PARENTAL REACTIONS

TO A COMPUTERIZED READING PORTFOLIO

THESIS

Submitted to the Graduate Committee of the

Department of Education and Human Development

State University of New York

College at Brockport

in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Master of Science in Education

by

Michele J. Dovan

State University of New York

College at Brockport

Brockport, New York

August 1996

SUBMITTED BY:

Michele J. Doran

APPROVED BY:

_____   *8/8/96*
Thesis Advisor   Date

_____   *8/8/96*
Second Reader   Date

_____   *8/19/96*
Director of Graduate Studies   Date

Abstract

Eighteen second graders participated in an oral reading assessment program that was intended to determine parents' reactions to an electronic reading portfolio. The Grady Profile was used to record and store data and oral reading samples for the children twice over a four month period. At the end of the four months, individual conferences gave parents an opportunity to listen to their child's reading performance and discuss anecdotal notes regarding comprehension, fluency, and general reading skills made by the teacher. At the end of the conference, the parents were asked to fill out a survey which indicated the degree to which they agreed with ten statements about the electronic reading portfolio. Six of the parents were also selected to participate in an open ended discussion regarding the portfolio. Results from the survey and the individual questioning of parents indicated strong support for the computerized reading portfolio. Parents found the electronic portfolio to be a valuable tool for gaining insight into their child's reading performance.

Table of Contents

CHAPTER I

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine parents' reactions and evaluations of a computerized reading portfolio. More teachers may wish to consider using computerized reading portfolios when conferencing with parents if positive reactions prevail.

Need for the Study

The idea of maintaining a portfolio to assist in assessing students, or as a sole form of assessment, has been developing steadily over the past ten years. Many teachers have been using some form of portfolio system for decades. Most teachers and administrators agree that portfolios are an important factor in assessing a child's progress. It gives concrete examples of the child's performance and demonstrates growth over time.

A computerized reading portfolio helps to document a child's oral reading performance over time. This is a very important piece of information that can assist in making judgments about a child's individual needs for additional services, such as remediation or acceleration. It is clear that teachers and administrators find computerized reading portfolios very useful and highly accurate in conveying a child's oral reading ability. It is possible that in the near future, computerized reading portfolios will be required by all teachers in some schools. Before a school proceeds with mandatory computerized portfolios, it behooves them first to determine if a computerized reading portfolio is of interest

to the parents, as well as the teachers and administrators. Parents play a key role in their child's education and must be included in the assessment process. If assessment is going to change we must be sure that the parents will find this change useful and easy to understand.

It is possible that a computerized reading portfolio will seem threatening to some parents who are unfamiliar with computers. They may find this form of assessment confusing or overwhelming. Perhaps a computerized reading portfolio is too much to share with parents and is better for a teacher's personal use. Computer literate parents may find a computerized reading portfolio boring or lacking concrete information that they would like to know about their child. On the other hand, some parents may feel that computerized reading portfolios give them a very accurate and concise picture of their child's reading ability.

In any case, it is important to get some feedback from parents before we sink more time, energy, and dollars into computerized reading portfolios. Parents should not only be involved in the process of assessing their children, but also the means with which we make those assessments. By involving parents in all aspects of assessment we are developing a partnership that will undoubtedly affect the child's education in a positive and hopefully life long manner.

Definition of Terms

Portfolio A collection of a student's work. The work is specifically chosen to reflect what the child *can* do. Typically it contains the student's best work. It is a tool that helps to show the child's growth and development over time. It is a

valuable tool for the child's self assessment as well as an important piece to share with parents. Traditionally, this work has been kept in a folder and passed along to the next teacher as the child moves through the grades.

Computerized Reading Portfolio   Using the computer to document a child's reading progress. The child reads a passage that is displayed on the computer screen. The computer records the child's voice as he is reading and stores the voice and corresponding passage in the child's computerized file. This may also be referred to as an electronic portfolio. Pertinent data about the child may also be stored in this file such as the child's address, phone number, and emergency numbers. Anecdotal records are also a valuable addition to the reading portfolio.

