

Assignment Description

Purpose: The primary purpose of this portfolio is to have teachers/teacher candidates demonstrate their ability to meet the knowledge, skills and dispositions identified in the Interstate new Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium Standards (InTASC standards). MAT students integrate competencies of the use of technology, experiences with diversity, and application of essential studies learning outcomes throughout the portfolio. The portfolio serves as a reflective tool for MAT students while it also serves to demonstrate professional competencies as indicated by the InTASC Standards. Students must receive a grade of “C” or better on this key assessment to pass the course. If a “C” is not earned by the student, the instructor will work with the student to improve their grade. Grading scale for this assignment follows what is listed in the syllabus:

A=100-81 points, B=80-69 points, C=68-54 points, D= 53-40 points, F=<40 points

Objectives:

- Apply pedagogical knowledge and skills through rationale development and artifact selection (InTASC 1-10; CAEP R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4).
- Demonstrate the use of research-based instructional practices for all learners (InTASC 1, 2,3, 6, 7, 8; CAEP R1.1, R1.3).
- Demonstrate discipline-specific research on teaching and learning (InTASC 4, 5; CAEP R1.2).
- Critically analyze and reflect upon clinical experiences in relationship to personal and professional leadership development (InTASC 1-10; CAEP R1.1, R1.2, R1.3, R1.4).
- Demonstrate application of ethics in education and ethical decision-making (InTASC 9; CAEP R1.4)
- Demonstrate professional presentation skills with confidence and enthusiasm (InTASC 9; CAEP R1.4).

Overview: Candidates will create a portfolio that will include the key assessment projects and other meaningful assignments created and implemented throughout the MAT Program. The artifacts (key assessment projects and meaningful assignments) will be uploaded to the MAT Capstone Portfolio in TaskStream. Candidates will write rationales that support using the artifacts for each of the InTASC standards. The capstone portfolio should provide evidence of the candidate’s ability to use technology to engage students, enhance instruction, and manage student assessment data to meet the needs of diverse learners. Candidates will then prepare a professional presentation open to faculty, colleagues, and others the candidate would like to invite.

Directions:

1. The **portfolio introduction** is the first tab within the portfolio in TaskStream. The introduction should be engaging and show an integration of concepts of the Authentic Constructivist Leadership Model (found in Blackboard) through statements of personal and professional goals. Other topics to be covered in the Introduction include background information, work experiences and experiences in educational settings, reasons for choosing Mayville State University, chosen degree, reasons for becoming a teacher, beliefs about teaching/learning.
2. The Introduction should be well-written and succinctly stated in 2-3 paragraphs. The Introduction should also include a professional looking photo of you.

3. Review assignments you completed throughout the MAT program. Select the assignments that were most meaningful to you in developing your knowledge and skills related to the **10 InTASC standards**. Your completed key assessments and assignments will serve as artifacts within your capstone portfolio (you may include more than one artifact for each standard).
4. Review the InTASC standards. Those standards can be found within the learning management system and at the bottom of this document. Decide which artifacts (key assessments and assignments) you selected align best to each of the 10 InTASC standards.
5. Upload the artifacts you selected into your MAT Capstone Portfolio in TaskStream as an attachment under the corresponding InTASC standard.
6. For each artifact uploaded, a 2-3 paragraph rationale needs to be written to demonstrate your ability to align your artifacts to the InTASC standards. The rationale should be written as text in TaskStream (not as an attachment).
7. To write a quality rationale, MAT students should keep the following points in mind:
 - a. Rationale should be well-written (formal, grammatically correct, concise, etc.).
 - b. Aim to write 2 to 3 paragraphs per rationale.
 - c. The first paragraph of the rationale should include a brief summary of the artifact and how the assignment has influenced your professional learning.
 - d. In subsequent paragraphs, align the artifacts to the InTASC standards in a written format providing justification as to how it represents your knowledge and performance in relation to the standards. Consider using the language found within the InTASC standards as you write your justification.
 - e. Each rationale should include reference and alignment to traits from the Authentic Constructivist Leadership model as outlined in the learning management system in a document titled "MAT Framework".
 - f. Each rationale should demonstrate your awareness of **diversity and equity** to include multiple perspectives, respect for responsiveness to cultural differences, and an understanding of diverse contexts.
 - g. The rationale should also include how you used **technology** to engage students, enhance instruction, and manage student assessment data.
8. Prepare an engaging, **professional presentation** to showcase your knowledge and skills shared throughout the creation of your portfolio. The presentation should:
 - a. Faculty reviewers will send you an email asking you to select 3 InTASC standards (with artifacts) they will discuss during their presentation.
 - b. Be **organized**, flow well, and cover a 30–45-minute time frame, including questions from reviewers.
 - c. Begin with an engaging introduction that thoroughly integrates your professional goals, your personal goals and the Authentic Constructivist Leadership Model.
 - d. Allow you to display a high level of professionalism and confidence with logical sequencing, fluency, enthusiasm, and use of discipline specific vocabulary throughout your presentation.
9. Present the capstone portfolio over a videoconference (MSU is currently using Zoom) on a date and time arranged by you and the instructor.
10. Use this assignment description and rubric to guide your quality submission. You are encouraged to use the rubric to self-evaluate your portfolio before your final presentation.

