**Instructions**

The UTC Job Embedded Portfolio Assessment is to be completed by the UTC clinical supervisor (CS), or job-embedded (JE) induction instructor, during the JE teacher’s last semester and prior to licensure completion. During Job-Embedded Induction, the JE teacher will submit the following artifacts to demonstrate readiness for licensure completion:

* One model lesson plan (teacher knowledge)
* One model instructional video directly related to the model lesson plan (teacher performance)
  + The CS/JE instructor will score the model lesson plan instructional video based upon the JE Portfolio Rubric (See attached)
* One formal JE induction professional reflection paper with attached professional development plan aligned with school district goals and expectations for the licensure area (teacher; disposition).

**Interrater Agreement Procedures**

UTC clinical supervisors/JE instructors complete annual TEAM training and maintain active certification prior to the start of each academic year. Additionally, at the close of the academic year, a committee of JE portfolio raters (i.e., JE instructors, clinical supervisors, UTC faculty) will randomly select and score 3 JE Teacher Portfolios for the purpose of providing a second-rater score and calculating interrater agreement (IRA). Interrater agreement is a measure of the degree to which two or more judges (raters) agree on a behavioral observation or performance task rating (Burry-Stock, Shaw, Laurie, & Chissom, 1996). Burry-Stock and colleagues recommend using Rater Agreement Indexes (RAI) as a measure of IRA.

The RAI suggested by Burry-Stock and colleagues accounts for slight imperfections (error). For example, each item is scored in terms of: *one minus the absolute value of the difference between rater one and rater two, over I (intervals) minus one.* Aligned with the Tennessee Educator Acceleration Model (TEAM), the JE portfolio consists of a 5-point ordinal scale (5 intervals: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). The UTC JE Portfolio Assessment consists of 15 items (indicators of teacher professional expectations) directly related to the TEAM evaluation model and aligned with elements of edTPA. To make a practical application of the method suggested by Burry-Stock and colleagues, a random sample of 3 UTC JE Portfolios will be scored by 3 raters at the end of each academic year. IRA Scores will need to be within 80% (.8) reliability standard (Gast, 2010) of the original scorer.

**UTC JE Portfolio Assessment Interrater Agreement Procedures**

UTC JE Portfolio IRA scores will be calculated as for each item (indicator).

A = number of agreements (exact, or adjacent [+/-1])

D = number of disagreements

Agreements are defined in terms of exact, or adjacent (within 1 ordinal rank [+/-1]), score at the indicator level. See attached JE Portfolio rubric.

Disagreements are defined in terms of indicator scores greater than 1 ordinal rank (+/- >1).

Pearson uses a similar IRA calculation for edTPA portfolios (Gitomer, Martínez, Battey, & Hyland, 2021; Pearson, 2019). The JE committee will randomly assign 3 JE portfolios, comprised of one model lesson plan and related video of instructional practice. Each of the 3 raters will score one JE portfolio. The JE committee will compare each rater’s score with the original JE Portfolio rater to evaluate IRA.

The JE portfolio is comprised of 15 items (indicators). See attached. To meet the proposed IRA standard, the second rater will need to be within 1 ordinal rank (exact, or adjacent; +/-1) of the original rater across 12 of 15 indicators (80%) across all 3 JE portfolio random samples. If a JE portfolio IRA score does not meet this standard, then the JE committee will require a rescore from a third rater. The JE committee will provide retraining per need to maintain the 80% IRA standard.

**References**

Burry-Stock, J. A., Shaw, D. G., Laurie, C., & Chissom, B. S. (1996). Rater agreement indexes for performance assessment. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, *56*(2), 251-262.

Gast, D. L. (2010). *Single-subject research methodology in Behavioral Sciences.* (1st ed.). Routledge

Gitomer, D. H., Martínez, J. F., Battey, D., & Hyland, N. E. (2021). Assessing the assessment: Evidence of reliability and validity in the edTPA. *American Educational Research Journal*, *58*(1), 3-31.

Pearson Education Inc., (2019). *edTPA Annual Administrative Report* <https://edtpa.org/resource_item/2019AR>

6/19/24