Grady Profile   A computer program designed to assist in the gathering, storing, and retrieving of data, particularly as it relates to the classroom setting. (It is available from Aurbach and Associates, Inc., 8233 Tulane Ave., St. Louis, MO 63132)

Summary

Computerized reading portfolios are becoming more widely used each year. Teachers and administrators are working with these portfolios as forms of assessment, as well as documentation of student growth. In order to justify the time, effort, and money involved in maintaining a computerized portfolio, districts need to closely examine the reactions of parents toward this type of assessment. Parental involvement is a vital component of a child's education.

Educators must work with parents to determine the extent to which a computerized portfolio will benefit the assessment process and the child's education. This study explored parents' reaction to the oral reading component of a computerized reading portfolio.

CHAPTER II
Review of the Literature

The constant change of an infant as he grows is a wonderful sight. From one week to the next, the child is developing and learning in countless ways. Family and friends who don't see the child for weeks at a time will undoubtedly comment on how quickly he is growing. But what do they mean by growing? He is so much heavier to carry around and perhaps his chubby, little legs no longer fit in his pajamas. These types of observations can be measured by putting the child on a scale, or by using a measuring tape. Then it is easy to compare him to the previous months or to other children.

But what about the way his smile has changed from a fleeting grin one week to a beaming smile the next week that stretches from ear to ear? Or how about the way he babbles? Random noises at first, then suddenly he is exercising his voice or using a demanding tone when he is hungry. These kinds of observations of growth certainly can not be measured in any kind of standard unit like his height or weight. There is no way of saying that his babbling has increased in standard increments like his height, or that his smile could be measured on a smile scale. (Grady, 1991). These signs of growth are often measured in other ways. A photo album and a baby book full of pictures, notes, and dates is typically the way a proud parent would document this kind of growth.

The parents of this child know so much about his likes and dislikes, his signs and signals, and they use this knowledge each time they respond to him.

In the Classroom

"When a teacher is entrusted with guiding intellectual growth and learning, she uses much the same methods. She seems to know how each child learns best, who should sit by whom when a reading lesson requires concentration; who will be frustrated by a page of addition problems, but can handle the same work in small increments." (Grady, 1991, p. 2). The teacher is constantly drawing from her knowledge about each child and adjusting her actions and reactions. It is an ongoing process that is, at times, at the subconscious level.

It would sound odd for a parent to talk only of the fact that his child is 11 pounds, 4 ounces and in the 95th percentile. There are so many other qualities worth discussing. Is he reaching for a toy yet? Does he respond to Mom's voice? Is he sleeping through the night? The statistics can give others a quick reference point that allows for immediate judgment about a small aspect of the child. What follows in the discussion of his ability to reach for toys, or sleep through the night is much more valuable and actually tells more about the whole child.

"Standardized testing has filled the bill in an efficient, economical and objective way to measure student productivity. But in these strengths, lies the weakness of these measurements." (Grady, 1991, p. 3). Wiggins (as cited in Grady, 1991) feels that there is a "long and unfortunate tradition in public schooling in America of testing cheaply what can easily be scored 'objectively'

and quickly, not of testing rigorously what we value as intellectual accomplishments." Standardized tests may provide a basis for comparison, but not specific insight or feedback to parents and teachers. "There aren't any standard kids, why should we assume that our evaluations of them should be standardized." (Grady, 1991, p. 6.)