Portfolio Rubric

| | Distinguished (4) | Proficient (3) | Basic (2) | Unsatisfactory (1) |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Presentation Introduction InTASC 9, 10 CAEP R1.4 CEC 1 | Engaging introduction hooks the audience and thoroughly integrates professional goals, educational philosophy, and the Authentic Constructivist Leadership Model. | Introduction hooks the audience and connects professional goals, educational philosophy, and the Authentic Constructivist Leadership Model. | Introduction provides the audience with professional goals and/or educational philosophy, with limited relation to the Authentic Constructivist Leadership Model. | Introduction does not provide the audience with professional goals and/or educational philosophy, with no reference to Authentic Constructivist Leadership Model. |
| Presentation Professionalism InTASC 9, 10 CAEP R1.4 CEC 1, 3 | Teacher candidate displays a high level of professionalism and confidence through fluency, enthusiasm, and use of academic vocabulary in appropriate contexts. | Teacher candidate displays professionalism and confidence through fluency, enthusiasm, and use of academic vocabulary. | Teacher candidate lacks professionalism and/or confidence with limited fluency, enthusiasm, and/or use of academic vocabulary. | Teacher candidate displays little to no professionalism or confidence, exhibiting low levels of fluency, enthusiasm, and/or academic vocabulary. |
| Presentation Organization InTASC 9, 10 CAEP R1.4 CEC 1 | Presentation follows a logical sequence, with clear introduction, body, and conclusion; presentation is organized around evidence of deep reflection aligned to learning outcomes of the program. | Presentation follows a logical sequence and is organized around evidence of reflection aligned to learning outcomes of the program. | Presentation follows some logical sequence and is not organized around evidence of reflection aligned to learning outcomes of the program. | Presentation does not follow a logical sequence and shows little to no evidence of reflection aligned to learning outcomes of the program. |
| Standard 1 Learner Development (Rationale) InTASC 1 CAEP R1.1 CEC 2, 6 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to learner development. | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to learner development. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to learner development. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to learner development. |
| Standard 1 Learner Development (Artifacts) InTASC 1 CAEP R1.1 CEC 2, 6 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and thorough application of learner development. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and application of learner development. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or application of learner development. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or application of learner development. |
| Standard 2 Learning Differences (Rationale) InTASC 2 CAEP R1.1 CEC 2, 6 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to learning differences. | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to learning differences. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to learning differences. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to learning differences. |
| Standard 2 Learning Differences (Artifacts) InTASC 2 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|--|
| CAEP R1.1 CEC 2, 6 | thorough application of learning differences. | application of learning differences. | application of learning differences. | application of learning differences. |
| Standard 3 Learning Environments (Rationale) InTASC 3 CAEP R1.1 CEC 2, 6 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to creating effective learning environments. | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to creating effective learning environments. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to creating effective learning environments. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to creating effective learning environments. |
| Standard 3 Learning Environments (Artifacts) InTASC 3 CAEP R1.1 CEC 2, 6 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and thorough application of creating effective learning environments. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and application of creating effective learning environments. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or application of creating effective learning environments. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or application of creating effective learning environments. |
| Standard 4 Content Knowledge (Rationale) InTASC 4 CAEP R1.2 CEC 3 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to content knowledge. | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to content knowledge. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to content knowledge. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to content knowledge. |
| Standard 4 Content Knowledge (Artifacts) InTASC 4 CAEP R1.2 CEC 3 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and thorough application of the interconnections among content knowledge. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and application of the interconnections among content knowledge. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or application of the interconnections among content knowledge. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or application of the interconnections among content knowledge. |
| Standard 5 Application of Content (Rationale) InTASC 5 CAEP R1.2 CEC 3 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to application of collaborative problem solving, and pedagogical knowledge in the content field. | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to collaborative problem solving, and pedagogical knowledge in the content field. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to collaborative problem solving, and pedagogical knowledge in the content field. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to collaborative problem solving, and pedagogical knowledge in the content field. |
| Standard 5 Application of Content (Artifacts) InTASC 5 CAEP R1.2 CEC 3 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and thorough application of the interconnections among application of | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and application of the interconnections among collaborative problem | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or application of the interconnections among | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or application of the interconnections among |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| | collaborative problem solving, and collaborative problem solving, and pedagogical knowledge in the content field. | solving, and pedagogical knowledge in the content field. | collaborative problem solving, and pedagogical knowledge in the content field. | collaborative problem solving, and pedagogical knowledge in the content field. |
| Standard 6 Assessment (Rationale) InTASC 6 CAEP R1.3 CEC 4 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to use of assessment to advance learning. | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to use of assessment to advance learning. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to use of assessment to advance learning. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to use of assessment to advance learning. |
| Standard 6 Assessment (Artifacts) InTASC 6 CAEP R1.3 CEC 4 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and thorough application of the interconnections among use of assessment to advance learning. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and application of the interconnections among use of assessment to advance learning. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or application of the interconnections among use of assessment to advance learning. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or application of the interconnections among use of assessment to advance learning. |
| Standard 7 Planning for Instruction (Rationale) InTASC 7 CAEP R1.3 CEC 5 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to use of planning for instruction. | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to use of planning for instruction. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to use of planning for instruction. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to use of planning for instruction. |
| Standard 7 Planning for Instruction (Artifacts) InTASC 7 CAEP R1.3 CEC 5 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and thorough application of the interconnections among planning for instruction. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and application of the interconnections among planning for instruction. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or application of the interconnections among planning for instruction. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or application of the interconnections among planning for instruction. |
| Standard 8 Instructional Strategies (Rationale) InTASC 8 CAEP R1.3 CEC 5 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to use of | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to use of instructional strategies. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to use of instructional strategies. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to use of instructional strategies. |

