TEAM Portfolio Guidebook
For Administrators and Teachers
2018-19

Contents

Introduction

The TEAM student growth portfolio is a growth model which measures student growth between two points in time (point A to point B) for a representative sample of students in a classroom. It is not an achievement measure, which demonstrates the proficiency level of an entire cohort of students at one point in time. TEAM portfolios serve as the 35 percent student growth component of a teacher's Level of Overall Effectiveness (LOE). Classroom observations constitute the 50 percent qualitative component for a teacher's LOE, while student achievement constitutes the remaining 15 percent of the LOE.

This document provides general information about TEAM portfolios and should be used in conjunction with the content-specific resource guides. The intended audience for this document includes teachers, principals, district personnel, and any other individuals seeking out more information regarding TEAM portfolios. It is critical that all educators who will submit a portfolio for the 2018-19 school year also read and utilize the accompanying content-specific resource guides and scoring rubrics, which can be found [here](). Additional guidance related to the online platform can be found [here]().

Background

Following the implementation of TEAM teacher evaluation in 2011, teachers in non-tested grades and subjects requested the opportunity to receive an individual student growth score based on their specific contributions to their own students' learning. The department worked with teachers from across the state to develop TEAM student growth portfolios to provide such a score, which in the past was only available to teachers in tested grades and subject areas through the Tennessee Value-Added Assessment System (TVAAS). TEAM portfolios provide an individual student growth measure to a larger group of teachers and offer teachers a more personalized evaluation experience. In addition, the reflective nature of the portfolio process—in which teachers collect, review, and submit student work artifacts throughout the school year—is a valuable professional learning experience for teachers.

Portfolio Structure

A TEAM portfolio consists of **four collections** of student work selected by the teacher. The student work selected is drawn from a standard (or set of three standards in ELA) aligned to the grade-level or subject area as outlined [here](). Each collection consists of point A and point B samples of student work for three students, and for six students in Physical Education.

1. **Point A** student work artifacts are collected, scored using the scoring rubric, and categorized by the teacher as emerging, proficient, and advanced at **the onset of learning** related to the standard(s) being taught. Scoring is done using a content-specific scoring rubric.
2. Then, at a point in time determined by the teacher to be the **completion of learning** related to that same standard(s), **point B** student work artifacts are collected and scored by the teacher using the same rubric that was used at point A.
3. The teacher then conducts **purposeful sampling** to determine which student work sample pairs (**points A and B**) to submit as part of a portfolio collection. Content-specific information about purposeful samples can be found in the resource guides found [here]().

It is important to note that paired point A and point B student work artifacts must reflect the same standard (or standards in ELA) and must be collected from the same student so that growth can be measured. The new TEAM Portfolio element of TNPortfolio auto-populates the standard options for collections that are available to teachers based on the TEAM portfolio (grade level/content area) in which they are enrolled, eliminating the need to upload a context form to identify each student work artifact. Additionally, once a collection has been selected by the teacher, all fields for entering emerging, proficient, and advanced student work aligned to the correct standard(s) will be available for teachers to upload work.

Task-Specific Expectations

Task-specific expectations are teacher-generated characteristics of expected student work related to concrete skills and/or content knowledge **aligned to the standard(s)**. Tasks that drive the student work artifacts at both points A and B should provide all students the opportunity to meet the expectations of the standard.

These expectations promote clarity and understanding of the scoring rubric and can serve as a feedback tool for teachers and students. Task-specific expectations for student work outcomes can have a significant impact on the depth of the work that is produced by students. The more that students know the expectations for student work outcomes, the more likely they are to self-monitor their own learning and set their own goals. Additionally, when teachers make it a consistent practice to develop task-specific expectations, they learn about their students' strengths and areas of need.

Often, point A student work artifacts demonstrate limited variance in performance levels across the cohort of students. For example, all student work artifacts might score at Level 2 (emerging) for a particular standard. In these instances, the task-specific expectations should be utilized for categorizing student work artifacts as emerging, proficient, and advanced within a performance level.