Assessment

Report cards don't look like they used to. In this ever changing field of education, teachers are leaving behind traditional report cards and turning to portfolios as a form of assessment. A growing number of educators recognize that as school reforms change curriculum and instruction, how we assess teaching and learning must also change (Bruder, 1993). "The word "portfolio" conjures up a variety of images depending on the context with which it is used. In the financial world, a portfolio signifies the securities owned by a person or company for investment purposes. In the art world, a portfolio is a collection of an individual's best art work which can be used by students for college entrance or assessment for graduation and by employers for employment purposes" (DeMasi, 1994, p. 24). Unlike a simple report card grade, portfolios give us a way to see actual student performance. Designed to show growth over time, portfolios give teachers, parents, and students the opportunity to evaluate the student's work on a continuum. The portfolio is a work in progress. Students and teachers are able to select pieces that they feel are representative of the student's performance. Jongsma (1989) cautions that the portfolio should not become a collection of each week's graded papers. Items should be carefully selected so that they reflect the

many different aspects of the child's learning. The student is able to take an active role in selecting what goes in the portfolio. Involving students in self-evaluation and critical thinking promotes students' ownership of the learning process (Hetterscheidt, Pott, Russell, & Tchang, 1992). Frazier and Paulson (1992) found that the greatest asset of portfolios is self evaluation. They felt that portfolio assessment offered students a way to take charge of their learning and encouraged ownership, pride, and high self-esteem.

Parents can use portfolio results to see how their child's learning and skills grow over time. Even if a child is not achieving particular goals intended for his or her grade level, a portfolio can show the effort and growth that *is* occurring. It is a positive approach to communicating with parents. Seeing actual work that a child is doing helps parents become more involved in their child's learning process. They have a better idea of the expectations of the teacher and can see what their child is doing in the classroom.

The Computerized Portfolio

Technology is a powerful tool. One of the most profound changes made within the last decade in the field of education has been the advent of computers into the schools. "Technology has not only altered the way teachers present information, but also the way students access information and how their work is collected and evaluated." (DeMasi, 1994, p. 24.).

Using computers as an instructional tool in the classroom is not a new idea. However, using those same computers for data collection and assessment is a relatively recent development. In today's complex world, students not only

need to understand and be able to do the basics, they also need to be ready to function in a technological environment (Murphy & Thuente, 1995). "Education today is intently seeking new methods of evaluating student performance that involves more individualization and alternative assessments. Seventeen states have already mandated new forms of student evaluation." (Silverman, 1994, p. 44). There are a number of new and interesting computer programs designed to assist in the gathering and storing of student data. Portfolio items can be entered through the keyboard (by the student or the teacher), paper samples can be scanned onto the computer, and pictures or video images can be imported onto the hard drive. This multimedia approach can help develop an accurate and interesting portfolio for the child. Including the child in the collection of his work through the different forms of media will motivate the child and help to produce a positive, accurate form of assessment. "Even more encouraging is the fact that using the computer for assessment and data collection not only measurers how much kids have learned, but also encourages them to learn even more." (Crim, 1992, p. 23.).

Another advantage of a computerized portfolio system is its ability to store enormous amounts of data in a very small amount of space. One of the major obstacles to implementing portfolio assessment, where children's works are collected over time, is the sheer volume of material that must be kept to be evaluated (Strommen, 1994). Managing portfolios with technology can ease the physical burden of storing massive amounts of information. (Bruder, 1993) Stacks of folders with paper and pencil samples of students' work can easily be eliminated by using a computerized portfolio program. Each student receives his

9

own file where data can be entered on a daily, weekly, or monthly basis by the teacher or student. The students' files can then be stored on a disc that can be passed along to the next teacher.

The Computerized Reading Portfolio

Over the past decade, portfolios have evolved into an exciting method of assessment. However, the traditional paper portfolio is unable to address one very important aspect of a child's education, oral reading. A computerized reading portfolio enables the teacher to record a child's voice reading a selected passage as it displays the passage on the screen. These reading samples can be taken several times during the year and shared with parents at portfolio conferences. This is an outstanding demonstration of a child's reading performance in the classroom.

The computerized reading portfolio also gives children an opportunity to reflect on their own reading. The teacher can use the recorded readings to conference one-on-one with students to discuss their reading progress and encourage them to make their own assessments and plan for improvement. "When students hear their own words and make immediate assessments, they become discerning critics, aware of the learning process as well as the product." (Hetterscheidt, Pott, Russell, and Tchang, 1992, p. 73).