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|--|---|
| | instructional strategies. | | | |
| Standard 8 Instructional Strategies (Artifacts) InTASC 8 CAEP R1.3 CEC 5 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and thorough application of the interconnections of instructional strategies. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and application of the interconnections of instructional strategies. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or application of the interconnections of instructional strategies. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or application of the interconnections of instructional strategies. |
| Standard 9 Professional Learning & Ethical Practice (Rationale) InTASC 9 CAEP R1.4 CEC 1, 6 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to the understanding professional standards of practice relevant laws, policies, and code of ethics. | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to the understanding professional standards of practice relevant laws, policies, and code of ethics. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to the understanding professional standards of practice relevant laws, policies, and code of ethics. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to the understanding professional standards of practice relevant laws, policies, and code of ethics. |
| Standard 9 Professional Learning & Ethical Practice (Artifacts) InTASC 9 CAEP R1.4 CEC 1, 6 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and thorough application of the interconnections among understanding professional standards of practice. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and application of the interconnections among understanding professional standards of practice. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or application of the interconnections among understanding professional standards of practice. | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or application of the interconnections among understanding professional standards of practice. |
| Standard 10 Leadership & Collaboration (Rationale) InTASC 10 CAEP R1.4 CEC 1, 7 | Rationale thoroughly describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly connects performance, knowledge, and personal insights related to ability to collaborate with learners, families, and colleagues. | Rationale describes the artifact(s) and the context for use; clearly discusses performance and knowledge related to ability to collaborate with learners, families, and colleagues. | Rationale identifies the artifact(s); limited discussion of how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to ability to collaborate with learners, families, and colleagues. | Rationale inadequately identifies the artifact(s); misinterprets how artifact demonstrates performance and knowledge related to ability to collaborate with learners, families, and colleagues. |
| Standard 10 Leadership & Collaboration (Artifacts) InTASC 10 CAEP R1.4 CEC 1, 7 | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates deep understanding and thorough application of the interconnections among ability to | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates understanding and application of the interconnections among ability to collaborate | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates a limited understanding and/or application of the interconnections among ability to collaborate | The artifact(s) selection demonstrates little or no understanding or application of the interconnections among ability to collaborate |