Scoring and Sorting Point A

Point A student work artifacts for each collection should be scored by the teacher and categorized as emerging, proficient, and advanced. While teachers have flexibility in defining these groups, proficient typically refers to artifacts scoring at Level 3, which is the grade-level standard. Emerging typically refers to performance levels below 3, and advanced typically refers to performance levels above 3. However, point A student work sometimes demonstrates limited variance in performance levels across a cohort of students. In these cases, teachers should use their knowledge of students, task-specific expectations, and other assessment data to categorize student work.

Scoring and Sorting Point B

Point B student work artifacts for each collection should be scored using the **same content-specific scoring rubric** used to score point A student work. Point A and point B artifacts should be paired at the student level.

> Note: Content-specific scoring rubrics used to score student work artifacts contain seven performance levels to allow for students who enter the grade at a high performance level to

demonstrate growth over time. **It is not an expectation that students reach performance Levels 6 or 7.** More information about Levels 6 and 7 is included in this document under Portfolio Scoring Process.

Purposeful Sampling

The process of selecting student work for inclusion in the portfolio collections after points A and B are collected is called **purposeful sampling**. When reviewing the scored student work sample pairs (point A and point B) for each student, the teacher selects one sample (point A and point B) from each of the three differentiated groups (emerging, proficient, advanced) which is representative of the growth demonstrated in that differentiated group.

For example, assuming five students were in the emerging group at point A, if three students grew 2 performance levels from point A to point B, and two students grew 1 performance level from point A to point B, the teacher would select a sample in which the student grew 2 performance levels. This process would be repeated for the proficient and advanced groups. The paired samples of point A and point B work for each of the students in the differentiated groups are submitted via the online platform, which calculates the growth for each collection.

Portfolio Development Snapshot

How to Create a High-Quality Portfolio

- Create a long-term instructional plan for the school year, considering when standards will be introduced, measured, and monitored.
- Deconstruct standards so that planning can be explicit and clear for students and develop or identify aligned tasks that will be used to measure performance.
- Utilize the scoring rubrics to develop task-specific expectations.
- Collect point A work at the most appropriate time within the instructional plan.
- Score and sort point A student work artifacts into differentiated groups (emerging, proficient, advanced) based on the scoring rubric, task-specific expectations, knowledge of students, and other assessment data (such as universal screeners or entry inventories in the early grades). See the content-specific resource guides for additional information on the sorting process.
- Differentiate instruction for specific needs and strengths that were identified within the point A student work artifacts.
- Collect point B work at the most appropriate time within the instructional plan.
- Score point B student work artifacts and analyze the results from point A and point B artifacts.
- Determine which samples within each differentiated group demonstrate the most representative growth; this guides the process of purposeful sampling. See the content-specific resource guides for additional information on purposeful sampling.
- Upload each differentiated group sample at point A and point B in the online platform.
- (Optional) Tag the artifacts with evidence from the rubric for reflection.
- Score each student work artifact on the online platform.
- Submit the purposefully sampled student work artifacts for each of the evidence collections prior to the May 1 due date.

Managing Student Work

The TEAM portfolios are designed to provide teachers with an authentic, individualized, student-centered growth measure based on student work artifacts. Various types of evidence can be collected in real time (at point A and point B) to determine student performance on a standard within each portfolio collection. An artifact can include, but is not limited to, written student work, video segments that demonstrate student performance or speaking, audio recordings of student conversations or think aloud, or photographs of student work. Student names associated with the work should not be visible. Content-specific information about evidence recommendations can be found [here](#).

Storing Student Work Artifacts

Teachers are encouraged to store student work artifacts locally throughout the year, but have the option to upload student work artifacts into the online platform at any time. Online storage platforms utilized at the local level are efficient in not only storing student work artifacts and/or audio/video artifacts, but also in providing a way for teachers to easily share student work artifacts with colleagues or their professional learning communities. Online storage platforms including, but not limited to Google, Dropbox, Evernote, Box, Github, and One Drive are compatible with the TEAM Portfolio platform for uploading student work artifacts. Teachers should check with their district about approved online storage platforms.

