&gt; (7) Conduct research on portfolio assessment in the program.</td>
<td>(1) Create a handbook on portfolio assessment. &lt;br&gt; (2) Provide samples exemplarily portfolios. &lt;br&gt; (3) Develop a rubric for assessment. &lt;br&gt; (4) Increase faculty commitment. &lt;br&gt; (5) Design a more systematic approach for portfolio development. &lt;br&gt; (6) Provide more guidance throughout the program. &lt;br&gt; (7) Allow more flexibility in selecting artifacts. &lt;br&gt; (8) Give an opportunity for creativity. &lt;br&gt; (9) Provide a chance to collaborate with their peers on portfolio development and promote peer review of portfolios. &lt;br&gt; (10) For faculty, review portfolio progress periodically and not only at the end of the program. &lt;br&gt; (11) Improve portfolio presentation as a culminating activity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program B</td>
<td>(1) Conduct training for faculty. &lt;br&gt; (2) Train students.</td>
<td>(1) Develop and apply uniformed portfolio expectations. &lt;br&gt; (2) Develop uniformed guidelines for portfolio construction and evaluation. &lt;br&gt; (3) Have examples of appropriately developed portfolios. &lt;br&gt; (4) Improve evaluation process. &lt;br&gt; (5) Provide additional and detailed feedback upon portfolio completion. &lt;br&gt; (6) Conduct more training for students. &lt;br&gt; (7) Discuss with students benefits and power of portfolio assessment &lt;br&gt; (8) Organize training for faculty on portfolio evaluation. &lt;br&gt; (9) Allow students to be more creative. &lt;br&gt; (10) Move to electronic portfolios or three-dimensional portfolios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Faculty Recommendations</td>
<td>Student Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program C</td>
<td>(1) Tighten up expectations about portfolios.</td>
<td>(1) Be more flexible (for faculty).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Work on continuous improvement of portfolio process and product.</td>
<td>(2) Allow students make decisions about the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Align course requirements and portfolio standards.</td>
<td>(3) Give more room for creativity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Improve evaluation practices.</td>
<td>(4) Improve advising practices on portfolio development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Conduct faculty training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(6) Encourage faculty communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(7) Do research on portfolio assessment in the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8) Have examples of good portfolios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(9) Move to electronic portfolios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(10) Be more flexible (for faculty).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11) Allow students make decisions about the content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(12) Give more room for creativity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(13) Improve evaluation practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(14) Conduct faculty training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(15) Encourage faculty communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(16) Do research on portfolio assessment in the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17) Have examples of good portfolios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(18) Move to electronic portfolios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(19) Be more flexible (for faculty).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20) Allow students make decisions about the content.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(21) Give more room for creativity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(22) Improve evaluation practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(23) Conduct faculty training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24) Encourage faculty communication.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(25) Do research on portfolio assessment in the program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(26) Have examples of good portfolios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(27) Move to electronic portfolios.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2002; Carney, 2001, 2003; Piper, 1999; Wright, Stallworth, & Ray, 2002). This option should be strongly considered in portfolio implementation.

**Training for faculty and students.** Training was mentioned as one of the critical elements of portfolio assessment improvement in all of the programs. Many authors view learning and training as one of many means to improve people performance, to enhance project continuation, and, in the long run, to gain commitment of the faculty (Biech, 2002; Dixon, 1994; Lick & Kaufman, 2000-1; Rossett, 1987, 2002; Senge, 1994; Senge et al., 1999) and students.
(Davis et al. 2001; Jones, 1996; Mick, 1996). It was suggested that learning, awareness and in-depth training, and support activities in portfolio assessment might account for substantial success and continuation of this innovation in programs preparing educational leaders.

Successful training must follow a systematic and planned process and attend to all fundamental aspects of the training process: needs analysis, goal setting, training design, evaluation, and transfer (Goldstein, 1993). Dixon (1994) considered that learning should become an intertwined part of any organization and, as such, it is “the intentional use of learning processes at the individual, group and system level to continuously transform the organization in a direction that is increasingly satisfying to its stakeholders” (p. 5). Misunderstanding about portfolio assessment and its processes and lack of the necessary skills might cause negative attitudes of the faculty and students toward portfolios and defer effective implementation of portfolios. Learning and training can be one of the means to avoid this. According to Lick’s and Kaufman’s universal change principal, “learning…must precede change” to improve chances for successful implementation of any innovation (Lick & Kaufman, 2000-1, p. 28). Written guidelines, a student portfolio handbook, written criteria for portfolio evaluation, and other materials might be instrumental in providing detailed information and promote acquisition of the necessary knowledge and skills in the area of portfolio assessment.

**Portfolio Assessment Recommendations for Improvement: A “Should-be” Portfolio**

When the faculty and students shared their opinions on what portfolio assessment should look like, their opinions did not differ in such areas as purposes of portfolio assessment in a program, portfolio evaluation, oral defense/presentation of portfolios, people attending presentations, feedback given, and student self-assessment. Please see Table 5.11 for a summary of major areas of a “should-be” portfolio, as perceived by the faculty and students.

**Oral defense/presentation of a student portfolio.** Both the faculty and students in this study acknowledged the value of an oral presentation of a student portfolio in front of a graduate committee and indicated that it should be included as a part of a portfolio assessment process. A student presentation of his/her portfolio before an audience could become a celebration of one’s accomplishments. This presentation also can encourage a dialogue between the faculty and a
student and enhance student professional growth and improvement. Inviting practicing school administrations to attend portfolio presentations would prompt their involvement in the

Table 5. 11

*Faculty and Students Perceptions Regarding Portfolio Assessment “Should Be”*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio purposes (top two)</td>
<td>(Other than a graduation requirement)</td>
<td>(Other than a graduation requirement)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Assessment of internship</td>
<td>(1) Program evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Program evaluation</td>
<td>(2) Assessment of internship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique features (top five)</td>
<td>(1) Assessment checklist for faculty</td>
<td>(1) Written guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Assessment checklist for students</td>
<td>(2) Assessment checklist for faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Mentor to guide students</td>
<td>(3) Website or handbook on portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Written guidelines</td>
<td>(4) Assessment checklist for students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) Website or handbook on portfolios</td>
<td>(5) Mentor to guide students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies/Areas (top five)</td>
<td>(1) Diversity and Ethics</td>
<td>(1) Curriculum and instruction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Curriculum and instruction, Parent and community relations, Technology, and Transformational leadership</td>
<td>(2) Parent and community relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Human resources and Student assessment</td>
<td>(3) School law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4) Political and regulatory environment and Student services</td>
<td>(4) Ethics, School finance, and Technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5) School law</td>
<td>(5) Human resources and Student assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio evaluation/grading</td>
<td>Portfolio should be evaluated and graded as a whole</td>
<td>Portfolio should be evaluated and graded as a whole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grades assigned</td>
<td>Pass/fail</td>
<td>On a scale (e.g., from excellent to poor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral portfolio defense/presentation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who should attend portfolio defense/presentation (top two)</td>
<td>(1) Committee members</td>
<td>(1) Committee members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Major professor</td>
<td>(2) Major professor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>In writing, on a separate form attached to the portfolio</td>
<td>In writing, on a separate form attached to the portfolio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student self-assessment</td>
<td>Yes, through written reflections enclosed in the portfolio</td>
<td>Yes, through written reflections enclosed in the portfolio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
portfolio assessment process, build professional connections between universities and schools, create a bridge between theory and practice, and perhaps would encourage school administrators to consider portfolios in employment interviews.

The previous sections described major research findings and conclusions. The following sections will provide a summary of differences in perceptions of the faculty and students regarding portfolio assessment, implications for practice in the field of Educational Leadership/Administration, and suggestions for further research.

**Differences in Faculty Perceptions Regarding Portfolio Assessment**

An attempt was made to compare perceptions of the faculty in Programs A and B that use portfolios for more than five years and Programs C and D where portfolios are used for a shorter period of time. I did not observe any differences in perceptions of the faculty in terms of portfolio assessment strengths, facilitating factors, or barriers. The only significant difference was identified at the .05 level regarding such potential portfolio weakness as portfolios being labor intensive for faculty to evaluate that was more strongly supported by the faculty in Programs A and B. This difference in perceptions might be explained by the evaluation mechanisms used, a quality of developed rubrics, and faculty proficiency in using rubrics and assessment sheets. Program A was only considering to moving to standards and rubrics for assessment. Another reason for this might be that Program A had the highest enrollment in comparison with Programs B, C, and D. The number of portfolios for evaluation can become a considerable burden for major professors and committee members.

**Differences in Student Perceptions Regarding Portfolio Assessment**

A comparison of student perceptions regarding portfolio assessment weaknesses, facilitating factors, or barriers revealed no significant differences between Programs A and B (group 1) using portfolio assessment for more than five years and Programs C and D (group 2) using portfolios less than five years. However, students in Programs A and B were less convinced that portfolios helped them to know themselves better in comparison to students in Programs C and D. It might be suggested that this difference was observed perhaps due to various reflection strategies implemented in the programs and/or self-assessment techniques. It is believed that both can help a student know himself/herself better if the portfolio assessment
formatted in such a way to highlight individual strengths, weaknesses, and areas for improvement.

**Differences in Faculty and Student Perceptions Regarding Portfolio Assessment**

The faculty and students were less homogeneous with respect to portfolio assessment strengths, weaknesses, facilitating factors, and barriers. They differed in perceptions of the following four portfolios strengths: portfolios were more powerful than single measures of student achievements; facilitated student application of knowledge; fostered critical thinking in students; and helped students come to know themselves better (significant at $p < .05$). Faculty members were convinced to a greater extent than students regarding the above portfolio assessment strengths. It is suggested that this difference was observed, perhaps because students were less aware of portfolio influence on them due to poorly designed portfolio processes or insufficient reflections.

The faculty and student perceptions also varied in terms of three portfolio weaknesses: portfolios being difficult to defend legally, submission of fraudulent work by students, and portfolios being time consuming for students to compile and maintain. Students were inclined to agree with these propositions, while faculty were convinced to a lesser degree.

Though there were no reported precedents of faculty actually defending portfolio grades legally, faculty members thought they would have no difficulty doing so. However, they stressed their concerns about portfolio assessment reliability and validity. It might be suggested that improving reliability and validity would make portfolio assessment more credible (Baume, 2001; Black, 1993; Mabry, 1999; Oosterhof, 2001). This might be achieved through a careful specification of evaluation criteria for a student’s portfolio either by developing a scoring plan for each objective, a checklist, a rating scale, a scoring rubric, or scoring protocols. Training of a portfolio assessor would also increase accuracy and consistency in rating. If resources are available increasing the number of portfolio reviewers to promote the consistency with which portfolios are scored can also increase the number of observations. To improve a situation with validity, students should be given clear criteria for evaluation and scoring of their portfolios. They also should to be guided on how to select their best work to demonstrate the achievement of specified objectives.
Despite previous reports of Christian (1993) and Prus and Johnson (1993), faculty members in this study indicated that it was unlikely that a student would submit fraudulent work. At the same time, students shared examples of how that was happening: some students would enclose in their portfolios project items from their schools or school districts where they had little or no input. Such projects as a school improvement plan, school budget, student disciplinary policy, and alike can be examples. It is worth noting that all forms of assessment are at risk of some form of cheating. Faculty members might consider the limited possibility of plagiarism as they evaluate reflections that cannot be purchased or downloaded from a school website. Experienced faculty members can identify fraudulent work and realize when a student is plagiarizing. A good portfolio requires the skills of analysis, synthesis, and evaluation, and evidence of individual progress and learning. As Baume (2001, p.19) noted, it should require the students to "find their own voice" -- it should not be just collection of information.

It might be suggested that, to prevent fraudulent work in portfolios, the faculty can ask students to provide information about their personal input into the project in the introduction to each portfolio entry or as a part of the reflection. This strategy should be also used in case of group projects, as collaborative learning and team projects become more and more popular. Students should indicate whether a project was completed individually or together with other team members. In this case, students also should provide a description and indicate the level of their involvement in the project.

The faculty and students also differed in their perceptions of two facilitating factors: faculty commitment to portfolio assessment and the integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program. Faculty members were convinced of the importance of these factors to a greater degree, in comparison to student perceptions. The importance of faculty commitment was already discussed in this paper. Integration of portfolio assessment with other types of assessment might be instrumental in making informed and sound decisions about individual students. Other assessment tools might be used alongside portfolios to make such high-stake decisions as student completion of the graduate program.

As for the barriers to successful implementation of portfolio assessment, such issues as faculty fear that portfolios might be viewed as a possible reflection on their teaching ability, incompatibility of portfolios with other assessment approaches in higher education, lack of
administrative support, and lack of training for students did not find equal support with faculty and students. Discussions and possible explanations of these findings follow.

Despite Prus’s and Johnson’s (1993) and Lopez’s (1999) findings that some faculty “believe the results of any assessment of student learning at the program level will be taken into account during faculty evaluation and could affect tenure, promotion, or salary decisions” (p. 12), faculty members in Programs A, B, C, and D tended to disagree with this notion. However, students were of the opinion that some faculty fear portfolios because the results of student portfolio assessment can be viewed as a possible reflection on their teaching ability and used against them in their performance evaluation. It might be suggested that, to avoid any misconception in this area, it should be explained that portfolio assessment would never be used for evaluation of individual professors. It should be stressed to both the faculty and students that the purpose of portfolio assessment and the use of its results are about student learning and not about faculty evaluation.