Using a computerized reading portfolio in their classroom, Hetterscheidt, et al. (1992) found that children were able to make accurate and thoughtful assessments of their own reading. Instead of a children commenting that his reading sounded *good* he was able to state *why* he did well. A child might say "I

lowered my voice at the end of sentences and stopped at periods." In their 1992 study, Hetterscheidt et al. also found that the self-assessment process gave students control. "Recording their evaluations, not our judgment, transfers ownership to the rightful owner of learning... the student" (Hetterscheidt et al.,1992, p. 73).

A computerized reading portfolio that is shared with parents as well as students can be twice as effective. Just as the students are better able to make assessments of their reading progress when hearing an oral reading sample, so too are parents. Parents need to be involved in the assessment process. An oral reading sample gives parents valuable insight into their child's reading progress. Currently, there is very little research involving parents in the portfolio process. Computerized portfolios are an inevitable component of the process of assessment in the future. They allow teachers to store large amounts of data at their finger tips, offer a multimedia approach to gathering, storing, and assessing student work, and provide a unique opportunity for students to assess their own work, including their own oral reading ability. Many districts are preparing to spend hundreds of thousands of dollars on implementing computerized portfolios in their schools. However, before this money is spent, schools would greatly benefit from more research on parents' perspective of an electronic portfolio. Parents are a vital component of a child's education. It is important to include them as we venture into this new age of technology in the classroom.

CHAPTER III

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine parents' reactions and evaluations of a computerized reading portfolio. More teachers may wish to consider using computerized reading portfolios when conferencing with parents if positive reactions prevail.

Methodology

Subjects

Eighteen students and their parents served as subjects. All were from the same second grade classroom in an urban elementary school in western New York.

Materials

One Macintosh computer with voice recording capabilities and headset

The Grady Profile software program

Three reading passages at the second grade level (one for the teacher to model, one for the January assessment and one for the March assessment)

Comprehension questions for the second grade passage

Questionnaires for the parents and students

Additional oral questions for follow-up

Procedure

  The teacher began by modeling the process of reading a passage into the computer. A discussion of fluency and the need for comprehension followed. The teacher then explained to the students that they should do the best job that they could. The entire procedure and reasons for the process were explained.

  Over the course of several days, each child was called to work on the computer. The child put on the headset and read the passage that was displayed on the computer screen. His voice was recorded and stored in his file on the computer. The teacher then asked the child four comprehension questions about the passage and recorded the answers. Two of the questions were literal and two were inferential. Next, the teacher asked the child how he felt about his own fluency. Finally, the recording of the child's voice was played back and a discussion of the child's fluency and comprehension followed. The teacher made anecdotal notes in the child's file on the computer regarding the discussion of fluency and comprehension. Approximately two months later, the process was repeated.

  Shortly after the second recordings were complete, the teacher individually conferenced with at least one parent of each child. The conference consisted of a sharing of paper portfolio products such as writing samples, spelling tests, and one or two additional pieces the child had chosen for his portfolio. Then, the computerized reading portfolio was shared with the parent. This included the oral reading sample and anecdotal records.

  At the conclusion of the conference, the parent was asked to fill out the written questionnaire assessing the degree to which they liked or disliked the

computerized reading portfolio on a scale of one to five. Six of the parents were chosen at random to have further oral discussions regarding the conference. Their comments are discussed in the Analysis of Data.

Summary

Two oral reading samples were collected on a computerized portfolio program for eighteen second graders. The samples were taken approximately two months apart. During parent conferences, the oral reading samples were shared along with additional paper portfolio items. The parents were then asked to complete a questionnaire indicating the degree to which they liked or disliked the computerized portion of the portfolio conference. Six parents were asked additional oral questions in order to obtain valuable data.

CHAPTER IV

Analysis of Data

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine parent's reactions and evaluations of a computerized reading portfolio. More teachers may wish to consider using computerized reading portfolios when conferencing with parents if positive reactions prevail.

