NICE

National Intervener Certification E-portfolio

The PARA² Center
PARAprofessional resource and research center

CU School of Education & Human Development
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO DENVER

NCDB National Center on Deaf-Blindness

NICE Reviewer Feedback Survey Results

Reviewers were asked for feedback on three aspects concerning reviewing portfolios:

- Online reviewer training

- Reviewer orientation and group meetings

- Review process

Online Reviewer Training

As a reviewer, the online training materials I used to navigate the E-Portfolio system as a reviewer were clear and understandable.

Strongly disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	12	5

The online training materials provided me adequate information and guidance to review a portfolio

Strongly disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	4	12	3

Reviewers indicated the 3 most important resources helpful to reviewers (3 of 10 ranked):

- Reviewer Handbook

- Tips for Reviewing

- Sample Portfolio

NICE Reviewer Orientation and Group Trainings

The group orientation provided beneficial background on the project.

Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	2	11	6

The orientation presenters answered all questions and concerns adequately.

Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
3	8	8

I felt more confident in my role as a reviewer after the group orientation.

Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
3	8	8

NICE Reviewer Orientation and Group Trainings

The Reviewer Group training provided in-depth knowledge in my role and responsibilities as a reviewer.

Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
2	14	4

The presenters for the Reviewer Group training answered all questions and concerns adequately.

Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	9	8

I felt that I was ready to review a NICE Portfolio after Reviewer Group training.

Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	12	5

Review Process

I was able to easily navigate the Venture System to review and score artifacts.

Agree	Strongly agree
12	6

Reviewers have clear directions on whom to contact if they have a technical problem.

Agree	Strongly agree
8	10

The "About Me" section was helpful in understanding the presentation of artifacts.

Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	12	5

Review Process

The four point scoring system worked well in reviewing portfolio artifacts.

Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	4	9	4

I felt confident assigning scores using the system.

Agree	Strongly agree
8	10

The final aggregated score was an accurate reflection of the overall quality of the portfolio

Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
1	1	4	8	3

Did you need to go back and refer to the materials while you were scoring? What part(s)?

- Yes. I used the scoring rubric to refresh my memory while attempting to determine which score to give to the artifacts – 5 reviewers

- Yes, consistently--all parts

- Yes, how to identify what is mastery and emerging while scoring

- The rubric and directions for majority vs. minority

- Handbook, scoring sections

- Yes- the samples, and guide

- Yes, some artifacts

- Yes. Particularly about scoring

- Not really

- No

Do you have any suggestions to improve the 'About Me' section?

- I think a question where they are asked for a half page reflection on the role of an intervener.

- No- this section is clear and provides an adequate snapshot of the individual

- No, it is helpful as is.

- No, it worked in the portfolio I reviewed.

- No. That's great.

- No – 4 reviewers

- Request that applicants address ALL prompts but limit their comments to those prompts.

- Perhaps a writing prompt about movement or mobility

- Not so far

- Not on the "About me" section, there was a glitch when I was scoring that even though all the parts were submitted it kept saying it was at 93% and would not let me submit. Wish it would let you submit even if it doesn't believe it is at 100%

In what instances was artifact scoring easy to complete?

- I found the videos of the interveners working with the students to be very easy to score

- When the intervener stayed focused on what they were doing to meet the needs of the individual with deafblindness.

- When video or written documents were used for artifacts

- I believe video footage is the easiest and is the most telling.

- When it was clearly outlined that all competencies were addressed

- The layout

- When it was laid out well with an outline

- When it was clear they met the competencies

- I wouldn't describe any of the artifact scoring as "easy."

- When the intervener candidate selected artifacts that were clearly related to the competencies she/he selected

- When there are three or more standards per artifact.

- When there was a strong match between required item and the presented materials.

- The more I did it, the more it made sense.

- Artifacts with Multi-media and detailed descriptions

- Scoring is easiest to complete when the artifact includes a video of an intervener demonstrating the application of a specific skill

- When there was clearly evidence, or no evidence, within the documentation or explanation of the competency (ies) addressed; if there was no evidence, it was also not found anywhere else in the portfolio.