Students were convinced more than the faculty that the incompatibility of portfolios with other assessment approaches in higher education might be a barrier to an effective implementation of portfolio assessment, thus providing some support to limited publications on this issue (Christian, 1993).

Consistent with the findings of Davis et al. (2001), Jones (1996), Mick (1996), Wade and Yarbrough (1996), and Zidon (1996), students in this study were almost unanimous in their acknowledgment that the lack of training for students might be a barrier to the successful implementation of portfolio assessments. The importance of training for both the faculty and students has already been discussed in this paper. It might be highlighted that students, to be active and willing participants in portfolio assessment, should understand its purpose, content, and processes. Confirming findings of Lopez (1999), it might be stated that without proper training and adequate information, “students form ambivalent or negative impressions of the assessment” (p. 21).

**Recommendations and Implications for Educational Leadership/Administration Programs**

Based on the literature review and major research findings of this study, many recommendations can be made for programs considering or using portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders. Based on observations of this research, I made an
attempt to present these recommendations in the form of a model that might be used in Educational Leadership/Administration programs to implement portfolio assessment and identify factors that promote and facilitate this process. It is important to remember that each program has different characteristics and circumstances. As such, this model might help direct portfolio assessment activities, but will not provide strict rules for assessment implementation.

**Portfolio Assessment Model**

The proposed Educational Leadership Portfolio Assessment Model is based on a typical ADDIE model (Gustafson, 1994; Reiser, 2002; Rossett, 1987) that involves analysis, design, development, implementation, and evaluation activities. The current model treats portfolio assessment implementation as a systematic process and includes five interconnected phases: (1) identify the purpose and focus of the portfolio in the program; (2) design and develop a portfolio model in the program; (3) pilot the model and improve it as needed; (4) implement the model; and (5) evaluate and improve it as needed (see Figure 5.1).

![Diagram of the Educational Leadership Portfolio Assessment Model](image)

**Figure 5.1. Educational Leadership Portfolio Assessment Model**

Though following the similar steps as other ADDIE models, this model suggests activities specifically designed for educational leadership programs. The following recommendations elaborate on each phase and offer guidelines for the implementation of the Educational Leadership Portfolio Assessment Model. It is important to analyze the current assessment practices in the program, identify the gaps, and determine whether there is a need for portfolio assessment in the program.
1. Identify the Purpose and Focus of the Portfolio

1.1 Establish a portfolio committee and include all stakeholders: the faculty, students, practicing school administrators, and representatives of outside agencies. Identify and involve those in outside agencies and their resources (NCATE, ISLLC, State Departments of Education), which might be instrumental in portfolio implementation through guidelines, requirements, and regulations. This recommendation is based on the need for coordinating assessment practices among all personnel working with graduate students in the program. The portfolio committee should work in a coordinated effort and be composed of faculty members, students, practicing school leaders, and district superintendents. State department of education representatives, personnel officers, and others also could be invited. Resources of outside agencies should be incorporated in developing procedures and guidelines for the program.

1.2 Determine the focus of the portfolio and its purposes in the program. Once the portfolio committee has been established, its first task is to determine purposes for which information in the portfolio will be used. In Educational Leadership/Administration programs, apart from a graduation requirement and summative assessment, this can include admission to the program, assessment in individual courses, assessment of internship experiences, and an overall program evaluation for improvement and/or accreditation.

2. Design and Develop a Portfolio Model in the Program

There is no one-size-fits-all model for portfolio assessment. Program requirements, state guidelines, and the culture in your program dictate major elements of the designed model. However, it is possible to specify the following:

2.1 Identify competencies to be assessed by portfolio. The purpose of this portfolio planning stage is to determine how information about student progress, related to each competency, will be gathered and evaluated against specified standards. State, ISLLC, NCATE, and other professional standards can be used as a guide. It should be specified in measurable outcomes what knowledge, skills, and abilities students need to be able to demonstrate in their portfolios for graduation.

2.2 Align curriculum to make sure that specific competencies are taught. It is critical to make sure that core classes provide a knowledge base and an opportunity for all students to develop professional competencies, be able to produce evidence of their mastery through
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portfolio artifacts, and become reflective learners and practitioners. A simple matrix can be used for aligning program curriculum and portfolio assessment (see Table 5.12 for details). Identified competencies or standards are placed in the left-hand column and matched to core courses in the program where this competency is built. Course products and other artifacts that provide evidence of the mastery of this competency are listed next. To facilitate the organization and cross-reference of portfolio entries, each artifact should be assigned to a particular portfolio section. It is worth noting that one portfolio product can correspond to multiple competencies. The last column has a space for any relevant references or notes. The same table also can be incorporated into a checklist for portfolio assessment.

Table 5.12

*Sample of a Curriculum and Portfolio Alignment Form*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standards/Competencies</th>
<th>Course</th>
<th>Artifacts illustrating student mastery of this competency</th>
<th>Portfolio Section</th>
<th>References/Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.3 Specify portfolio structure, content, and artifacts that might serve as evidence of mastering the competencies. Both the faculty and students should have an understanding of the course objectives, their connection to the ultimate standards and competencies addressed in the portfolios, and the development of course products that later can become portfolio artifacts. Students should be trained not only as to how to collect and select portfolio artifacts, but also as to how to write reflections to accompany their portfolio entries. Students should also be given an opportunity to present any other artifacts they consider to be significant evidence of their professional preparation. Rationale for the selection of these artifacts and reflections should accompany this and other sections of a portfolio. To avoid the excessive accumulation of paper
and projects, the portfolio size should be specified (e.g., a one-inch binder) and should be divided into two sections: required portfolio content, which is needed to maintain basic information that is related to student achievement of competencies or needed for educational or administrative decisions, and supplementary portfolio content, which broadens the range of information to provide a comprehensive picture of a student as a professional.

Such organizational tools as a table of content, references, clear labels, and titled sections are important for portfolio constructions. Students should be advised in all their classes on a preferred style and format for their products. The same format of artifacts should be requested for portfolio development. A submission checklist might help students to ensure that portfolios are assembled and submitted according to the specified standards.

The format and medium of portfolios should also be considered at this stage. Strong considerations should be given to electronic portfolios. Depending on available resources and technology competencies of both the faculty and students, various formats can be used: CD-ROM portfolios, web-based portfolios, and customized and commercially developed and supported portfolios. This possibility should be strongly considered as electronic portfolios interlink standards, artifacts, and reflections, allow easy access to portfolios from any computer with Internet access, promote collaboration across distance through the reviewer interface or feedback, and ease the transition from an assessment portfolio to an employment and professional development tool.

2.4 Set standards and criteria for portfolio evaluation. Written guidelines for portfolio development should be established to include competencies to be assessed, the collection and selection of artifacts, a format for reflections, and a set of criteria for portfolio evaluation. Mastery of competencies, as evidenced through student portfolio, might be assessed by students themselves, their peers, faculty members in the program, committee members, internship supervisors, and practicing school administrators. Standards and criteria for student performance are necessary for reaching decisions on student admission to the program or for graduation. The standards and criteria established by the portfolio committee will be used to assist in interpreting each student's portfolio and will, therefore, play a critical role in portfolio planning.

A criterion-referenced interpretation of data is used when students are rated in terms of their mastery of educational objectives and professional competencies. The criteria for mastery
should be set for each competency area and progress should be determined by comparing where the student stands in relation to each criterion. Mastery of competencies might be defined as the successful achievement of course objectives and completion of adequate samples of each type of specified portfolio artifacts. When students fulfill these requirements, they have mastered the criteria. It might be useful to separately assess the quality of the portfolios and the achievement of competencies, as evidenced by portfolio artifacts.

**2.5 Develop evaluation and feedback procedures.** A system should be established to check reliability and to validate decisions regarding student mastery of competencies. Reliability of the portfolio information needs to be addressed to ensure that judgments about student performance are based on accurate information. To avoid potential inconsistency in interpretation and scoring of portfolios, a rubric should be developed and followed. There are various types of rubrics available. Review several of them, modify them, and develop the one that most adequately conveys information about student performance to faculty, a student, and other audiences. Even assuming two different faculty members would use exactly the same evidence, there is still considerable room for differences of opinion. The resolution of this difficulty is for the portfolio committee to decide on the specific criteria for reaching judgments concerning student progress, to discuss, thoroughly and in advance, areas where there is a potential for varied interpretations of the same information, and to perform intermittent checks on the accuracy of ratings.

A rubric and feedback form should be designed and given to students. Depending on the availability of advisors, both formative and summative techniques should be incorporated into evaluation practices to elicit specific kinds of information about student progress throughout the program.

More often student portfolios are evaluated as a whole. A pass/fail grade might be assigned to student portfolios, though one might want to consider evaluating each competency or standard on a scale. The latter might provide a better feedback on individual student strengths and weaknesses.

Portfolio review and evaluation responsibilities should be allocated among portfolio committee members and should be scheduled at predetermined points. It is preferable to provide feedback to students in writing, on a separate form attached to the portfolio and also during a
formal presentation/defense of the portfolio by a student. Portfolios should be used to convey information to students concerning their mastery of competencies and illustrate the student's growth and progress to other interested audiences. While grades inform students about their success or failure, feedback provides them with specific details and examples. Consider organizing the presentation activity as a professional formal event when a student, the major professor and committee members discuss student strengths, weaknesses, and potential ways to improve identified areas. Additionally, this event might be a celebration and a memorable event for the student.

2.6 Plan and complete student and faculty training. Involve all stakeholders and build their commitment to portfolio assessment. All people involved in portfolio implementation should be informed about all procedures through a written handbook, a website, or written guidelines. Their feedback and opinions should be incorporated into any revisions of the portfolio model. The commitment of all stakeholders should be built through their shared responsibility and participation in assessment, their constant involvement in a portfolio development process, and the communication of portfolio design and implementation issues. Both the faculty and students should have easy access to all written documentation regarding portfolio requirements for reference purposes. A well-designed and comprehensive training program for all of the faculty and students should incorporate, but not be limited to, the following topics:

- Portfolio assessment purposes in the program
- Portfolio benefits for the faculty and students
- Competencies to be addressed in portfolios
- Portfolio structure and content
- Selection of artifacts
- Reflective writing
- Evaluation of portfolios and criteria for evaluation
- Deadlines and procedures for portfolio submission
- Next steps for the student portfolio: how to modify an assessment portfolio into a professional development portfolio
All training materials should be updated regularly and be available for self-study or quick reference. It is useful to have some exemplarily portfolio samples for reference and review. It also is preferable to invite students and faculty members who benefited from portfolio assessment to share their experiences.

3. Pilot the Model

3.1 Implement the pilot model. A purpose of the pilot project is to test the effectiveness of the portfolio process and products and make necessary revisions.

3.2 Conduct research and assess effectiveness. Report results to stakeholders.

Improve as needed. Conclude a pilot project once objectives are met, and begin preparing for a full implementation. Document the lessons learned. It is important at all stages of portfolio implementation to conduct research to identify portfolio effectiveness and solicit opinions of this form of assessment from all stakeholders, the faculty and students in particular. Purposes of this research are multifaceted: it allows not only for making informed decisions and leads to data-driven conclusions and actions, but also involves all participants, gives them a sense of control, and promotes better commitment to the portfolio process. Gather feedback from the faculty, students, practicing school administrators, and other stakeholders to fine-tune the implementation of portfolios, gather reactions, and identify what is not working as planned. It is important to report all the findings to faculty and students and keep them informed at all stages of piloting procedures. Piloting will also allow an estimation of necessary resources and costs associated with portfolio assessment. Recommendations for improvement should be taken into account and considered in the refinement of the final model.

4. Implement the Model

The extensive planning that has entered into all previous stages of the portfolio model design and piloting will contribute essential information and procedures to aid implementation. By the time of implementation, the portfolio committee should be able to develop detailed understanding of the purposes for which the portfolio will be used and the professional competencies that will be assessed. Portfolio contents and evaluation procedures should be selected and a plan for their use identified. Finally, procedures for ensuring the reliability of portfolio information and the validity of decisions should be determined. Written guidelines, forms, rubrics, and training materials should be developed, piloted, and improved as required.
All implementation procedures should be monitored and documented to ensure consistency and accountability.

5. Evaluate the Model and Improve as Needed

As with any innovation, evaluation as a systemic process is important for determining the quality and effectiveness of the model. A focus should be on finding out whether efforts are unfolding as planned, uncovering any barriers or unexpected opportunities that may have emerged, and identify adjustments and corrections which can help insure the success of the portfolio assessment in the future.

Suggestions for Future Research

The findings of this study may serve as a basis for future studies of portfolio assessment in programs preparing educational leaders. The research outline and strategies may be used to examine programs at other universities in an attempt to provide a broader spectrum of portfolio assessment, as only four programs were a part of this study. It is suggested that not only master’s level students but also specialists and doctoral students preparing portfolios as part of their graduation requirements need to be included in future research. There might be a potential benefit in studying how demographic and personal characteristics of graduate students influence their perceptions toward portfolio assessment. Other potential areas for further research might include, but are not limited to, such areas as mechanisms of portfolio evaluation, reflective practices and portfolios, and the incorporation of technology in portfolio assessment. It also might be important to study whether faculty or student demographic and personal characteristics have any influence on person’s perceptions and attitudes towards portfolio assessment.

Portfolio Evaluation

Portfolio evaluation is one of the stronger concerns and criticisms of this type of assessment. Improvement of reliability and validity of portfolio assessment might be considered as one of the most important areas for future research. The development of effective and efficient evaluation and feedback mechanisms would benefit both the faculty and students.