As student work is captured for electronic submission into the online platform, teachers should ensure that video/audio are clear, and photos and scans are readable. This will ensure accurate scoring after submission.

Context Narrative

An upgrade to the submission process for 2018-19 allows teachers to indicate the collection and corresponding standard(s) without the need to *upload* a context narrative form.

Context narratives are no longer required, but are recommended at the collection level. An interactive component of the new TEAM Portfolio platform allows teachers to provide contextual information about the collection to assist peer reviewers in effective scoring. For example, for an early grades ELA standard, a teacher will provide the name and author of the text(s). Instructions for including a context narrative are available in the platform. Note that teachers should *not* record student names or score-related information; context narratives should contain objective information only.

Tagging and My Reflection Notes (Optional)

Tagging is an optional process through which teachers may annotate student work at the artifact level as they engage in reflection about their instruction. The online portfolio platform provides virtual tools with which teachers can record their thinking by tagging or annotating portions of the student work. Tagging is for the teacher's benefit only; it will not be seen by peer reviewers.

Additionally, the platform has a My Reflection Notes feature that allows teachers to record additional thoughts and reflections at the artifact level. These also will not be seen by peer reviewers.

Portfolio Submission

All **completed** collections in the online portfolio platform must be submitted by the **11:59 p.m. local time on May 1, 2019**. A completed collection consists of point A and point B samples for the differentiated groups (emerging, proficient, and advanced). The TEAM Portfolio platform has been refined for 2018-19 so that a "mismatch" of standards between points A and B will not occur.

Teachers should ensure that the work uploaded into the platform within each collection aligns with the rigor and requirements of the standard; otherwise, growth for that standard cannot be measured, which will result in a collection score of 1. Therefore, teachers are highly encouraged to ensure the following are true before the final submission:
- Student work at the artifact level (point A and point B) is from the same student.
- Student work at the sample level (emerging, proficient, and advanced) is from different students.
- Student work for each component is available and not duplicated at any point.
- Student work at both points A and B align to the rigor and requirements of the standard identified in the online system. For example, if a literature/narrative standard is selected, the student work artifacts at both points A and B should reflect the work of that literature/narrative standard and not the work of an informational/expository standard.

Note: A portfolio will be assigned an *Incomplete (I)* if any of the four collections are not completed and submitted by the deadline. District portfolio leads and school administrators should take an active role in monitoring the progress of portfolio development and submission.

Portfolio Scoring Process

Scoring Rubrics

Scoring rubrics are a critical part of planning for and measuring student learning. Teachers can use these to understand the types of performance that might be seen in student work at varying levels, to categorize student work into performance levels, and to identify the types of performance that indicate progress for instructional planning. While the recommended method of viewing scoring rubrics is within the TEAM Portfolio online system, they are also available for download from the TEAM website [here](#).

Performance Levels 6 and 7

Scoring rubrics used to measure student performance were expanded in 2017-18 by two performance levels (Levels 6 and 7) to allow students at an advanced level at point A an opportunity to demonstrate growth from point A to point B. Performance Level 3 reflects the expectation of student work at the end of the year; **it is not an expectation that students reach performance Levels 6 or 7.**

Portfolios are designed to measure meaningful learning and effective teaching. Therefore, growth can happen anywhere along the rubric and can be reflected in an overall portfolio growth score (i.e., the teacher effectiveness indicator). For example, positive student growth, and an accompanying teacher effectiveness indicator of three or higher, can be obtained when a teacher employs developmentally appropriate practice that moves students from below grade-level expectations (Levels 1 or 2) at the beginning of the year to meeting grade-level expectations (Level 3) at the end of the year. It is developmentally inappropriate to plan

and deliver instruction beyond students' developmental levels; therefore, expectations for students beyond Level 3 should be approached with discretion. All student growth from one performance level to another should be celebrated and positively impact teacher effectiveness scores.

