

## Teaching Portfolio Evaluation Rubric

Portfolio: \_\_\_\_\_

Evaluator Name: \_\_\_\_\_

For each item, mark the description that BEST describes the portfolio:

	Major Deficits	Minor Deficits	No Deficits
<b>Portfolio Homepage, Bio, &amp; CV</b>	Does not include required items or is not specific to teaching. May focus more on future career goals (written as if applying for a position) rather than the teaching program. Bio and/or CV not updated or complete. Image(s) are unprofessional.	Summarizes teaching experiences and provides some information of whether teaching would be incorporated in future positions. Provides some information regarding growth in teaching.	Summarizes teaching experiences. Elaborates on growth in specific aspects of teaching and impact of program on career goals regardless of career focus. Bio & CV reflect professionalism, are updated, and completed. Includes appropriate professional picture.
<b>Teaching Goals</b>	Goals do not challenge growth in teaching, but rather describe tasks to complete. Goals are not specific to teaching, are not measurable (ex "become comfortable"), or do not include action plans, assessment of strengths/weaknesses, etc.	Goals reflect consideration of individual's strengths and weaknesses and desire to improve teaching abilities. Goals written in such a way to facilitate evaluation (measurable).	Goals are measurable, well thought out, and reflect careful consideration of teaching experience and abilities. Goals suggest desire to provide quality teaching in multiple settings.
<b>Teaching Philosophy</b>	Philosophy does not reflect personal attributes or experiences. Appears too vague/general.	Provides a reflective statement of beliefs about teaching/learning and teaching practices. Describes relevant contributory experiences and/or qualities he/she is aspiring to gain.	Creates a personal, unique "picture" of teaching indicative of deep self-reflection.
<b>Teaching Experiences</b> Required: 6 activities with different content; at least 1 activity tailored to: a) individual learner (n=1-2) b) small group (n=3-19) c) large group (n≥20)	Did not meet teaching activity requirements or provides incomplete or inadequate description of experiences (omitted setting, impression of teaching ability, materials, etc).	Completed required experiences, but consisted primarily of multiple examples of same type activity. Provided adequate description of each experience and some discussion of overall self-impression following each activity.	Completed a variety of teaching experiences, including didactic and experiential settings. Provided thoughtful discussion of each activity's success and how it might be improved. Completed multiple experiences of same type so that feedback could be used to improve activity.
<b>Teaching Materials</b>	Did not include or develop teaching materials, or materials lack meaningful content, organization, or professional appearance.	Most materials have similar format (ppt slides, etc.), but appear to have quality content, good organization, and professional appearance.	Provides a variety of material types. All are well-organized and professional in appearance. Used materials or technology in creative or innovative way.
<b>Evaluations of Teaching Activities</b> Required: at least 1 eval from each: a) Mentor/preceptor/director b) Learner/student c) Peer (another TCP participant)	Omitted required evaluations, required evaluations were not appropriately identified, or documents lacked explanation of scale or format (ex: scale 1-5, 1=strongly disagree)	Included required evaluations, but did not seek evaluations specific to teaching goals. Included examples such as CE or recitation evaluations which were routinely provided.	Included evaluations for most/all teaching experiences. Evaluation tools often included items specific to teaching goals, strengths/weaknesses, and/or teaching activity.
<b>Teaching Observations</b> (2 required)	Provides only cursory teaching evaluation. Does not critically evaluate by providing both positive and negative comments.	Provides a fairly detailed evaluation but appears reluctant to provide negative comments or suggestions to improve.	Provides detailed, specific comments relating to both strengths and weaknesses of teaching. Thoroughly evaluates all aspects of teaching, including audience engagement, active learning strategies, etc.
<b>Selective Experiences</b> (3 required)	Did not complete 3 unique selective experiences or did not include required portfolio artifacts.	Completed required experiences but shared little insight into the experience reflection. Artifacts were incomplete or appeared rushed.	May have completed more experiences than required or submitted the highest quality artifacts (online modules, etc).

	Major Deficits	Minor Deficits	No Deficits
<b>Reflections: Ability to Evaluate/Assess Learners</b>	Provides numerical score data but does not specifically discuss ability to evaluate/assess.	Discusses ability to evaluate learners in 1 setting, but does not elaborate on evaluative ability in other settings (recitation, experiential, other lectures/discussions, etc).	Discusses evaluative abilities in variety of teaching settings, including how ability could be improved. Provides specific examples of how he/she distinguished between learners of varying abilities.
<b>Reflections: Ability to Provide Feedback to Learners</b>	Did not discuss how feedback was provided to learners or did so in a general manner. Teaching evaluations may indicate that meaningful feedback was not regularly provided.	Summarized methods employed in providing feedback in some but not all settings. May have provided examples of how feedback was provided to specific learners.	Elaborates on providing feedback in all/most teaching settings. Provides examples of how feedback was tailored to meet needs/challenges of specific learners. Discusses how ability to provide feedback evolved during the year's experiences.
<b>Reflections: Plans for Improving Teaching Abilities</b>	Plans were vaguely described, not described, or not attempted. Plans were not specific to address teaching goals/weaknesses or capitalize on strengths.	Provided general plan for goal achievement and improvement. Provided general plan for evaluation to gauge improvement.	Provides thoughtful, detailed plan for improvement as well as plan for evaluation from mentor, peers, and learners to gauge improvement. Describes how plan was incorporated into subsequent teaching activities.
<b>Overall Reflective Abilities (midpoint &amp; final reflections)</b>	Does not appear to have spent sufficient time in self-reflection. No in-depth description of personal strengths/weaknesses, challenges faced.	Provided evidence of general self-reflection through a discussion of activities encountered and lessons learned. Addressed progress toward achieving each teaching goal.	Candid, in-depth discussion of strengths, weaknesses, concerns, and challenges faced/expected. Reflection on experiences resulted in behavior change or plan for change.
<b>Content &amp; Organization</b>	Contents not grouped in logical manner or difficult to find required materials. Irrelevant materials included.	Content is logical and easy to navigate. Required materials included, but some irrelevant materials also included.	Logical content, easy to navigate. All required materials (but no irrelevant materials) included.
<b>Professional Approach &amp; Appearance</b>	Multiple grammatical/spelling errors or overall appearance does not reflect professional document (too many graphics/icons, distracting color scheme or font, etc). Portfolio would not be well-received if submitted by a candidate for faculty position.	Few (if any) grammatical/spelling errors. Appearance is professional. Portfolio provides some useful information regarding teaching experiences to prospective employer.	No grammatical/spelling errors. Professional-appearing document includes a wealth of valuable information regarding teaching experiences, abilities, philosophies, and future plans. Effective addition to a faculty candidate's application materials.
<b>Utilization of Teaching Mentor (FEEDBACK FROM ASSIGNED TEACHING MENTOR)</b>	Did not participate in required mentor meetings, did not send materials in timely manner, did not contribute to meaningful discussion of abilities/goals/plans, or did not accept advice or feedback appropriately.		Participated in required mentor meetings. Prepared to discuss abilities/goals/plans during meetings. Appeared interested in improving teaching abilities. Submitted materials in timely manner.

**Overall portfolio evaluation:**

- Surpasses minimum standard  
 Meets minimum standard  
 Does not meet minimum standard

**Should this portfolio be used as an example for future participants?**

Yes

**Comments: (please continue on additional pages):**