Reflections and Portfolios

Reflections involve potential educational leaders in examining their practice, seeking to expand their leadership abilities, deepen their knowledge, sharpen their judgment, and adapting to new findings, ideas, and theories. It might be practical to study how the reflective process can
be incorporated into the coursework of a program preparing educational leaders and in portfolio assessment, thus allowing students to describe what they learn, tie what they learn to standards, and explain how they can apply new skills in practice. Further research could help to identify appropriate reflective practices and models and reflective writing templates.

**Teaching and Student Portfolios**

One of potential research areas might include a study of portfolio assessment and its effectiveness in programs where faculty members also develop their teaching portfolios. This study would allow examining an assessment culture in programs and seeing correlation, if any, in such areas as portfolio development processes, level of faculty and student collaboration and involvement, attitudes towards portfolio assessment, and perceptions of the faculty and students engaged in portfolio development.

**Practicing School Administrators and Portfolios**

It might be practical to study whether the use of portfolio assessments in graduate programs impact performance of new practicing administrators and encourage the use of portfolios for teachers and students in their schools. Correlation aspects between leadership program preparation and school administrator/principal effectiveness (measured by teacher perceptions and school improvement) might also be of a potential interest. Another issue of a potential interest is how portfolio preparation in a graduate program facilitates a person’s adaptation to a school district performance-based administration evaluation process, underlying principles, and procedures.

**Electronic portfolios.** Further research would help programs preparing educational leaders to determine the most useful technologies for assessment, as well as the most effective ways of integrating technology into the preparation of school administrators. There is a need for more data collection and longitudinal research on the effects of incorporating technology, the problems encountered, strengths and/or weaknesses of creating a portfolio electronically, perceptions of the faculty and students on the value and purpose of electronic portfolios, and whether the benefits extend beyond programs preparing educational leaders. Other suggested studies might include a comparative study on traditional paper portfolios in contrast to electronic portfolios to assess the efficacy of effort and move beyond implementation issues to research and evaluation. It also might be valuable to study how the faculty can use technology to monitor
student progress in portfolio development, evaluate portfolios, assign grades, and provide feedback.

**Conclusion**

Portfolios offer rich possibilities for learning and assessment and, as such, can benefit the faculty, students, and other stakeholders. The possibilities of integrating portfolio assessment into programs preparing educational leaders are endless. Many programs accept portfolios as an integral part of their instructional strategies, student assessment, and program evaluation. They are committed to refining assessments by evolving further guidelines for portfolio use and making evaluation of portfolios valid and reliable. If universities are to enhance standard- and performance-based assessment reforms in American schools, future educational leaders and administrators should be in the vanguard of knowing, experiencing, and promoting new forms of assessment. Procedures of performance- and standards-based assessment should be updated and refined to meet the new requirements and expectations for today’s school leaders. Stakeholders at all levels (state, university, secondary education, superintendents, principals) and personnel from school administrators’ associations, teachers’ associations, parents’ associations, and schools board associations should become active participants in this process. Improved preparation of graduate students in Educational Leadership/Administration programs will help to produce school leaders who are ready to handle today’s educational challenges.
APPENDIX A
INTERSTATE SCHOOL LEADERS LICENSURE CONSORTIUM (ISLLC) STANDARDS

No longer an active project, the Interstate School Leaders Licensure Consortium (ISLLC) was established in 1994, under the guidance of the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). ISLLC was a consortium of 32 education agencies and 13 education administration associations that worked collaboratively to establish an education policy framework for school leadership. The Consortium's vision of leadership was based on the premise that the criteria and standards for the professional practice of school leaders must be grounded in the knowledge and understanding of teaching and learning. The purpose of the ISLLC was to provide a means through which states could work together to develop and implement model standards, assessments, professional development, and licensing procedures for school leaders. The ultimate goals of ISLLC were to raise the bar for school leaders to enter and remain in the profession and to reshape concepts of educational leadership (CCSSO, 2002).

Six ISLLC standards were adopted in November 1996. Each standard reflects what knowledge (knowledge and understanding), dispositions (beliefs, values, and commitments), and performances school leaders need to have and demonstrate. The standards are as follows.

**Standard 1**: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by **facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.**

**Knowledge**

*The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:*

* learning goals in a pluralistic society
* the principles of developing and implementing strategic plans
* systems theory
* information sources, data collection, and data analysis strategies
* effective communication  
* effective consensus-building and negotiation skills  

**Dispositions**  

*The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:*

* the educability of all  
* a school vision of high standards of learning  
* continuous school improvement  
* the inclusion of all members of the school community  
* ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, and values needed to become successful adults  
* a willingness to continuously examine one’s own assumptions, beliefs, and practices  
* doing the work required for high levels of personal and organization performance  

**Performances**  

*The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:*

* the vision and mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members  
* the vision and mission are communicated through the use of symbols, ceremonies, stories, and similar activities  
* the core beliefs of the school vision are modeled for all stakeholders  
* the vision is developed with and among stakeholders  
* the contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated  
* progress toward the vision and mission is communicated to all stakeholders  
* the school community is involved in school improvement efforts  
* the vision shapes the educational programs, plans, and actions  
* an implementation plan is developed in which objectives and strategies to achieve the vision and goals are clearly articulated  
* assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision and goals  
* relevant demographic data pertaining to students and their families are used in developing the school mission and goals
The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:

* barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, and addressed
* needed resources are sought and obtained to support the implementation of the school mission and goals
* existing resources are used in support of the school vision and goals
* the vision, mission, and implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, and revised

**Standard 2:** A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by **advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning and staff professional growth.**

**Knowledge**

* **The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:**
  * student growth and development
  * applied learning theories
  * applied motivational theories
  * curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, and refinement
  * principles of effective instruction
  * measurement, evaluation, and assessment strategies
  * diversity and its meaning for educational programs
  * adult learning and professional development models
  * the change process for systems, organizations, and individuals
  * the role of technology in promoting student learning and professional growth
  * school cultures

**Dispositions**

* **The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:**
  * student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling
  * the proposition that all students can learn
  * the variety of ways in which students can learn
  * life long learning for self and others
  * professional development as an integral part of school improvement
  * the benefits that diversity brings to the school community
* a safe and supportive learning environment
* preparing students to be contributing members of society

**Performances**

* The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:
  * all individuals are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect
  * professional development promotes a focus on student learning consistent with the school vision and goals
  * students and staff feel valued and important
  * the responsibilities and contributions of each individual are acknowledged
  * barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed
  * diversity is considered in developing learning experiences
  * life long learning is encouraged and modeled
  * there is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance
  * technologies are used in teaching and learning
  * student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated
  * multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students
  * the school is organized and aligned for success
  * curricular, co-curricular, and extra-curricular programs are designed, implemented, evaluated, and refined
  * curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, and the recommendations of learned societies
  * the school culture and climate are assessed on a regular basis
  * a variety of sources of information is used to make decisions
  * student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques
  * multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students
  * a variety of supervisory and evaluation models is employed
  * pupil personnel programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families

**Standard 3:** A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.


**Knowledge**

*The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:*  
* theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational development  
* operational procedures at the school and district level  
* principles and issues relating to school safety and security  
* human resources management and development  
* principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management  
* principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space  
* legal issues impacting school operations  
* current technologies that support management functions

**Dispositions**

*The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:*  
* making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching  
* taking risks to improve schools  
* trusting people and their judgments  
* accepting responsibility  
* high-quality standards, expectations, and performances  
* involving stakeholders in management processes  
* a safe environment

**Performances**

*The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:*  
* knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development is used to inform management decisions  
* operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning  
* emerging trends are recognized, studied, and applied as appropriate  
* operational plans and procedures to achieve the vision and goals of the school are in place  
* collective bargaining and other contractual agreements related to the school are effectively managed  
* the school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, and effectively
* time is managed to maximize attainment of organizational goals
* potential problems and opportunities are identified
* problems are confronted and resolved in a timely manner
* financial, human, and material resources are aligned to the goals of schools
* the school acts entrepreneurally to support continuous improvement
* organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed
* stakeholders are involved in decisions affecting schools
* responsibility is shared to maximize ownership and accountability
* effective problem-framing and problem-solving skills are used
* effective conflict resolution skills are used
* effective group-process and consensus-building skills are used
* effective communication skills are used
* a safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing school environment is created and maintained
* human resource functions support the attainment of school goals
* confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained

**Standard 4**: A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by **collaborating with families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.**

**Knowledge**
The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
* emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community
* the conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community
* community resources
* community relations and marketing strategies and processes
* successful models of school, family, business, community, government and higher education partnerships

**Dispositions**
The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
* schools operating as an integral part of the larger community
* collaboration and communication with families
* involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes
* the proposition that diversity enriches the school
* families as partners in the education of their children
* the proposition that families have the best interests of their children in mind
* resources of the family and community needing to be brought to bear on the education of students
* an informed public

**Performances**

The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:

* high visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community is a priority
* relationships with community leaders are identified and nurtured
* information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly
* there is outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations
* credence is given to individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict
* the school and community serve one another as resources
* available community resources are secured to help the school solve problems and achieve goals
* partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups
to strengthen programs and support school goals
* community youth family services are integrated with school programs
* community stakeholders are treated equitably
* diversity is recognized and valued
* effective media relations are developed and maintained
* a comprehensive program of community relations is established
* public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely
* community collaboration is modeled for staff
* opportunities for staff to develop collaborative skills are provided

**Standard 5:** A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by **acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.**
Knowledge

* the purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society
* various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics
* the values of the diverse school community
* professional codes of ethics
* the philosophy and history of education

Dispositions

* the ideal of the common good
* the principles in the Bill of Rights
* the right of every student to a free, quality education
* bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process
* subordinating one’s own interest to the good of the school community
* accepting the consequences for upholding one’s principles and actions
* using the influence of one’s office constructively and productively in the service of all students and their families
* development of a caring school community

Performances

* examines personal and professional values
* demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics
* demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance
* serves as a role model
* accepts responsibility for school operations
* considers the impact of one’s administrative practices on others
* uses the influence of the office to enhance the educational program rather than for personal gain
* treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect
* protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff
* demonstrates appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community
* recognizes and respects the legitimate authority of others
* examines and considers the prevailing values of the diverse school community
* expects that others in the school community will demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior
* opens the school to public scrutiny
* fulfills legal and contractual obligations
* applies laws and procedures fairly, wisely, and considerately

**Standard 6:** A school administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by **understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context.**

**Knowledge**

* The administrator has knowledge and understanding of:
  * principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools
  * the role of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation
  * the law as related to education and schooling
  * the political, social, cultural and economic systems and processes that impact schools
  * models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural and economic contexts of schooling
  * global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning
  * the dynamics of policy development and advocacy under our democratic political system
  * the importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society

**Dispositions**

* The administrator believes in, values, and is committed to:
  * education as a key to opportunity and social mobility
  * recognizing a variety of ideas, values, and cultures
  * importance of a continuing dialogue with other decision makers affecting education
* actively participating in the political and policy-making context in the service of education
* using legal systems to protect student rights and improve student opportunities

**Performances**

*The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:*
* the environment in which schools operate is influenced on behalf of students and their families
* communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which schools operate
* there is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups
* the school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities
* public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students
* lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community
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To: Dina Vyortkina
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The forms that you submitted to this office in regard to the use of human subjects in the proposal referenced above have been reviewed by the Secretary, the Chair, and two members of the Human Subjects Committee. Your project is determined to be exempt per 45 CFR § 46.101(b)2 and has been approved by an accelerated review process.

The Human Subjects Committee has not evaluated your proposal for scientific merit, except to weigh the risk to the human participants and the aspects of the proposal related to potential risk and benefit. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals which may be required.

If the project has not been completed by October 21, 2003 you must request renewed approval for continuation of the project.

You are advised that any change in protocol in this project must be approved by resubmission of the project to the Committee for approval. Also, the principal investigator must promptly report, in writing, any unexpected problems causing risks to research subjects or others.

By copy of this memorandum, the chairman of your department and/or your major professor is reminded that he/she is responsible for being informed concerning research projects involving human subjects in the department, and should review protocols of such investigations as often as needed to insure that the project is being conducted in compliance with our institution and with DHHS regulations.
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APPENDIX C
E-MAIL QUESTIONNAIRE (PHASE I)

1. University:

2. Department:

3. Program:

4. Does your Department implement portfolio-based assessment?
   a) Yes
   b) No

5. If NO: Are you planning to employ portfolio assessment in the nearest future?
   a) Yes
   b) No

6. If YES: At what level do you use portfolio assessment:
   a) Master's degree?
   b) Specialist degree?
   c) Doctoral level?
   d) Other (please specify): 

7. Do you use portfolio assessment as:
   a) Assessment of students at individual courses?
   b) As a graduation requirement at the end of the entire program?
   c) Other (please specify):

8. What format of portfolio assessment do you use:
   a) Print-based (e.g., ring binder)?
   b) Electronic (e.g., on the floppy disk, Web-based, etc.)?
   c) Other (please specify):

9. Name and contact address (e-mail and telephone) of the person I should contact for more detailed information:

10. Would you like a copy of the results of this survey?
    a) Yes
    b) No
APPENDIX D
DEPARTMENT CHAIR WEB-BASED QUESTIONNAIRE (PHASE II)

Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

To insure your confidentiality, all surveys are coded. Please type the identification code given to you in the accompanying e-mail here:  

Directions: Please answer the following questions by checking the letter of the appropriate answer(s).