Scoring of Collections

After the submission deadline, collections are scored by trained, certified peer reviewers who determine the performance level of each student work artifact using the **same** aligned scoring rubric at points A and B. **If a discrepancy of more than one performance level exists between the teacher's score and peer reviewer score for the average of a collection, an expert reviewer conducts final scoring. To increase accuracy in scoring and reduce bias, each of the four collections in the portfolio is scored by a different peer reviewer.**

A growth score is calculated by finding the difference between point A and point B scores for each student work sample in the collection (emerging, proficient, and advanced differentiated groups) and determining an average level of student growth for that collection. The average level of student growth for the evidence collection is then applied to the scaled Student Growth Indicator values (below) to determine the evidence collection score.

Student Growth Indicator Chart	
Level 5 Significantly Above Expectations	Students demonstrate, on average, ***three or more levels of student growth (= or >3 levels of growth)***
Level 4 Above Expectations	Students demonstrate, on average, ***two levels of student growth, but less than three levels of student growth (=2 levels of growth, but < 3 levels of growth)***
Level 3 At Expectations	Students demonstrate, on average, ***one, but less than two levels of student growth (=1 level of growth but <2 levels of growth)***
Level 2 Below Expectations	Students demonstrate, on average, ***less than one level of student growth (>0 levels of growth but <1 level of growth)***
Level 1 Significantly Below Expectations	Students demonstrated, on average, ***no growth or negative growth***

Calculating the Teacher Effectiveness Indicator

The Teacher Effectiveness Indicator, or the overall portfolio score, is calculated by averaging the four evidence collection growth scores (as described above), and then applying the average to the scaled value of 1-5 as outlined on the following page. This becomes the educator's growth score that serves as 35 percent of the LOE.

Teacher Effectiveness Indicator	Student Growth Indicator Scores
Level 1	1.00 – 1.79
Level 2	1.80 – 2.59
Level 3	2.60 – 3.39
Level 4	3.40 – 4.19
Level 5	4.20 – 5.00

Note: A portfolio will be assigned an *Incomplete (I)* if any of the four collections are not completed and submitted by the deadline.

Portfolio Exemptions, Late Submissions, Incompletes, and Grievances

Exemptions

Tennessee statute § 49-1-302 states that the evaluation process shall not apply to teachers who are employed under contracts of duration of 120 days per school year or fewer or who are not employed full-time. The educator should be marked as partial year exemption (PYE) in TNCompass. Any teacher who serves as the teacher of record for a tested grade or subject AND who also teaches a portfolio grade or subject is not required to submit a portfolio, and would receive the TVAAS score as the 35 percent measure for his/her LOE.

Late Submissions

It is required that all portfolio collections are submitted by May 1, 2019. In the case of a natural disaster or other such circumstance, districts may submit a late submission request for approval on district letterhead to the director of teacher effectiveness at Portfolio.Questions@tn.gov. Extension requests must be received by the department no later than May 1, 2019. No late submission requests will be considered after the May 1 deadline. Extensions will be approved on a case-by-case basis.

Incompletes

Failure to submit a portfolio, or any portfolio that receives a student growth indicator less than 1.0, will result in the teacher receiving an *Incomplete (I)*. In cases where portfolios are required for submission by state law, failure to submit puts a district out of compliance with state law, and districts may dismiss or suspend the teacher for neglect of duty per T.C.A. § 49-5-511.

Additionally, the department reserves the right to make future decisions regarding VPK funding based on this non-compliance. In cases where portfolios are required for submission by district opt-in, districts may dismiss or suspend the teacher per T.C.A. § 49-5-511.

Grievances

T.C.A. § 49-1-302 requires the development of a local-level evaluation grievance procedure to provide a means for evaluated teachers to challenge only the accuracy of the data used in the evaluation and the

adherence to the evaluation policies adopted by the State Board of Education. "Accuracy of the data" refers to its correct identification with a particular teacher. If a grievance related to accuracy of data or adherence to the scoring methodology is upheld by the district, the district lead portfolio contact may submit a request to vacate the portfolio score. Information about vacating a score will be available on the [TEAM website](#) by the portfolio submission date.