Analysis of the Findings

Qualitative and Quantitative data were collected to help determine the level of interest and enthusiasm for the electronic reading portfolio.

Quantitative Data - Each parent was given the ten question survey. Mean scores were calculated for each of the ten survey questions. See table 1. On the Parent Survey a score of 1 indicated strong agreement with the statement. A score of 5 indicated strong disagreement with the statement. All of the statements were worded in a positive manner so that a score of 1 indicated strong support for electronic reading portfolio. None of the surveys returned had the number four or five marked on the scale. All of the scores recorded were one, two or three. None of the statements elicited disagreement from any of the parents. The mean score for all ten questions on the survey was 1.75.

Table 1 - Mean Scores

Parent Survey Question	Mean Score
1. The electronic portfolio contains valuable information about my child's reading performance.	1.50
2. I think children are very motivated to read on the computer.	1.22
3. Information from the electronic portfolio will help me when working with my child at home.	2.00
4. The anecdotal records provide insight into the level of my child's reading performance.	2.05
5. The oral reading sample gave me a clear understanding of my child's reading ability at the second grade level.	1.77
6. I feel the computerized oral reading sample helps my child reflect on his own reading abilities.	1.44
7. Using a computerized portfolio system also helps expand my child's knowledge of computers.	2.16
8. The computerized reading portfolio is a very effective way to document my child's growth in reading.	1.77
9. I prefer the electronic portfolio over the traditional paper portfolio.	1.77
10. I am very interested in seeing an electronic portfolio system in place at all grade levels.	1.83

16

Qualitative Data - Qualitative data were collected from six parents in the form of oral questions and answers. Below is a list of the parents interviewed and a short summary of their background and that of their child.

Parent #1 - Middle class father of two; a business professional with moderate experience with computers; uses a computer occasionally at work and at home; the computer at home is mostly used for word processing and games; college graduate; his daughter is a very successful student; she is in the top 10% of her class; she is highly motivated and a class leader.

Parent #2 - Lower middle class father of one; businessman; high school diploma; involved in many school activities; very little computer experience; son is below average in school; he works hard with assistance.

Parent #3 - Low income mother of five; homemaker; did not finish high school; not involved in classroom activities; no experience with computers and no computer at home; son is below average in school; he frequently does not finish his work or do his homework; repeated first grade.

Parent #4 - Middle class mother of two; homemaker; very involved in school activities; some computer experience but no computer at home; college graduate; daughter is slightly above average in school; a very hard worker.

Parent #5 - Low income mother of three; homemaker; high school diploma; involved in some school activities; very little computer experience; old computer at home that is just used for games; parent would really like a new computer at home; daughter is an average student.

Parent #6 - Middle class mother of two; very involved in school activities; significant experience with computers; college degree; computer at home that is used very often; son in very successful in school; highly motivated, hard worker.

All of the parents were highly supportive of building wide (or district wide) use of an electronic portfolio. They all felt that it is an excellent way to document a child's growth in reading. All of the parents also felt that, at some point in the near future, the electronic portfolio should replace the paper portfolio. A great deal of time was spent with each parent discussing the further possibilities of electronic portfolios - What are its greater capabilities? Through discussions of scanning in written material, storing video images and using a digital imaging camera to import still pictures the parents became more and more interested and expressed a desire for their child to be involved in any further pilot of such a program.

Parents # 1, 2, and 6 inquired about different kinds of electronic portfolios available. They wondered if there were other such programs that perhaps offered more options or different ways to store and retrieve information. They also suggested that in the years to come there would likely be many more types of programs like this one and that several programs should be piloted before one is

chosen. Parent #1 asked if he could take the disc home at the end of grade six to keep it with his child's school memorabilia.

Due to the short length of time between readings, it was difficult to rate the electronic portfolio for Parents #3, 4, 5, and 6. They had the most difficulty seeing growth in the two different readings. However, they all commented on how they could see the potential for this system and they based many of their answers on the survey on what they felt the electronic portfolio was capable of doing.