1. Portfolio assessment is a graduation requirement for your master’s students who are (please circle all that apply):
   A. On-campus students.
   B. Distance learning students.
   C. Other (please specify): ____________________________________________________

2. What academic year did your program start using portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement for awarding a master’s degree?
   A. 2001
   B. 2000
   C. 1999
   D. 1998
   E. 1997
   F. 1996
   G. 1995
   H. 1994
   I. 1993
   J. 1992
   K. 1991 or before

3. How many master’s students graduated from your program in Fall 2001?
   A. 0-10
   B. 11-20
   C. 21-30
   D. 31-40
   E. 41-50
   F. More than 50

4. How many students prepared portfolios for their graduation in Fall 2001?
   A. 0-10
   B. 11-20
   C. 21-30
D. 31-40
E. 41-50
F. More than 50

5. What types of assessment can students choose from to graduate with their master’s degree in Educational Leadership/Administration? (Circle all that apply.)
   A. Portfolio
   B. Comprehensive examination
   C. Thesis
   D. Other (please specify): ______________________

6. What is the format of graduation portfolios used in your program? (Please circle all that apply.)
   A. Paper-based (e.g., a binder)
   B. Electronic (e.g., webpage, CD, etc.)
   C. Other (please specify): __________________________________________

7. Which of the following are portfolio components in your program? (Please circle all that apply.)
   A. Introduction with an overview of a student portfolio.
   B. Student’s program of study.
   C. Student’s personal section with vita or resume.
   D. Student’s transcript.
   E. Simulation and/or an authentic project to solve a real educational problem.
   F. Standards or competencies with artifacts to demonstrate their achievement.
   G. Justification for selecting each product.
   H. Reflection piece(s) for competencies.
   I. Student self-assessment of competencies.
   J. Practicum or internship projects and reflections.
   K. Leadership development plan (goals and plan of actions for further professional development).
   L. Letters of recommendation from faculty and/or employers.
   M. Other (please specify): __________________________________________

8. Which Educational Leadership areas/competencies are addressed by a master’s student portfolio in your program? (Please circle all that apply.)
   A. Curriculum and instruction
   B. Diversity
   C. Ethics
   D. Human resources
   E. Parent and community relations
   F. Political and regulatory environment
   G. Site-based management
   H. Student assessment
   I. Student services
   J. Technology
   K. Transformational leadership
   L. School law
9. Which of the following features of portfolio assessment process are currently used in the program? (Please circle all that apply.)
   A. Assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to faculty.
   B. Assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to students.
   C. Mentor(s) to guide students in preparing portfolios.
   D. Course/study group to clarify portfolio preparation for graduating students.
   E. Website or a handbook where students can find answers to frequently asked questions.
   F. Written guidelines for students on portfolio preparation.
   G. Peer review of portfolios.
   H. Graduate committee made up of professors and school administrators.
   I. Other (please specify): __________________________________________

10. In your program, who determines what products should go into a graduation portfolio? (Please circle all that apply.)
    A. Student
    B. Major professor
    C. Committee members
    D. Faculty in the program
    E. Department chair
    F. Other (please specify): __________________________________

11. Do students have an oral portfolio defense?
    A. Yes
    B. No
    C. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________

12. Who attends student portfolio defense? (Please circle all that apply.)
    A. Committee members
    B. Major professor
    C. Any faculty
    D. Any student
    E. Potential employers
    F. Anybody can attend
    G. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________

13. How are students given feedback on their portfolios (please circle all that apply)?
    A. Orally during their defense.
    B. In writing, on a separate form attached to the portfolio.
    C. In writing, as comments within the portfolio.
    D. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________
14. How are portfolios evaluated and graded?
   A. Each product in the portfolio is evaluated and graded separately.
   B. Each competency is evaluated and graded separately.
   C. Portfolio is evaluated and graded as a whole.
   D. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________

15. What grades (or their equivalents) are assigned for student portfolios? (Please circle all that apply.)
   A. Pass/Fail, Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory
   B. On a scale (e.g., from excellent to poor)
   C. In percentage (out of 100%)
   D. Letter equivalent
   E. Scoring rubric
   F. Other (please specify): _______________________________________

16. Do students conduct self-assessment of competencies achieved in the program as a part of their portfolio?
   A. Yes, through a self-assessment instrument that is a part of portfolio assessment.
   B. Yes, through written reflections enclosed in the portfolio.
   C. There are other self-assessment practices (please describe): ___________________
   D. There are no self-assessment practices.

17. Apart from a graduation requirement, portfolios are also used in your program for (please circle all that apply):
   A. Admission to the program
   B. Assessment in individual courses
   C. Internship
   D. Initial certification
   E. Job placement/employment
   F. Program evaluation
   G. Other (please specify):_____________________________________________

Directions: For items 18-21, please circle the answer (SA, A, D, SD) which most accurately indicates your level of agreement with each of the given statements.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. Student portfolios are a good method for assessing student achievement in Educational Leadership/Administration programs because portfolios:
| A. | Allow for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences. | SA | A | D | SD |
| B. | Are meaningful for all audiences (students, faculty, employers). | SA | A | D | SD |
| C. | Are more powerful than single measures of student achievement. | SA | A | D | SD |
| D. | Are useful to view learning and development longitudinally. | SA | A | D | SD |
| E. | Contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies. | SA | A | D | SD |
| F. | Develop student accountability and responsibility. | SA | A | D | SD |
| G. | Develop student planning and organizational skills. | SA | A | D | SD |
| H. | Facilitate student application of knowledge. | SA | A | D | SD |
| I. | Foster critical thinking in students. | SA | A | D | SD |
| J. | Help students come to know themselves better. | SA | A | D | SD |
| K. | Increase student participation, independence, and self-direction. | SA | A | D | SD |
| L. | Promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis. | SA | A | D | SD |
| M. | Other (please explain) | |

19. Portfolios in Educational Leadership/Administration programs have the following weaknesses:

| A. | Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability. | SA | A | D | SD |
| B. | Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity. | SA | A | D | SD |
| C. | Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally. | SA | A | D | SD |
| D. | Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate. | SA | A | D | SD |
| E. | Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education. | SA | A | D | SD |
| F. | Portfolios are not an accurate assessment of students' competencies. | SA | A | D | SD |
| G. | Portfolios are not meaningful to students, faculty, and other audiences. | SA | A | D | SD |
20. **Portfolios would be a more effective method for assessing student achievements in Educational Leadership/Administration programs when the following support factors are present:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Administrative support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Availability of instructor's time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Faculty commitment to the portfolio process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Formal policy regarding portfolio assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. More detailed information about portfolios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Recognition and motivation of the involved faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Systematic and formal planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Other (please explain): ___________________________________________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. **The following barriers keep portfolio assessment from being an effective method for assessing students in Educational Leadership/Administration programs:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their grading practices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their teaching ability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Faculty lack experience in grading/evaluating portfolios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Faculty members are resistant to change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher education.

F. Lack of administrative support.

G. Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.

H. Lack of training for faculty.

I. Lack of training for students.

J. Faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.

K. Faculty assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.

L. Other (please explain):__________________________________________________________

Directions: For items 22-23, please write your answers in a space provided.

22. What were the identified needs that motivated your department to start using portfolio assessment?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

23. In your opinion, what should be done to improve portfolio assessment effectiveness in your program?

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

______________________________________________________________________________

******************************************************************************
Please provide the following information:

24. How many years have you been working with the Program in Educational Leadership/Administration in your institution? ________________

25. How many years have you been serving as the department chair (or program coordinator)? ________________

26. How many full-time faculty members work in your Educational Leadership/Administration program teaching master’s level students? ____

Your contribution to this effort is greatly appreciated!

If you would like to receive an executive summary of the results, please check here ☐

Thank you very much for your time and effort. The information you provide will be valuable for strategic planning and implementation purposes, where the strongest facilitators will be promoted and the inhibitors will be reduced to promote the successful use of portfolios in educational leadership programs and beyond.

Thanks again!
December 13, 2001

Dear Dr. ,

I am Dina Vyortkina, a doctoral student under the direction of Professor Judith L. Irvin in the Department of Educational Leadership, College of Education at the Florida State University. I am conducting a research study to identify practices of portfolio assessment as used by Educational Leadership/Administration programs nationwide.

I would like to thank you once again for participating in a brief survey on portfolio assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration programs in summer of 2001. Let me briefly inform you about the results: I contacted 504 programs preparing educational leaders nationwide. 377 department chairs were very kind to respond and provide information as follows:

--137 programs do not use portfolios and do not have plans to do so;
--31 programs do not currently require portfolios but strongly consider introducing them in their programs as a graduation requirement;
--96 use portfolios for other purposes (e.g., internship, licensure, individual courses, etc.);
--112 programs use portfolios as a graduation requirement for their master’s students.

Your program is one of those that employ portfolios as a graduation requirement for their master’s students. I am very interested in implementation issues and your opinion on portfolio assessment. I would like to request your participation in an on-line survey that will help me to clarify these issues.

If you do not mind, in several days I will send you additional information via e-mail and provide a link to the on-line survey. I will greatly appreciate your help and support in my research efforts. I will be happy to send you a summary of this study.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Dina Vyortkina
113 Stone Building,
Florida State University,
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Tel: (850) XXX-XXXX (H); (850) 644-XXXX (W)
Departmental Fax: (850) 644-XXXX
E-mail address: XXXXXX
APPENDIX F

COVER LETTER TO DEPARTMENT CHAIRS WITH THE INFORMATION ON A WEB-BASED QUESTIONNAIRE

January 4, 2002

Dear Dr. ,

I am Dina Vyortkina, a doctoral student under the direction of Professor Judith L. Irvin in the Department of Educational Leadership, College of Education at the Florida State University. I am conducting a research study to identify portfolio assessment practices as used by Educational Leadership/Administration programs nationwide.

By participating in this study you will have the opportunity to appraise portfolio assessment practices in an atmosphere where you are the prime assessor of strengths and areas for improvement. The information gained from this study may assist both researchers and education professionals to better understand the role of portfolio assessment as part of professional development and growth of educators and educational leaders. The research will also advance the existing body of knowledge in the field of portfolio assessment in educational leadership preparation programs.

I am requesting your participation, which will involve answering an on-line survey consisting of 26 questions. The completion of the survey should not take more than 20 minutes of your time. You might want to keep a printed copy of your answers for your records. Upon your request, an executive summary of the study findings will be e-mailed to you.

Participation in this study is voluntarily. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no negative consequences or impact on your employment. Completion and return of this questionnaire will be considered as your consent to participate. The results of the study may be published, but your name or name of your University will not be disclosed. For completing the survey, please use the following identification code: XXX. Your confidentiality will be maintained at all stages of the research. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call me at 850-644-XXXX (e-mail: XXXX) or my major professor Dr. Judith L. Irvin at 850-644-XXXX (e-mail: XXXX).

You can access the on-line survey using the following address http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~dvv5017/dcsurvey/

Please let me know if you prefer to complete a mailed version of this survey, and I will send it to you immediately. Please provide the mail address you prefer the survey to be sent to.

I will greatly appreciate if you will complete and submit the Portfolio Assessment Survey by January 10, 2002.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Dina Vyortkina
If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this research, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Office of the Vice President for Research, FSU, at (850) 644-8633.
January 14, 2002

Dear Dr. ,

About two weeks ago I e-mailed you information about a portfolio assessment survey and provided a link to the on-line questionnaire.

If you have completed and submitted this survey, please accept my thanks for your cooperation and assistance.

If you have not yet had an opportunity to do so, I would be grateful if you would complete the 26-question survey in the next few days. I would appreciate if you submit your answers by January 16, 2002. Please let me know if you prefer to complete a mailed version of this survey, and I will send it to you immediately. Please provide the mail address you would like the survey to be sent to.

Please follow this link to locate the on-line survey:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~dvv5017/dcsurvey/

Your identification code is: XXX

Thank you very much.