In what instances was artifact scoring a challenge?

- Some of the videos in which the intervener did not actually demonstrate a skill by working with a student but described their knowledge of how they might use a skill were difficult for me to score.

- When the intervener described the student and not what they were doing and why.

- When only photographs were used for artifact documentation

- Where the interpretation was left up to the reviewer rather than being well explained by the intervener. As a reviewer who is experienced in deafblindness and intervener services it is easy to read into what is presented.

- When it addressed a couple of artifacts but not all and it didn't match the examples for mastery or emerging. It was somewhere in between

- When the artifacts and competencies did not appear to align, or reflected confusion in the intervener's process of aligning artifacts with competences. For example, it was challenging to score an intervener if the artifact demonstrated skills in a competency that was not represented in her/his selection.

- When there are only two standards per artifact. Great portfolios otherwise get taken down a peg only because information seen in other places are not in that section.

In what instances was artifact scoring a challenge?

- When the interpretation of the item was overly narrow, but the items presented were strong.

- In the beginning. Not sure what the difference between evidence and explanations. I'm thinking these two should be worth equal points. Their artifact may not be exactly what they wanted, but their ability to explain what they do on a daily basis is important.

- Making sure the artifacts truly reflected the competencies

- If other team members were involved, not sure how much was their work

- If there was not much material or if the material was used more than once for different areas

- For the majority of artifacts, honestly; this is likely heavily influenced because this was my FIRST portfolio review.

- Scoring is more challenging when there is no physical record (e.g. video) of skill implementation

- It took me a while to understand that I have to hit "save" everytime before moving around, I lost a lot of scores that way! Would be nice if it automatically saved if you closed out. Especially since it blocks part of the screen so it makes it harder to comment as you go, have to wait until the end to fill it all out at the same time.

- In times when I wasn't sure what they were demonstrating

- It was not technically a challenge, but I felt it was ethically a challenge, when evidence was seen in other sections but not in the section being reviewed, and the directions would have that section receive less than proficient score (or when a stand-alone competency did not pass, but would have received a "proficient" score if submitted with three other competencies). It felt as if the candidate was having portfolio construction reviewed, not intervention.

What would you change in the system to make it easier for a reviewer?

- I would make it clear that an intervener describing the implementation of a skill is equivalent to a photo or video of the intervener actually practicing a skill

- I think there needs to be at least one mandatory video of the intervener actually intervening with a student and then providing either verbal or written commentary as to how what they are doing demonstrates the role of the intervener

- Require more video footage of the intervener interacting with the student with explanations of what they are doing and WHY.

- I would require the intervener to address pre-selected competencies, not to allow him/her to choose from a list of competencies. There was significant confusion and lower scores as a result of this structure.

- Revamp the directions to 1) allow for documentation from other sections to be considered in other competencies, using reviewers' professional judgement 2) do not allow for single artifact/single competency entries, unless required by the standard 3) perhaps provide more support for the use of the "Additional Information" section under the artifacts

- Consider information seen in other sections? Maybe I did this wrong : (It was a great portfolio, but two-standard sections did not do as well...

- Reduce redundancy among items. Reduce items.

- Have it instantly save any comments made, I lose a lot of comments by forgetting to save before closing the comment box

- I think that there should be some more specific guidelines on how to score artifacts in which demonstration of skills are being evaluated based on still photographs, interviews or written description

- Also, automatic saving of reviewer comments, they always get deleted on me and I am having to constantly rewrite them if I forgot to save or if the save did not go through for whatever reason

- Nothing, not sure, none

Approximately, how long did it take to review each portfolio?

- 5 hours

- 6 hours

- 7 Hours

- 9 hours

- Approximately 6-8 hours

- 12 hours

- 12 -15hrs

- 8-10 hrs I think, I don't exactly remember

- 8-10 hrs

- It took me between 5 & 6 hours to review each portfolio

- About 10 focused hours

- 8 - 9 hours

- 6-7 hours

- This one portfolio took about 8 hours. Previous portfolios (my first) took about 10 hours each.

- 8-10 hours