District-Level Roles and Responsibilities

District Portfolio Lead

District TEAM portfolio leads are responsible for:
- maintaining accurate teacher rosters in the portfolio platform,
- distributing all portfolio-related information and resources to teachers,
- participating in, and encouraging teachers to participate in, trainings offered by the department,
- monitoring and supporting the timely and complete portfolio submission for all teachers,
- recruiting the appropriate number of peer reviewers for certification as outlined in state board policy 5.201[here](#), and
- communicating with the department as needed.

Portfolio Technology Lead

Each district's technology lead is responsible for ensuring all educators in the district have access to the online platform. Additionally, they will be provided teacher-level access in order to provide support to teachers at a local level. For more information on the technical features to support portfolio implementation, guidance can be found [here](#).

School Administrator Role and Responsibilities

The school administrator should provide support to teachers by doing the following:
- **Provide teachers with time and resources needed to be successful**
  School-level administrators should work to develop the capacity of teachers as they plan for and implement portfolios. This is best done through teacher collaboration via professional learning communities, teacher partnership, etc. School administrators should ensure that teachers are deconstructing standards, creating assessment tasks, planning differentiated instruction, collecting and analyzing student work to make instructional decisions, and reflecting.

- **Make connections to other evaluation components**
  The student growth that teachers seek to foster through the TEAM portfolio process is directly correlated to the effectiveness of the instructional practices that teachers employ in their classrooms. Therefore, evaluators should consider how practices observed during evaluation of the planning, instruction, and environment domains are impacting student learning in a measurable way. Feedback is critical to teacher development; therefore, post-observation conferences should promote reflection on **areas of reinforcement and refinement** in light of portfolio development. For example, if a lesson's refinement area is Lesson Structure and Pacing in terms of providing opportunities for students who progress at different learning rates, the evaluator might ask the

teacher to consider how the actionable feedback discussed could be applied to ensure that students with emergent, proficient, and advanced portfolio artifacts could be provided similar opportunities. Any feedback that is provided to teachers to improve instructional practice can and should be connected to the student growth possible through portfolio development.

TEAM Portfolio Online Platform

Platform Registration and Tutorial

Teachers use the TEAM Portfolio platform, powered by Portfolium, to submit portfolio collections. In late August 2018, all teachers who submitted a portfolio in 2017-18 will receive notification via email that the TEAM Portfolio platform is available. Educators must login for access to the online platform; platform tutorials and guidance can be found here. This guidance will remain available for use throughout the school year and will demonstrate various processes, including how to select or delete collections, how to upload and enter a score for a student work artifact, and how to use the optional tagging feature.

Teachers who are new to a district in 2018-19, or new to portfolios, must request access here, and district portfolio leads must approve access requests through the TEAM Portfolio Approval Queue.

Technical Requirements

Portfolios were designed to be implemented without an additional investment in technology. For portfolios that include video collections to demonstrate student growth, teachers have used a variety of district-owned devices (e.g., tablets or video cameras) and low- or no-cost downloadable software. Some districts have found tripods to be helpful. The department provides the online platform for portfolio submissions at no cost to districts.

Media Release Forms

Teachers who choose to submit audio or video artifacts should ensure that district media releases have been completed and are on file at the district level.

Online Platform Supported File Formats

The online portfolio platform supports multiple file formats to enable users to capture work that is authentic to the task they are asked to perform. **All files have a 4GB limit.** The file types and formats supported by the platform include, but are not limited to:

Images	Documents	Presentations	Spreadsheets	Audio/Visual
.png, .svg, .tiff, .bmp, .gif, .jpeg, .jpg, .psd	.doc, .docx, .odt, .ott, .rtf, .txt, .pdf	.odp, .ppt, .pptx	.ods, .xls, xlsx	.mp4, .mp3, .wav, .ogg, .wma, .aac, .mpeg, .mpg, Mov, .wmv, .Avi, .3gp, .flv, .webm, .m2v, .m4v, .vob, .ogv

Teachers will be able to securely utilize the online platform in August to upload student work, tag evidence (if desired), and score the work for each student work artifact.

Contact Information

With additional content-specific questions about TEAM student growth portfolios, please reach out to Portfolio.Questions@tn.gov. With additional technical questions about the TEAM Portfolio platform, please utilize the chat feature within the platform.