Yours sincerely,

Dina Vyortkina
113 Stone Building,
Florida State University,
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Tel: (850) XXX-XXXX (H); (850) 644-XXXX (W)
Departmental Fax: (850) 644-XXXX
E-mail address: XXXX
APPENDIX H

RESULTS OF WEB-BASED QUESTIONNAIRE
Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs
(Department Chairs)

1. Portfolio assessment is a graduation requirement for your master’s students who are (please check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. On-campus students.</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>(100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Distance learning students.</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>(51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What academic year did your program start using portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement for awarding a master’s degree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. 1991 or before</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How many master’s students graduated from your program in Fall 2001?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>(32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. How many students prepared portfolios for their graduation in Fall 2001?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(39%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. 21-30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. 31-40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. 41-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. More than 50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. What types of assessment can students choose from to graduate with their master’s degree in Educational Leadership/Administration? (Check all that apply.)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Portfolio</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>(87%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Comprehensive examination</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>(42%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Thesis</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>(34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>(28%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. What is the format of graduation portfolios used in your program? (Please check all that apply.)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Paper-based (e.g., a binder)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>(92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Electronic (e.g., webpage, CD, etc.)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Which of the following are portfolio components in your program? (Please check all that apply.)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Introduction with an overview of a student portfolio.</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>(66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Student’s program of study.</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>(38%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Student’s personal section with vita or resume.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Student’s transcript.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Simulation and/or an authentic project to solve a real educational problem.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Standards or competencies with artifacts to demonstrate their achievement.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Justification for selecting each product.</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>(52%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Reflection piece(s) for competencies.</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>(89%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Student self-assessment of competencies.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Practicum or internship projects and reflections.</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>(83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Leadership development plan (goals and plan of actions for further professional development).</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Letters of recommendation from faculty and/or employers.</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>(35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Which Educational Leadership areas/competencies are addressed by a master’s student portfolio in your program? (Please check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Competency</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Curriculum and instruction</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Diversity</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Ethics</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Human resources</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Parent and community relations</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Political and regulatory environment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Site-based management</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Student assessment</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Student services</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Technology</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Transformational leadership</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. School law</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. School finance</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Which of the following features of portfolio assessment process are currently used in the program? (Please check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to faculty.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to students.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Mentor(s) to guide students in preparing portfolios.</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Course/study group to clarify portfolio preparation for graduating students</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Website or a handbook where students can find answers to frequently asked questions.</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Written guidelines for students on portfolio preparation.</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Peer review of portfolios.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Graduate committee made up of professors and school administrators.</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. In your program, who determines what products should go into a graduation portfolio? (Please check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Determiner</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Student</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Major professor</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Committee members</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Faculty in the program</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Department chair</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Do students have an oral portfolio defense?

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. No</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Other practices (please specify):</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Who attends student portfolio defense? (Please check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Committee members</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Major professor</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Any faculty</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Any student</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Potential employers</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Anybody can attend</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Other practices (please specify):</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. How are students given feedback on their portfolios (please check all that apply)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feedback Method</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Orally during their defense.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. In writing, on a separate form attached to the portfolio.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. In writing, as comments within the portfolio.</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other practices (please specify)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How are portfolios evaluated and graded?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Method</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Each product in the portfolio is evaluated and graded separately.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Each competency is evaluated and graded separately.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Portfolio is evaluated and graded as a whole.</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Other practices (please specify):</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What grades (or their equivalents) are assigned for student portfolios? (Please check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Pass/Fail, Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. On a scale (e.g., from excellent to poor)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. In percentage (out of 100%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Letter equivalent</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Scoring rubric</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Other (please specify):</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Do students conduct self-assessment of competencies achieved in the program as a part of their portfolio?

A. Yes, through a self-assessment instrument that is a part of portfolio assessment.  19  27%
B. Yes, through written reflections enclosed in the portfolio.  42  59%
C. There are other self-assessment practices (please describe):  11  15%
D. There are no self-assessment practices.  6  8%

17. Apart from a graduation requirement, portfolios are also used in your program for (please check all that apply):

A. Admission to the program  8  11%
B. Assessment in individual courses  25  35%
C. Internship  26  37%
D. Initial certification  9  13%
E. Job placement/employment  22  31%
F. Program evaluation  25  35%
G. Other (please specify):  9  13%

SA = Strongly Agree = 4
A = Agree = 3
D = Disagree = 2
SD = Strongly Disagree = 1

18. Student portfolios are a good method for assessing student achievement in Educational Leadership/Administration programs because portfolios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Allow for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Are meaningful for all audiences (students, faculty, employers).</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Are more powerful than single measures of student achievement.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
D. Are useful to view learning and development longitudinally. 49 49 0 2

E. Contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies. 40 0 0

F. Develop student accountability and responsibility. 40 54 6 0

G. Develop student planning and organizational skills. 51 3 0

H. Facilitate student application of knowledge. 44 51 5 0

I. Foster critical thinking in students. 57 8 0

J. Help students come to know themselves better. 46 54 0 0

K. Increase student participation, independence, and self-direction. 51 6 0

L. Promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis. 59 39 2 0

M. Other (please explain)__________________________________________________

19. Portfolios in Educational Leadership/Administration programs have the following weaknesses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability.</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Portfolios are not an accurate assessment of students' competencies.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Portfolios are not meaningful to students, faculty, and other audiences.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
H. Students lack the experience of portfolio preparation. 9 62 27 2
I. Students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios. 44 49 5
J. Portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain. 3 6 78 13
K. Other (please explain):
_____________________________________________________________________

20. Portfolios would be a more effective method for assessing student achievements in Educational Leadership/Administration programs when the following support factors are present :

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Administrative support</td>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Availability of instructor's time</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Faculty commitment to the portfolio process</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Formal policy regarding portfolio assessment</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. More detailed information about portfolios</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Recognition and motivation of the involved faculty</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Systematic and formal planning</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Other (please explain):</td>
<td>_____________________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
21. The following barriers keep portfolio assessment from being an effective method for assessing students in Educational Leadership/Administration programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their grading practices.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their teaching ability.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Faculty lack experience in grading/evaluating portfolios.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Faculty members are resistant to change.</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher education.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Lack of administrative support.</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Lack of training for faculty.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Lack of training for students.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Faculty assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Other (please explain):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


APPENDIX I

A PERSONAL INTERVIEW ON THE PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT WITH DEPARTMENT CHAIRS

____________________________________  ______________________
Department Chairperson Name               Date

Potential questions:

1. What does ”portfolio assessment” mean to you? How would you explain and introduce it to a new faculty member at your department?

2. Could you please tell me why your department decided to move to portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement?

3. What was the particular purpose for portfolio assessment in this program? Out of what particular needs did it arise? How does the portfolio represent the student as an educational leader? How does the portfolio represent the program objectives?

4. Based on your experience, what are the strengths and weakness of portfolios in Educational Administration programs?

   What aspects of the portfolio process do you think, were MOST helpful to the students? What do you consider the greatest strengths?

   What aspects of the portfolio process do you think, were LEAST helpful to the students? If you could change something about portfolios, what would it be?

5. How has portfolio assessment been implemented in your program?
   What were your major strategies?
   Key players?
   Significant stages?
   Components of the implementation process?

6. What lessons were learned by you in this process?
   With all your current experience, what would you do the same? What would you do differently?

7. What were facilitators and barriers in the portfolio assessment implementation process?

8. What recommendations do you have for improving the portfolio process?
9. In your opinion, how faculty in the Program of Educational Administration could use portfolio assessment and its results to get full benefits of portfolio experience?
APPENDIX J

FACULTY COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Date:

Dear Dr. Name,

I am Dina Vyortkina, a doctoral student under the direction of Professor Judith L. Irvin in the Department of Educational Leadership, College of Education at the Florida State University. I am conducting a research study to identify portfolio assessment practices as used by Educational Leadership/Administration programs nationwide.

In December 2001, an initial survey was conducted to determine the prevalence and nature of such assessments. Your program was selected as the result of this survey as being one that may prove interesting to study. You can view brief results of this survey at http://www.fsu.edu/~edleadr/portfolio.html

I am requesting your participation, which will involve answering an on-line survey consisting of 21 questions. The completion of the survey should not take more than 15-20 minutes of your time. You might want to keep a printed copy of your answers for your records. Upon your request, an executive summary of the study findings will be e-mailed to you.

By participating in this study you will have the opportunity to appraise portfolio assessment practices in an atmosphere where you are the prime assessor of strengths and areas for improvement. The information gained from this study may assist both researchers and education professionals to better understand the role of portfolio assessment as part of professional development and growth of educators and educational leaders. The research will also advance the existing body of knowledge in the field of portfolio assessment in educational leadership preparation programs.

Participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no negative consequences or impact on your employment. Completion and return of this questionnaire will be considered as your consent to participate. The results of the study may be published, but your name or name of your University will not be disclosed. For completing the survey, please use the following identification code: XXX. Your confidentiality will be maintained at all stages of the research. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call me at 850-644-XXXX (e-mail: XXX@XXX) or my major professor Dr. Judith L. Irvin at 850-644-XXXX (e-mail: XXX@XXX).

You can access the on-line survey using the following address:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~dvv5017/
Follow the link “Faculty Survey” and use your access code XXX.
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Please let me know if you prefer to complete a mailed version of this survey, and I will send it to you immediately. Please provide the mail address you prefer the survey to be sent to.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this research, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Office of the Vice President for Research, FSU, at (850) 644-8633.

I will greatly appreciate if you complete and submit the Portfolio Assessment Survey by November 22, 2002.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Dina Vyortkina
113 Stone Building,
Florida State University,
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Tel: (850) XXX-XXXX (H); (850) 644-XXXX (W)
Departmental Fax: (850) 644-1258
E-mail address: dvv5017@garnet.acns.fsu.edu

Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs

To insure your confidentiality, all surveys are coded. Please type the identification code given to you in the accompanying e-mail here: __________

Directions: Please answer the following questions by checking the letter of the appropriate answer(s).

1. In your opinion, which of the following should become portfolio components in your program? (Please check all that apply.)
   A. Introduction with an overview of a student portfolio.
   B. Student’s program of study.
   C. Student’s personal section with vita or resume.
   D. Student’s transcript.
   E. Simulation and/or an authentic project to solve a real educational problem.
   F. Standards or competencies with artifacts to demonstrate their achievement.
   G. Justification for selecting each product.
   H. Reflection piece(s) for competencies.
   I. Student self-assessment of competencies.
   J. Practicum or internship projects and reflections.
   K. Leadership development plan (goals and plan of actions for further professional development).
L. Letters of recommendation from faculty and/or employers.
M. Other (please specify): ______________________________________________

Comments:

2. Which Educational Leadership areas/competencies should be addressed by a master’s student portfolio in your program? (Please check all that apply.)
   A. Curriculum and instruction
   B. Diversity
   C. Ethics
   D. Human resources
   E. Parent and community relations
   F. Political and regulatory environment
   G. Site-based management
   H. Student assessment
   I. Student services
   J. Technology
   K. Transformational leadership
   L. School law
   M. School finance
   N. Other (please specify): ______________________________________________

Comments:

3. Which of the following features of portfolio assessment process should be used in the program? (Please check all that apply.)
   A. Assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to faculty.
   B. Assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to students.
   C. Mentor(s) to guide students in preparing portfolios.
   D. Course/study group to clarify portfolio preparation for graduating students.
   E. Website or a handbook where students can find answers to frequently asked questions.
   F. Written guidelines for students on portfolio preparation.
   G. Peer review of portfolios.
   H. Graduate committee made up of professors and school administrators to evaluate portfolios.
   I. Culminating interviews with peers, faculty, and potential employers to review portfolios.
   J. Review of portfolios by practitioners in the field of Educational Administration.
   K. Other (please specify): ______________________________________________

Comments:

4. In your opinion, who should determine what products go into a graduation portfolio? (Please check all that apply.)
   A. Student
   B. Major professor
   C. Committee members
   D. Faculty in the program
   E. Department chair
   F. Other (please specify): ______________________________________________

Comments:

5. In your opinion, should students have an oral portfolio defense or presentation?
6. Who should attend student portfolio defense? (Please check all that apply.)
   A. Committee members
   B. Major professor
   C. Any faculty
   D. Any student
   E. Potential employers
   F. Anybody can attend
   G. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________

Comments:

7. In your opinion, how should students be given feedback on their portfolios (please check all that apply)?
   A. Orally during their defense.
   B. In writing, on a separate form attached to the portfolio.
   C. In writing, as comments within the portfolio.
   D. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________

Comments:

8. In your opinion, how should portfolios be evaluated and graded?
   A. Each product in the portfolio is evaluated and graded separately.
   B. Each competency is evaluated and graded separately.
   C. Portfolio is evaluated and graded as a whole.
   D. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________

Comments:

9. In your opinion, what grades (or their equivalents) should be assigned for student portfolios? (Please check all that apply.)
   A. Pass/Fail
   B. Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory
   C. On a scale (e.g., from excellent to poor)
   D. In percentage (out of 100%)
   E. Letter equivalent
   F. Other (please specify): _______________________________

Comments:

10. In your opinion, should students conduct self-assessment of competencies achieved in the program as a part of their portfolio?
    A. Yes, through a self-assessment instrument that is a part of portfolio assessment.
    B. Yes, through written reflections enclosed in the portfolio.
    C. There are other self-assessment practices (please describe): _______________________________
    D. There are no self-assessment practices.

Comments:
11. In your opinion, apart from a graduation requirement, portfolios **should** be also used in your program for (please check all that apply):

A. Admission to the program  
B. Assessment in individual courses  
C. Internship  
D. Initial certification  
E. Job placement/employment  
F. Program evaluation  
G. Other (please specify): ____________________________________________

Comments:

**Directions:** For items 12-15, please check the answer (SA, A, D, SD) which most accurately indicates your level of agreement with each of the given statements.