All of the parents expressed a concern about the limited time available for recording the oral readings. Parents # 3 and 5, whose children are struggling readers, were particularly concerned that their children were only able to read two or three lines before time ran out. Even the parents of average or above average readers wanted at least two minutes of recorded readings. They also would have liked to have heard their child read a passage one grade level above and one grade level below their child's current level. Parent #4 suggested that this would give her an even better feel for what her child is capable of. She suggested that at a grade level below, her daughter might read fluently and with expression. At a grade level above, she might struggle a bit, but it would show what kinds of errors she is making. Similarly, Parent #2 suggested that we have a sample of a typical second grader reading the passage to help give parents an idea of what the expectation is at this level.

Parents # 1 and 2 would have liked to have had the comprehension questions recorded and not just included as part of anecdotal records.

Summary

From the data collected in this study, it was concluded that there is overwhelming support for the use of electronic reading portfolios. The parent survey indicated that the reading portfolio was highly motivating to the children, it helped children reflect on their own reading, and it gave valuable information about the child's reading. Additional questioning with the six parents proved to offer valuable insights into the positive aspects of the electronic portfolio as well as its drawbacks.

CHAPTER V

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine parents' reactions and evaluations of a computerized reading portfolio. More teachers may wish to consider using computerized reading portfolios when conferencing with parents if positive reactions prevail.

Conclusions

Overall, parents felt that an electronic reading portfolio greatly benefits the students and the teacher. They were in the strongest agreement with the fact that children are very motivated to read on the computer. This is a key element in teaching reading. They also felt very strongly that the computerized reading portfolio helps children reflect on their own reading. Most importantly, they were in strong agreement that the electronic reading portfolio provides valuable information about their child's reading. This statement received a mean score of 1.50 on a scale of one to five.

The parents did not feel as strong about the possibility that the electronic portfolio helps expand a child's knowledge about computers. They also were slightly less interested in the anecdotal records. Although these two statements received responses that were not as strong as the others, they were still definitely more towards agree than disagree. The mean scores for these two statements were 2.16 and 2.05 respectively.

The six parents who were questioned individually about the electronic reading portfolio offered valuable insights. They tended to point out similar faults in the program at first, such as the limited time available for recording the readings. Through further discussions they all were very interested in seeing a more sophisticated version of this portfolio system implemented at all grade levels.

Parents # 2 and 3, the parents of children who were struggling readers, seemed almost surprised to hear their child's voice reading on the computer. It was obvious that they were disappointed with their child's performance and they immediately brought up concerns and questions about how to help their children become more successful readers. They wanted to hear an average second grader reading so that they could have a better understanding of the expectation at this grade level. They were frustrated and sometime even apologetic. This was definitely a motivator for parents to work more with their children. Although in October these same parents were cautioned about their children's poor performance in reading, they would have greatly appreciated hearing the oral reading sample on the computer. They felt that this would have had a greater impact on them and they would have been working with their children more throughout the school year. Both admitted that they did not feel, in October, that there was that great of a concern, but after hearing the oral reading sample and reading the anecdotal records they felt they had a better understanding of their children's reading ability. These two parents were very strong supporters of the electronic reading portfolio. They had very little experience with computers at

home and were very interested in having their children learn more about computers and use the portfolio system to help document their growth.

Parents #1, 4,5, and 6 enjoyed listening to their children read. They smiled and seemed very proud. They felt that the electronic reading portfolio was a terrific way for the children to reflect on their own reading and that it has helped them use more expression when reading and to pay closer attention to punctuation. All of these parents were interested also in seeing this type of system implemented building-wide. They asked many questions that seemed more focused on the portfolio system, rather than on their children's performance. Most of the interest was in getting a more sophisticated version of this type of program and implementing it throughout the grades. Parents #1 and 4 were also interested in how this impacted teaching. They both asked questions regarding the amount of time it takes to record each child reading and the possibility of adjusting instruction based on the oral reading samples and anecdotal records. Parent #4 was also concerned whether other teachers in the building would be willing to take on such a project, if it will become mandatory, and what kind of training the teachers would receive. She was very interested in seeing an electronic portfolio system in place for next year.