| | | | | |
|---|--|---|---|--|
| | collaborate with learners, families, and colleagues. | with learners, families, and colleagues. | with learners, families, and colleagues. | with learners, families, and colleagues. |
| Diversity and Equity InTASC 1-10 CAEP R1, R2, R3, R4 CEC 2, 6 | Rationale and artifacts consistently embed strong evidence of the EPP's Diversity Goals related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating multiple perspectives, • Respect for and responsiveness to cultural differences, and • Understanding of diverse contexts | Rationale and artifacts consistently embed evidence of the EPP's Diversity Goals related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating multiple perspectives, • Respect for and responsiveness to cultural differences, and • Understanding of diverse contexts | Rationale and artifacts embed limited evidence of the EPP's Diversity Goals related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating multiple perspectives, • Respect for and responsiveness to cultural differences, and/or • Understanding of diverse contexts | Rationale and artifacts embed little to no evidence of the EPP's Diversity Goals related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating multiple perspectives, • Respect for and responsiveness to cultural differences, and/or • Understanding of diverse contexts |
| Technology InTASC 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 CAEP R1.3, R2.3 CEC 4 | Rationale and artifacts consistently embed strong evidence of meeting the EPP's Technology Goals related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating technology to engage students and enhance instruction, and • Manage student assessment data | Rationale and artifacts consistently embed evidence of meeting the EPP's Technology Goals related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating technology to engage students and enhance instruction, and • Manage student assessment data | Rationale and artifacts embed limited evidence of meeting the EPP's Technology Goals related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating technology to engage students and enhance instruction, and/or • Manage student assessment data | Rationale and artifacts embed little or no evidence of meeting the EPP's Technology Goals related to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporating technology to engage students and enhance instruction, and • Manage student assessment data |
| Comments | | | | |

Standards Alignment

| SLO | InTASC | <u>InTASC Standards</u> |
|-----|--------|--|
| 1 | 1 | Learner Development: The teacher understands how learners grow and develop, recognizing that patterns of learning and development vary individually within and across the cognitive, linguistic, social, emotional, and physical areas, and designs and implements developmentally appropriate and challenging learning experiences. |
| | 2 | Learning Differences: The teacher uses understanding of individual differences and diverse cultures and communities to ensure inclusive learning environments that enable each learner to meet high standards |
| | 3 | Learning Environments: The teacher works with others to create environments that support individual and collaborative learning, and that encourage positive social interaction, active engagement in learning, and self-motivation. |
| 2 | 4 | Content Knowledge: The teacher understands the central concepts, tools of inquiry, and structures of the discipline(s) he or she teaches and creates learning experiences that make the discipline accessible and meaningful for learners to assure mastery of the content. |
| | 5 | Application of Content: The teacher understands how to connect concepts and use differing perspectives to engage learners in critical thinking, creativity, and collaborative problem solving related to authentic local and global issues. |
| 3 | 6 | Assessment: The teacher understands and uses multiple methods of assessment to engage learners in their own growth, to monitor learner progress, and to guide the teacher's and learner's decision making. |
| | 7 | Planning for Instruction: The teacher plans instruction that supports every student in meeting rigorous learning goals by drawing upon knowledge of content areas, curriculum, cross-disciplinary skills, and pedagogy, as well as knowledge of learners and the community context. |
| | 8 | Instructional Strategies: The teacher understands and uses a variety of instructional strategies to encourage learners to develop deep understanding of content areas and their connections, and to build skills to apply knowledge in meaningful ways. |
| 4 | 9 | Professional Learning and Ethical Practice: The teacher engages in ongoing professional learning and uses evidence to continually evaluate his/her practice, particularly the effects of his/her choices and actions on others (learners, families, other professionals, and the community), and adapts practice to meet the needs of each learner. |
| | 10 | Leadership and Collaboration: The teacher seeks appropriate leadership roles and opportunities to take responsibility for student learning, to collaborate with learners, families, colleagues, other school professionals, and community members to ensure learner growth, and to advance the profession. |

| Standard | <u>Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Preparation Standards</u> |
|----------|--|
| R1.1 | The Learner and Learning: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of the learner and learning at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate that candidates are able to apply critical concepts and principles of learner development (InTASC Standard 1), learning differences (InTASC Standard 2), and creating safe and supportive learning environments (InTASC Standard 3) in order to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families. |
| R1.2 | Content: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of content at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided demonstrates candidates know central concepts of their content area (InTASC Standard 4) and are able to apply the content in developing equitable and inclusive learning experiences (InTASC Standard 5) for diverse P-12 students. Outcome data can be provided from a Specialized Professional Associations (SPA) process, a state review process, or an evidence review of Standard 1. |
| R1.3 | Instructional Practice: The provider ensures that candidates are able to apply their knowledge of InTASC standards relating to instructional practice at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence demonstrates how candidates are able to assess (InTASC Standard 6), plan for instruction (InTASC Standard 7), and utilize a variety of instructional strategies (InTASC Standard 8) to provide equitable and inclusive learning experiences for diverse P-12 students. Providers ensure candidates model and apply national or state approved technology standards to engage and improve learning for all students. |
| R1.4 | Professional Responsibility: The provider ensures candidates are able to apply their knowledge of professional responsibility at the appropriate progression levels. Evidence provided should demonstrate candidates engage in professional learning, act ethically (InTASC Standard 9), take responsibility for student learning, and collaborate with others (InTASC Standard 10) to work effectively with diverse P-12 students and their families. |