SA = Strongly Agree  
A = Agree  
D = Disagree  
SD = Strongly Disagree

12. **Student portfolios are a good method for assessing student achievement in Educational Leadership/Administration programs because portfolios:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>A. Allow for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences.</th>
<th>B. Are meaningful for all audiences (students, faculty, employers).</th>
<th>C. Are more powerful than single measures of student achievement.</th>
<th>D. Are useful to view learning and development longitudinally.</th>
<th>E. Contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies.</th>
<th>F. Develop student accountability and responsibility.</th>
<th>G. Develop student planning and organizational skills.</th>
<th>H. Facilitate student application of knowledge.</th>
<th>I. Foster critical thinking in students.</th>
<th>J. Help students come to know themselves better.</th>
<th>K. Increase student participation, independence, and self-direction.</th>
<th>L. Promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td>SA     A     D     SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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M. Serve as a self-evaluation tool that help students to document areas of strength and to become aware of areas of weakness. SA A D SD
N. Provide students with the opportunity to set appropriate goals for themselves. SA A D SD
O. Other (please explain) ____________________________________________
P. __________________________________________________________________

13. Portfolios in Educational Leadership/Administration programs have the following weaknesses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Portfolios are not an accurate assessment of students' competencies.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. Portfolios are not meaningful to students, faculty, and other audiences.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Students lack the experience of portfolio preparation.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Other (please explain): _____________________________________________ _____________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Portfolios would be a more effective method for assessing student achievements in Educational Leadership/Administration programs when the following support factors are present:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Administrative support</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Availability of instructor's time</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Availability of training and/or portfolio handbook for faculty and students</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Availability of mentors and/or peer support group to guide students in portfolio preparation process</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
E. Faculty commitment to portfolio assessment  
F. Formal policy regarding portfolio assessment  
G. Integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program  
H. More detailed information about portfolios  
I. Recognition and motivation of the involved faculty  
J. Systematic and formal planning  
K. Other (please explain): ________________________________  
L. ___________________________________________________________________

15. The following barriers keep portfolio assessment from being an effective method for assessing students in Educational Leadership/Administration programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their grading practices.  
B. Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their teaching ability.  
C. Faculty lack experience in grading/evaluating portfolios.  
D. Faculty members are resistant to change.  
E. Incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher education.  
F. Lack of administrative support.  
G. Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.  
H. Lack of training for faculty.  
I. Lack of training for students.  
J. Faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.  
K. Faculty assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.  
L. Other (please explain): ___________________________________________________________________

Directions: For items 16-17, please type your answers in a space provided.

16. What were the identified needs that motivated your department to start using portfolio assessment?
17. In your opinion, what should be done to improve portfolio assessment effectiveness in your program?

18. Any comments you might have about portfolio assessment in your program:

Please provide the following information:

19. As a faculty member, what year did you become involved in portfolio assessment in your master’s program?
   A. 2001
   B. 2000
   C. 1999
   D. 1998
   E. 1997
   F. 1996
   G. 1995
   H. 1994
   I. 1993
   J. 1992
   K. 1991 or before

Comments:

20. How many years have you been working with the Program in Educational Leadership/Administration in your institution? _______________

21. How many years have you been teaching master’s degree level students? _______________
Your contribution to this effort is very greatly appreciated!

If you would like to receive an executive summary of the results, please check here:

Thanks again!
APPENDIX K

A PERSONAL INTERVIEW ON THE PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT WITH FACULTY

____________________________________  ____________________________
Faculty member                                                                        Date

Potential questions:

1. If you use portfolios in your other classes, how do use them?

2. How would you define “portfolio assessment”? How would you explain and introduce it to a new faculty member at your department?

3. Could you please tell me why your department decided to move to portfolio assessment as a graduation requirement?

4. What was the particular purpose for portfolio assessment in this program? Out of what particular needs did it arise?

5. How does the portfolio represent the student as an educational leader? How does the portfolio represent the program objectives? What are structural components of portfolios used for final demonstration of knowledge in your program? What was the rationale for these categories? Do you think student portfolios have enough items to represent a student effectively? If not, what would you put in?

6. What was your role with the master's students and their portfolios? What assistance did you give to students, if any?

7. What strategies do you use to evaluate portfolios? What did portfolios reveal to you about (a) your student? (b) your teaching? (c) assessing students? Other?

8. In your opinion, what aspects of the portfolio process were MOST helpful to the students? What do you consider the greatest strengths?

What aspects of the portfolio process do you think, were LEAST helpful to the students? What were the weaknesses? What problems do you perceive students have constructing portfolios? If you could change something about portfolios, what would it be?

9. How has portfolio assessment been implemented in your program?
What were your major strategies?
Key players?
Significant stages?
Components of the implementation process?

10. What lessons were learned by you in this process?
With all your current experience, what would you do the same? What would you do differently?

11. What were facilitators and barriers in the portfolio assessment implementation process?

12. What recommendations do you have for improving the portfolio process?

13. In your opinion, how faculty in the Program of Educational Administration could use portfolio assessment and its results to get full benefits of portfolio experience?
APPENDIX L

STUDENT COVER LETTER AND QUESTIONNAIRE

Date:

Dear Name,

I am Dina Vyortkina, a doctoral student under the direction of Professor Judith L. Irvin in the Department of Educational Leadership, College of Education at the Florida State University. I am conducting a research study to identify portfolio assessment practices as used by Educational Leadership/Administration programs nationwide.

I am requesting your participation, which will involve answering an on-line survey consisting of 25 questions. The completion of the survey should not take more than 15-20 minutes of your time. You might want to keep a printed copy of your answers for your records. Upon your request, an executive summary of the study findings will be e-mailed to you.

By participating in this study you will have the opportunity to appraise portfolio assessment practices in an atmosphere where you are the prime assessor of strengths and areas for improvement. The information gained from this study may assist both researchers and education professionals to better understand the role of portfolio assessment as part of professional development and growth of educators and educational leaders. The research will also advance the existing body of knowledge in the field of portfolio assessment in educational leadership preparation programs.

Participation in this study is voluntarily. If you choose not to participate or to withdraw from the study at any time, there will be no negative consequences or impact on your study. Completion and return of this questionnaire will be considered as your consent to participate. The results of the study may be published, but your name or name of your University will not be disclosed. For completing the survey, please use the following identification code: 211. Your confidentiality will be maintained at all stages of the research. Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law.

If you have any questions concerning the research study, please call me at 850-644-XXXX (e-mail: XXX@XXX) or my major professor Dr. Judith L. Irvin at 850-644-XXXX (e-mail: XXX@XXX).

You can access the on-line survey using the following address:
http://garnet.acns.fsu.edu/~dvv5017/
Follow the link “Student Survey” and use your access code XXX.

Please let me know if you prefer to complete a mailed version of this survey, and I will send it to you immediately. Please provide the mail address you prefer the survey to be sent to.

If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this research, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Office of the Vice President for
Research, FSU, at (850) 644-8633.

I will greatly appreciate if you complete and submit the Portfolio Assessment Survey by December 9, 2002.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Dina Vyortkina
113 Stone Building,
Florida State University,
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Tel: (850) XXX-XXXX (H); (850) 644-XXXX (W)
Departmental Fax: (850) 644-XXXX
E-mail address: XXX@XXXX

**Portfolio Assessment in Educational Leadership/Administration Programs**

To insure your confidentiality, all surveys are coded. Please type the identification code given to you in the accompanying e-mail here:  

**Directions:** Please answer the following questions by checking the letter of the appropriate answer(s).

1. **In your opinion, which of the following should become portfolio components in your program? (Please check all that apply.)**
   - A. Introduction with an overview of a student portfolio.
   - B. Student’s program of study.
   - C. Student’s personal section with vita or resume.
   - D. Student’s transcript.
   - E. Simulation and/or an authentic project to solve a real educational problem.
   - F. Standards or competencies with artifacts to demonstrate their achievement.
   - G. Justification for selecting each product.
   - H. Reflection piece(s) for competencies.
   - I. Student self-assessment of competencies.
   - J. Practicum or internship projects and reflections.
   - K. Leadership development plan (goals and plan of actions for further professional development).
   - L. Letters of recommendation from faculty and/or employers.
   - M. Other (please specify): ______________________________________________

Comments:

3. **Which Educational Leadership areas/competencies should be addressed by a master’s student portfolio in your program? (Please check all that apply.)**
   - A. Curriculum and instruction
   - B. Diversity
C. Ethics  
D. Human resources  
E. Parent and community relations  
F. Political and regulatory environment  
G. Site-based management  
H. Student assessment  
I. Student services  
J. Technology  
K. Transformational leadership  
L. School law  
M. School finance  
N. Other (please specify): ______________________________________________

Comments:

4. Which of the following features of portfolio assessment process should be used in the program? (Please check all that apply.)
   A. Assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to faculty.  
   B. Assessment checklist with a scale to evaluate portfolios presented in advance to students.  
   C. Mentor(s) to guide students in preparing portfolios.  
   D. Course/study group to clarify portfolio preparation for graduating students.  
   E. Website or a handbook where students can find answers to frequently asked questions.  
   F. Written guidelines for students on portfolio preparation.  
   G. Peer review of portfolios.  
   H. Graduate committee made up of professors and school administrators to evaluate portfolios.  
   I. Culminating interviews with peers, faculty, and potential employers to review portfolios.  
   J. Review of portfolios by practitioners in the field of Educational Administration.  
   K. Other (please specify): ______________________________________________

Comments:

5. In your opinion, who should determine what products go into a graduation portfolio? (Please check all that apply.)
   A. Student  
   B. Major professor  
   C. Committee members  
   D. Faculty in the program  
   E. Department chair  
   F. Other (please specify): ________________________________

Comments:

6. In your opinion, should students have an oral portfolio defense or presentation?
   A. Yes  
   B. No  

Comments:

7. Who should attend student portfolio defense? (Please check all that apply.)
   A. Committee members  
   B. Major professor  
   C. Any faculty
D. Any student
E. Potential employers
F. Anybody can attend
G. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________
Comments:

8. In your opinion, how should students be given feedback on their portfolios (please check all that apply)?
   A. Orally during their defense.
   B. In writing, on a separate form attached to the portfolio.
   C. In writing, as comments within the portfolio.
   D. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________
Comments:

9. In your opinion, how should portfolios be evaluated and graded?
   A. Each product in the portfolio is evaluated and graded separately.
   B. Each competency is evaluated and graded separately.
   C. Portfolio is evaluated and graded as a whole.
   D. Other practices (please specify) _______________________________
Comments:

10. In your opinion, what grades (or their equivalents) should be assigned for student portfolios? (Please check all that apply.)
    A. Pass/Fail
    B. Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory
    C. On a scale (e.g., from excellent to poor)
    D. In percentage (out of 100%)
    E. Letter equivalent
    F. Other (please specify): __________________________________________
Comments:

11. In your opinion, should students conduct self-assessment of competencies achieved in the program as a part of their portfolio? 
    A. Yes, through a self-assessment instrument that is a part of portfolio assessment.
    B. Yes, through written reflections enclosed in the portfolio.
    C. There are other self-assessment practices (please describe): _____________________
    D. There are no self-assessment practices.
Comments:

12. In your opinion, apart from a graduation requirement, portfolios should be also used in your program for (please check all that apply):
    A. Admission to the program
    B. Assessment in individual courses
    C. Internship
    D. Initial certification
    E. Job placement/employment
    F. Program evaluation
    G. Other (please specify): ___________________________________________
Comments:
**Directions:** For items 13-16, please check the answer (SA, A, D, SD) which most accurately indicates your level of agreement with each of the given statements.

SA  =  Strongly Agree  
A   =  Agree  
D   =  Disagree  
SD  =  Strongly Disagree

### 13. Student portfolios are a good method for assessing student achievement in Educational Leadership/Administration programs because portfolios:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>A. Allow for measurement across various learning contexts and experiences.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Are meaningful for all audiences (students, faculty, employers).</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>C. Are more powerful than single measures of student achievement.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>D. Are useful to view learning and development longitudinally.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E. Contain samples that present more authentic evidence of student competencies.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F. Develop student accountability and responsibility.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G. Develop student planning and organizational skills.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. Facilitate student application of knowledge.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I. Foster critical thinking in students.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. Help students come to know themselves better.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K. Increase student participation, independence, and self-direction.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>L. Promote student self-improvement through reflection, self-assessment, and self-analysis.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M. Serve as a self-evaluation tool that help students to document areas of strength and to become aware of areas of weakness.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N. Provide students with the opportunity to set appropriate goals for themselves.</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O. Other (please explain)________________________________________________</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>

### 14. Portfolios in Educational Leadership/Administration programs have the following weaknesses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
<th>A. Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated reliability.</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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B. Portfolio assessment lacks demonstrated validity. 
C. Portfolio grades will be difficult to defend legally.
D. Portfolios are labor intensive for faculty to evaluate.
E. Grading of a portfolio is inconsistent with current grading system in higher education.
F. Portfolios are not an accurate assessment of students' competencies.
G. Portfolios are not meaningful to students, faculty, and other audiences.
H. Students lack the experience of portfolio preparation.
I. Students might submit fraudulent work in their portfolios.
J. Portfolios are too time consuming for students to compile and maintain.
K. Other (please explain): _____________________________________________

15. Portfolios would be a more effective method for assessing student achievements in Educational Leadership/Administration programs when the following support factors are present:

A. Training for students in portfolio preparation
B. Availability of portfolio handbook for students
C. Availability of mentors and/or peer support group to guide students in portfolio preparation process
D. Faculty commitment to portfolio assessment
E. Formal policy regarding portfolio assessment
F. Integration of portfolio assessment with other assessment types used in the program
G. More detailed information about portfolios
H. Recognition and motivation of the involved faculty
I. Systematic and formal planning
J. Other (please explain): _____________________________________________
K. ________________________________________
16. The following barriers keep portfolio assessment from being an effective method for assessing students in Educational Leadership/Administration programs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Level of agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their grading practices.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Faculty fear portfolios as possible reflections of their teaching ability.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.</td>
<td>Faculty lack experience in grading/evaluating portfolios.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.</td>
<td>Faculty members are resistant to change.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.</td>
<td>Incompatibility of portfolio with other assessment approaches in higher education.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.</td>
<td>Lack of administrative support.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.</td>
<td>Lack of information about advantages of portfolio assessment.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.</td>
<td>Lack of training for faculty.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Lack of training for students.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.</td>
<td>Faculty skepticism about portfolio effectiveness.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K.</td>
<td>Faculty assume that portfolios are too time consuming to grade.</td>
<td>SA A D SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.</td>
<td>Other (please explain): __________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.</td>
<td>________________________________________________________________________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Directions: For items 17-18, please type your answers in a space provided.