Implications For Further Research

Further investigation into parents' interest in computerized portfolios is suggested. Research into the following areas is needed:

1. Surveying a greater number of parents and leaving some open-ended questions. Asking what they would like to see in an electronic portfolio.

2. Similar research would be valuable at different grade levels. There may be a difference in parents' reaction between the primary and intermediate levels.

3. Using a different type of electronic portfolio system would be beneficial. There are many new programs available that may allow for greater flexibility.

4. Performing this research in October and March may provide more insight for the parents and serve as a better tool for research.

5. Further studies in which children are tracked for two to three years (or more) using the same portfolio system and conferencing with parents periodically.

6. Oral reading samples could be varied.

    a. Children could be asked to record readings of stories with which they are familiar.

    b. They could also be asked to read passages that are at their independent reading level instead of their grade level.

7. Future studies could concentrate on just low achieving readers and the impact of the computerized reading portfolio on the child and his parents.

Suggestions for Classroom Practice

1. Record oral reading samples in September, January, and May.

2. Use good modeling techniques when demonstrating the oral reading sample.

3. Choose passages that are of high interest to the children.

4. Ask a minimum of four comprehension questions that assess different levels of comprehension.

5. Conference with parents using the electronic reading portfolio at least twice per year. The first conference should be no later than October.

6. Children should be able to listen to their own reading as often as they wish to allow for further reflection.

7. They should be given the opportunity to record more readings if they wish, especially if they are noticing an improvement in their own skills.

8. Use the oral reading samples to guide instruction. Common errors can be addressed in small or large group lessons.

9. The children are highly motivated to read on the computer. Allow them many opportunities to do this with limited teacher supervision.

10. Have the children write stories on the computer and record them reading the stories aloud. Parents will receive two good pieces of assessment.

Maintaining an electronic reading portfolio takes extra time and effort, but the benefits are immeasurable. The children soon learn to manage their own portfolios and become independent workers on the computer. They eagerly

anticipate their turn on the computer and choose to read on the computer rather than play board games or do puzzles. They actively reflect on their reading and have an acute awareness of their own strengths and weaknesses. Through electronic portfolio conferencing, parents receive a more rounded picture of their child and have a greater understanding of their true performance in the classroom. The electronic reading portfolio is a valuable piece of information to share with each parent throughout the school year and beyond.

References

Bruder, I. (1993). Alternative assessment: Putting technology to the test. Electronic Learning, 12, (4). 22-29.

Crim, M.B. (1992). Evaluations: New tools for new tasks. Instructor, 101, (7). 23-27.

DeMasi, A.M. (1994). Creating computer-based portfolios. New York State Association for Computers and Technologies in Education, 8. 24-25.

Frazier, D.M., & Paulson, F.L. (1992). How portfolios motivate reluctant writers. Educational Leadership, 49, 8. 62-65.

Grady, E. (1991). The real picture: Portfolio based assessment. [Brochure] St. Louis, MO: Aurbach & Associates, Inc.

Grady Profile [computer software]. (1992). St. Louis, MO: Aurbach and Associates, Inc.

Hetterscheidt, J., Pott, L., Russell, K., & Tchang, J. (1992). Using the computer as a reading portfolio. Educational Leadership, 49 (8). 73.

Jongsma, K.S. (1989). Portfolio assessment (questions and answers). The Reading Teacher, 43, (3). 264-265.

Murphy, V. & Thuente, K. (1995). Using technology in early learning classrooms. Learning and Leading With Technology, 22, (8). 8-10.

Silverman, S. (1994). PDAs as on-site assessment tools. Electronic Learning, 14, (2). 44.

Strommen, E. (1994). Can technology change the test? Electronic Learning, 14, (1). 44-53.