17. In your opinion, what should be done to improve portfolio assessment effectiveness in your program?

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

18. Any comments you might have about portfolio assessment in your program:

_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________________________

******************************************************************************
Please provide the following information about yourself:

Your age: _____  Gender:  F  M  
Ethnicity: _______________________

Professional experience in education:

Teaching (Years total): _______  Administrative position (Years total): _______
Subject area (if teaching): _____________________________________________________

What is your school type: Elementary  Middle  High  Other
What year did you enter the Program in Educational Leadership/Administration? _______
What is your current student status?  Full-time student  Part-time student

Your contribution to this effort is very greatly appreciated!

If you would like to receive an executive summary of the results, please check here:  

Thanks again!
APPENDIX M

A PERSONAL INTERVIEW ON THE PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT WITH STUDENTS

_______________________                                                     _____________________
Master's candidate                                                                           Date

Potential questions:

1. How would you define "portfolio assessment"? How would you explain and introduce it to your potential employer?

2. In your opinion, what was the particular purpose for portfolio assessment in this program?

3. How does the portfolio represent you (your experience, knowledge, ability) as an educational leader? How did the portfolio represent the program objectives?

4. What aspects of the portfolio process were MOST helpful to you? What do you consider the greatest strengths? What were the advantages of keeping portfolios?

5. What aspects of the portfolio process were LEAST helpful to you? What do you consider weaknesses of portfolios? What were the disadvantages of keeping portfolios?

6. What has most challenged you as you have worked on your portfolio? What problems did you have constructing your portfolios?

7. How did the completing the portfolio benefit your personally? The program in Educational Administration? Your school (organization)?

8. What messages do you hope, your portfolio will convey to others?

9. If you could change something about portfolios, what would it be?

10. What factors influenced your selection of samples for your portfolio?

11. Do you think your portfolio has enough items? If not, what would you put in?

12. What is the next step for you and your portfolio? How can you use it your professional life? Employment search?
13. In your opinion, how faculty in the Program of Educational Administration could use portfolio assessment and its results to get full benefits of portfolio experience?

14. What recommendations do you have for improving the portfolio process?

**Potential questions for clarification:**

- Do you think portfolios clearly communicate your learning and accomplishments?
- Do you think the portfolio represented you favorably as a beginning professional?
- Do you feel you were given enough time to develop your portfolio?
- On a scale from 1-10 how would you rate the help you received from faculty and staff?
- What suggestions would you make to improve the portfolio process?
- What would you tell another student who is considering using portfolios?
- Are portfolios worth the time and effort?
APPENDIX N
A LETTER INVITING TO PARTICIPATE IN THE INTERVIEW

Date:
Dear Name,

Thank you very much for your participation in the survey on portfolio assessment in graduate programs preparing educational leaders. The brief results of this survey will be available soon on my research website.

I would like to request your participation in a telephone interview. It should not take more than 45 minutes of your time. If you agree, I would like to fax or e-mail you a list of potential questions. Please let me know what time and at what telephone number I might contact you.

Information obtained during the course of the study will remain confidential, to the extent allowed by law. All data will be kept in confidence and you will not be identified by name in the study, nor will your program be identified. The data will not be available to the administration of your University and will not be used to evaluate your performance as part of any college or system evaluation. All the data collected during the study will be secured in a locked filing cabinet and will be shredded after two years.

To ensure accuracy of data processing, I would like to record the interview. The interview will be taped only upon your agreement. Each tape will be coded. All tapes will be stored in a locked cabinet and will be destroyed by August 8, 2010.

Please let me know if you would agree to participate in the interview and answer the following question to facilitate the interview organization.

Would like to participate in the interview? (YES/NO)

Would you like to receive potential questions? (YES/NO)

Would you like to get potential questions by (please include the number or address):
Fax:
Mail:
Preferred E-mail:

Would you agree to my taping the telephone interview? (YES/NO):
When would you like to schedule the interview--
Option 1:
   Date:
   Time:
   Phone:

Option 2:
   Date:
   Time:
   Phone:

Please include here any comments or suggestions you might have.

Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Dina Vyortkina

113 Stone Building,
Florida State University,
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Tel: (850) XXX-XXXX (H); (850) 644-XXXX (W)
Departmental Fax: (850) 644-XXXX
E-mail address: XXXX

If you have questions about your rights as a subject/participant in this research, you can contact the Chair of the Human Subjects Committee, Institutional Review Board, through the Office of the Vice President for Research, at (850) 644-8633.
APPENDIX O
INTERVIEW PREPARATION FORM

Person’s name:

Code:

Affiliation:

Any personal/professional information:

Any survey comments need to be followed up:

Agreement to get a copy of portfolio: Yes/No

Other
Date

Dear Name,

About two weeks ago I e-mailed you information about a portfolio assessment survey and provided a link to the on-line questionnaire.

If you have completed and submitted this survey, please accept my thanks for your cooperation and assistance.

If you have not yet had an opportunity to do so, I would be grateful if you would complete the survey in the next few days. I would appreciate if you submit your answers by XXX, 2002. Please let me know if you prefer to complete a mailed version of this survey, and I will send it to you immediately. Please provide the mail address you would like the survey to be sent to.

Please follow this link to locate the on-line survey: http://XXXX

Your identification code is: XXX

Thank you very much.

Yours sincerely,

Dina Vyortkina
113 Stone Building,
Florida State University,
Tallahassee, FL 32306
Tel: (850) XXX-XXXX (H); (850) 644-XXXX (W)
Departmental Fax: (850) 644-XXXX
E-mail address: XXXX@XXXX
APPENDIX Q

WRITTEN DOCUMENT ANALYSIS WORKSHEET

1. TYPE OF DOCUMENT (Check one):
   ___ Newspaper  ___ Guidelines  ___ Advertisement
   ___ Letter  ___ Evaluation/feedback form  ___ Handbook
   ___ E-mail  ___ Press release  ___ Checklist
   ___ Memorandum  ___ Report  ___ Other

2. UNIQUE PHYSICAL QUALITIES OF THE DOCUMENT (Check one or more):
   ___ Interesting letterhead  ___ Notations
   ___ Handwritten  ___ "RECEIVED" stamp
   ___ Typed  ___ Other
   ___ Seals

3. DATE(S) OF DOCUMENT: ____________________________________________________

4. AUTHOR (OR CREATOR) OF THE DOCUMENT: ________________________________
   POSITION (TITLE): ____________________________________________________________

5. FOR WHAT AUDIENCE WAS THE DOCUMENT WRITTEN?
   ______________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________

6. DOCUMENT INFORMATION

   A. List three things the author said that you think are important:

      1. __________________________________________________________________________
      2. __________________________________________________________________________
      3. __________________________________________________________________________

   B. Why do you think this document was written?
   ______________________________________________________________________________

   C. What evidence in the document helps you know why it was written? Quote from the document.
   ______________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________

   D. Write a question to the author that is left unanswered by the document:
   ______________________________________________________________________________
   ______________________________________________________________________________
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APPENDIX R

PROGRAM B ASSESSMENT RUBRIC

THE COMPREHENSIVE EXAMINATION, WHICH INCLUDES THE WRITTEN EXAMINATION AND THE ACADEMIC PORTFOLIO PRESENTATION, WILL BE APPRAISED USING THE FOLLOWING OR SIMILAR RUBRICS:

☐ Quality of Writing and Content on Answers to the Comprehensive Questions
  1. Uses APA format correctly; content is comprehensive and is covered in depth; note research is synthesized.
  2. Uses APA format with minor revisions; content is somewhat comprehensive and has some depth; research is included, but not synthesized.
  3. Uses APA format with major revisions; content lacks depth; some research is included.
  4. APA format was not used; no depth in content; noted research is not mentioned.

☐ Relevance and Documentation of Artifacts and Reflections
  1. All artifacts and reflections are relevant to the standards and provide documentation of significant understanding and growth.
  2. Most artifacts and reflections are relevant to the standards and provide documentation of some growth.
  3. Some artifacts and reflections are relevant to the standards and demonstrate limited growth.
  4. Artifacts and reflections are not relevant to the standards and do not demonstrate growth.

☐ Meaningfulness as Evidenced through Reflections
  1. All reflections specifically address all components of the Reflection Cycle in The Principal Portfolio, p. 26-34.

☐ Other Contents of the Portfolio
  1. All contents are reflective of current theory and sound philosophy and reflect maturity of thought.
  2. Most contents are reflective of current theory and sound philosophy and reflect maturity of thought.
  3. Some contents are reflective of current theory and sound philosophy and reflect maturity of thought.
  4. Contents are not reflective of current theory and sound philosophy and do not reflect maturity of thought.

☐ The Academic Portfolio will be Evaluated as Follows:
  1. Pass without revisions.
  2. Pass with minor revisions by date indicated.
  3. Pass with major revisions by date indicated.
APPENDIX S
PROGRAM B PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT REPORTING FORM

Masters Degree Committee Chair
Completion of Masters Coursework

Name of Masters student: ________________________________________

A portfolio presentation was held on ______________________________
at ________________a.m./p.m.

The student's portfolio was evaluated as follows:

Pass
Pass with major/minor revisions
No pass

Comments/suggestions for Revisions:

________________________________________
Committee Chair’s Signature
Program B University B
APPENDIX T

PROGRAM B PORTFOLIO REVIEW BY SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR FORM

(To be submitted during final semester of master’s coursework)

- This form is to accompany student's portfolio upon submission to the district representative on the student's masters committee.
- The district representative should review the portfolio, complete the information below, and return this form with the portfolio to the student.
- The student should apply any corrections or suggestions made by the district representative and include this form in the portfolio for presentation to the Educational Leadership masters committee.

University B
City, State

Name of Masters student: ________________________________________________

A portfolio review was completed on the day of ____________________, 20 by the following School Administrator.

Name:
Title:
School Address:
School Telephone Number:( ) FAX( )
E-Mail:
The student's portfolio was evaluated with recommendations as follows:
  Accepted
  Major/minor revisions needed
  Not accepted

Comments/suggestions for revisions:

__________________________________________
School Administrator's Signature
APPENDIX U
EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP PROGRAM B
MASTERS PORTFOLIO STUDENT EVALUATION OF SELF AND PROGRAM

As the final piece of the Masters Degree portfolio process, each student will complete the following student evaluation form and submit it to his/her committee chair immediately following the presentation of the portfolio.

A. Student's evaluation of impact of program on self:

B. Student's evaluation of effectiveness of program—strengths, areas need improvement:

Committee Chair

Date
APPENDIX V

UNIVERSITY C
COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS & LEADERSHIP
Masters Portfolio Rubric and Rating Sheet

SECTION 1—Standard 1: Facilitating the Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rudimentary</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is little or no evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is limited evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 2—Standard 2: School Culture and Instructional Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rudimentary</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is little or no evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is limited evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 3—Standard 3: Managing the Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rudimentary</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is little or no evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is limited evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### SECTION 4—Standard 4: Collaboration and Community Engagement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rudimentary</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>There is little or no evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is limited evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected COE</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 5—Standard 5: Ethics and Integrity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rudimentary</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>There is little or no evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is limited evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected COE</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SECTION 6—Standard 6: Understanding Publics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rudimentary</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>There is little or no evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is limited evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear evidence that the student:</td>
<td>There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the student:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understands</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Understands this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connected COE</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
<td>☐ Has connected the COE themes and this standard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commentary</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
<td>☐ Has supported the commentary by the chosen artifact(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Summary Rating Sections 1-6:

- Rudimentary
- Developing
- Proficient
- Accomplished

### SECTION 7: Personal Narrative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Rudimentary</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence</td>
<td>☐ There is little or no evidence that the student demonstrated growth and commitment to the core components of professional practice and scholarship: knowledge, technology, diversity, and ethic.</td>
<td>☐ There is limited evidence that the student demonstrated growth and commitment to the core components of professional practice and scholarship: knowledge, technology, diversity, and ethic.</td>
<td>☐ There is clear evidence that the student demonstrated growth and commitment to the core components of professional practice and scholarship: knowledge, technology, diversity, and ethic.</td>
<td>☐ There is clear, convincing, and consistent evidence that the student demonstrated growth and commitment to the core components of professional practice and scholarship: knowledge, technology, diversity, and ethic.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Academic Conventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rudimentary</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Accomplished</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>□ There are multiple errors in spelling, punctuation, usage, grammar, capitalization, and/or paragraphing, distracting the reader and making the text difficult to read.</td>
<td>□ The writer shows limited control over the most common writing conventions. There are instances of appropriate use of the conventions and of errors. The text is readable in some places and distracting and difficulty to understand in others.</td>
<td>□ The writer shows clear control over most writing conventions. Conventions are usually handled well and the text is normally clearly understandable. Occasional errors are usually not distracting and rarely affect readability.</td>
<td>□ The writer shows clear, convincing, and consistent control of writing conventions in spelling, punctuation, usage, grammar, capitalization, and paragraphing. Errors are rare and so minor as to be consistently overlooked.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SUMMARY RATING OF THE PORTFOLIO:

- □ **Rudimentary** demonstration of professional development and/or demonstration of only rudimentary growth.
- □ **Developing** demonstration of professional development and/or demonstration of some, limited growth.
- □ **Proficient** demonstration of professional development to a clear level of proficiency in professional knowledge, disposition, and performance.
- □ **Accomplished** demonstration of professional development to a clear, convincing, and consistent level of proficiency in professional knowledge, disposition, and performance.

Evaluator: ___________________________ Date ___________________________
APPENDIX W

PROGRAM D STANDARDS AND RATING RUBRIC FOR ASSESSING STUDENT PORTFOLIOS

Standard 1. A School administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by facilitating the development, articulation, implementation, and stewardship of a vision of learning that is shared and supported by the school community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The administrator has knowledge &amp; understanding of</strong></td>
<td><strong>The administrator believes in values, and is committed to:</strong></td>
<td><strong>The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Score</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning goals in a pluralistic society</td>
<td>The educability of all</td>
<td>Vision &amp; mission of the school are effectively communicated to staff, parents, students, and community members</td>
<td>3 clear, consistent, and convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of developing &amp; implementing strategic plans</td>
<td>A school vision of high standards of learning</td>
<td>Vision &amp; mission are communicated through the use of symbols, ceremonies, stories, and similar activities</td>
<td>2 clear, but possibly uneven in depth and scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systems theory</td>
<td>Continuous school improvement</td>
<td>The core beliefs of the school vision are modeled for all stakeholders</td>
<td>1 limited in depth and scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Info. Sources, data collection, &amp; data analysis strategies</td>
<td>Inclusion of all members of the school community</td>
<td>Vision developed w/ &amp; among stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication</td>
<td>Ensuring that students have the knowledge, skills, &amp; values needed to become successful adults</td>
<td>Contributions of school community members to the realization of the vision are recognized and celebrated</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective consensus-building &amp; negotiation skills</td>
<td>A willingness to continuously examine one’s own assumptions, beliefs, and practices</td>
<td>Progress toward vision &amp; mission is communicated to all stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doing the work required for high levels of personal and organization performance</td>
<td>School community is involved in school improvement efforts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision shapes the educational programs, plans, &amp; activities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation plan is developed in which objectives &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
strategies to achieve the vision & goals are clearly articulated
Assessment data related to student learning are used to develop the school vision & goals
Relevant demographics data pertaining to students and their families are used in developing the mission & goals
Barriers to achieving the vision are identified, clarified, & addressed
Needed resources are sought and obtained to support the implementation of the school mission & goals
Existing resources are used in support of the school vision and goals
Vision, mission, & implementation plans are regularly monitored, evaluated, & revised

Standard 2. A School administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by advocating, nurturing, and sustaining a school culture and instructional program conducive to student learning & staff professional growth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The administrator has knowledge &amp; understanding of</td>
<td>The administrator believes in values, and is committed to:</td>
<td>The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</td>
<td>3 clear, consistent, and convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student growth &amp; development</td>
<td>Student learning as the fundamental purpose of schooling</td>
<td>All individuals are treated with fairness, dignity, and respect</td>
<td>2 clear, but possibly uneven in depth and scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied learning theories</td>
<td>Proposition that all students can learn</td>
<td>Professional development promotes a focus on student learning consistent with the school vision and goals</td>
<td>1 limited in depth and scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied motivational theories</td>
<td>Variety of ways in which students can learn</td>
<td>Students and staff feel valued &amp; important</td>
<td>0 little or no evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum design, implementation, evaluation, &amp; refinement</td>
<td>Life long learning for self and others</td>
<td>Responsibilities &amp; contributions of each individual are acknowledged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles of effective instruction</td>
<td>Professional development as an integral part of school improvement</td>
<td>Barriers to student learning are identified, clarified, and addressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measurement, evaluation, &amp; assessment strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diversity &amp; its meaning for educational programs</td>
<td>Benefits that diversity brings to the school community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change process for systems, organizations, &amp; individuals</td>
<td>Safe and supportive learning environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of technology in promoting student learning &amp; professional growth</td>
<td>Preparing students to be contributing members of society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School cultures</td>
<td>Diversity is considered in developing learning experiences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Life long learning is encouraged and modeled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>There is a culture of high expectations for self, student, and staff performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Technologies are used in teaching &amp; learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student and staff accomplishments are recognized and celebrated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple opportunities to learn are available to all students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School is organized &amp; aligned for success</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curricular, co-curricular, &amp; extra-curricular programs are designed, implemented, evaluated, and refined</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum decisions are based on research, expertise of teachers, and the recommendations of learned societies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School culture &amp; climate are assessed on a regular basis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of sources of information used to make decisions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student learning is assessed using a variety of techniques</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multiple sources of information regarding performance are used by staff and students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variety of supervisory &amp; evaluation models is employed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pupil personnel programs are developed to meet the needs of students and their families</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Standard 3. A School administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by ensuring management of the organization, operations, and resources for a safe, efficient, and effective learning environment.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The administrator has knowledge &amp; understanding of</td>
<td>The administrator believes in values, and is committed to:</td>
<td>The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</td>
<td>3 clear, consistent, and convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories and models of organizations and the principles of organizational</td>
<td>Making management decisions to enhance learning and teaching</td>
<td>Knowledge of learning, teaching, and student development is used to inform management decisions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>development</td>
<td>Taking risks to improve schools</td>
<td>Operational procedures are designed and managed to maximize opportunities for successful learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational procedures at the school and district level</td>
<td>Trusting people and their judgments</td>
<td>Emerging trends are recognized, studied, and applied as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles and issues relating to school safety and security</td>
<td>Accepting responsibility</td>
<td>Operational plans and procedures to achieve the vision and goals of the school are in place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resources management and development</td>
<td>High-quality standards, expectations, and performances</td>
<td>Collective bargaining and other contractual agreements related to the school are effectively managed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles and issues relating to fiscal operations of school management</td>
<td>Invoking stakeholders in management processes</td>
<td>The school plant, equipment, and support systems operate safely, efficiently, and effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles and issues relating to school facilities and use of space</td>
<td>A safe environment</td>
<td>Time is managed to maximize attainment of organizational goals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal issues impacting school operations</td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential problems and opportunities are identified</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current technologies that support management functions</td>
<td></td>
<td>Problems are confronted and resolved in a timely manner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Financial, human, and material resources are aligned to the goals of the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The school acts entrepreneurally to support continuous improvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Organizational systems are regularly monitored and modified as needed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stakeholders are involved in decisions affecting schools</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility is shared to maximize ownership and accountability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

304
Effective problem-framing and problem-solving skills are used
Effective communication skills are used
Effective use of technology to manage school operations
Fiscal resources of the school are managed responsibly, efficiently, and effectively
A safe, clean, and aesthetically pleasing school environment is created and maintained
Human resources functions support the attainment of school goals
Confidentiality and privacy of school records are maintained

Standard 4. A School administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by **collaborating with the families and community members, responding to diverse community interests and needs, and mobilizing community resources.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The administrator has knowledge &amp; understanding of</th>
<th>The administrator believes in values, and is committed to:</th>
<th>The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerging issues and trends that potentially impact the school community</td>
<td>Schools operating as an integral part of the larger community</td>
<td>High visibility, active involvement, and communication with the larger community is a priority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The conditions and dynamics of the diverse school community</td>
<td>Collaboration and communication with families</td>
<td>Relationships with the community leaders are identified and nurtured</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community resources</td>
<td>Involvement of families and other stakeholders in school decision-making processes</td>
<td>Information about family and community concerns, expectations, and needs is used regularly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community relations, marketing strategies, and processes</td>
<td>Proposition that diversity enriches the school</td>
<td>There is an outreach to different business, religious, political, and service agencies and organizations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Successful models of school, family, business, community, government, and higher education partnerships</td>
<td>Families as partners in the education of their children</td>
<td>Credence is given to individuals and groups whose values and opinions may conflict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Proposition that families have the best interests of their children in mind</td>
<td>The school and community serve on another as resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resources of the family and community needing to be brought to bear on the education of students</td>
<td>Available community resources are secured to help the school solve problems and achieve goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An informed public</td>
<td>Partnerships are established with area businesses, institutions of higher education, and community groups to strengthen programs and support grad schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community youth family services are integrated with school programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Community stakeholders are treated equitably</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diversity is recognized and valued</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Effective media relations are developed and maintained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A comprehensive program of community relations is established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Public resources and funds are used appropriately and wisely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 3 clear, consistent, and convincing | 2 clear, but possibly uneven in depth and scope | 1 limited in depth and scope | 0 little or no evidence |
Community collaboration is modeled with staff
Opportunities for staff to develop collaborative skills are provided

Standard 5. A School administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by acting with integrity, fairness, and in an ethical manner.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The administrator has knowledge &amp; understanding of</td>
<td>The administrator believes in values, and is committed to:</td>
<td>The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</td>
<td>3 clear, consistent, and convincing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of education and the role of leadership in modern society</td>
<td>The ideal of common good</td>
<td>Examines personal and professional values</td>
<td>2 clear, but possibly uneven in depth and scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various ethical frameworks and perspectives on ethics</td>
<td>The principals in the Bill of Rights</td>
<td>Demonstrates a personal and professional code of ethics</td>
<td>1 limited in depth and scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The values of the diverse school community</td>
<td>The right of every student to a free, quality education</td>
<td>Demonstrates values, beliefs, and attitudes that inspire others to higher levels of performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional codes of ethics</td>
<td>Bringing ethical principles to the decision-making process</td>
<td>Serves as a role model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The philosophy and history of education</td>
<td>Subordinating one’s own interest to the good of the school community</td>
<td>Accepts responsibility for school operations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Accepting the consequences for upholding one’s principles and actions</td>
<td>Considers the impact of one’s own administrative practices on others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using the influence of one’s office constructively and productively in the service of all students and families</td>
<td>Uses the influence of the office to enhance the education program rather than for personal gain</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Development of a caring school community</td>
<td>Treats people fairly, equitably, and with dignity and respect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Protects the rights and confidentiality of students and staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Demonstrate appreciation for and sensitivity to the diversity in the school community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recognizes and respects the legitimate authority of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Examines and considers the prevailing values of the diverse school community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Expects that others in the school community will demonstrate integrity and exercise ethical behavior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opens the school to public scrutiny</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Standard 6. A School administrator is an educational leader who promotes the success of all students by **understanding, responding to, and influencing the larger political, social, economic, legal, and cultural context**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Disposition</th>
<th>Performance</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The administrator has knowledge &amp; understanding of</td>
<td>The administrator believes in values, and is committed to:</td>
<td>The administrator facilitates processes and engages in activities ensuring that:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The principles of representative governance that undergird the system of American schools</td>
<td>Education as a key to opportunity and social mobility</td>
<td>The environment in which the schools operate is influenced on behalf of the students and their families</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The roles of public education in developing and renewing a democratic society and an economically productive nation</td>
<td>Recognizing a variety of ideas, values, and cultures</td>
<td>Communication occurs among the school community concerning trends, issues, and potential changes in the environment in which school operate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The law as related to education and schooling</td>
<td>Importance of a continuing dialogue with other decision makers affecting education</td>
<td>There is ongoing dialogue with representatives of diverse community groups</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The political, social, cultural, and economic systems and processes that impact schools</td>
<td>Actively participating in the political and policy-making context in the service of education</td>
<td>The school community works within the framework of policies, laws, and regulations enacted by local, state, and federal authorities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Models and strategies of change and conflict resolution as applied to the larger political, social, cultural, and economic contexts of schooling</td>
<td>Using legal systems to protect student rights and improve student opportunities</td>
<td>Public policy is shaped to provide quality education for students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global issues and forces affecting teaching and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lines of communication are developed with decision makers outside the school community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The importance of diversity and equity in a democratic society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX X
PROGRAM D EVALUATION CRITERIA AND SCORING SHEET

Portfolio Evaluation Criteria

Student Name ________________________________________

Date________________________________________________

Advisor _____________________________________________

Evaluator ____________________________________________

On a scale from 1 to 5 (5 being high) how successfully does the work in this portfolio meet the following criteria:

1. Evidence provided on competency completion 1 2 3 4 5

2. Well-organized 1 2 3 4 5

3. Includes appropriate information on school improvement project 1 2 3 4 5

4. Includes a variety of work (forms, memos, agendas, etc.) 1 2 3 4 5

5. Shows clarity of writing 1 2 3 4 5

6. Shows conciseness of writing 1 2 3 4 5

7. Uses correct grammar 1 2 3 4 5

8. Is persuasive 1 2 3 4 5

9. Uses correct spelling 1 2 3 4 5

10. Looks neat and professional 1 2 3 4 5

11. Materials are current 1 2 3 4 5

12. Supportive evidence for narrative is provided 1 2 3 4 5

COMMENTS:
APPENDIX Y
PROGRAM D MEMORANDUM

Memorandum

To: Dr. …

From: Dr. …, Masters Coordinator

Date:

Re: Masters Comprehensive Exam

The following student has successfully completed the Masters Comprehensive Exam over knowledge, dispositions and performance standards that school leaders must possess.

Name________________________________________

SSN________________________________________

Date________________________________________

The following professors of educational administration served on the review panel and concur that the candidate successfully completed the exam.

_____________________________________________

Signature

_____________________________________________

Signature

_____________________________________________

Signature
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