

Portfolio Evaluation Rubric IFST 480 lam/ljw December 2, 2002

Unsatisfactory	Acceptable	Outstanding
Artifact Description (What?):		
Student does not provide the reader with adequate information to understand/interpret the artifact. Information given is broad. Student includes information listed on the assignment description, but does not consider relevance. Information is given whether or not it pertains to a particular artifact.	Student includes relevant contextual information, including information about the school, family, community, prior experiences, and knowledge of the children that is helpful to the reader. Student demonstrates an awareness of factors that may have influenced the learning experience. Student tries to make decisions about what pieces of contextual information are relevant and necessary, although the connection may not be clear.	Description illustrates student's understanding of factors that impact learning. Information included provides a clear understanding of the children, the context, the assignment, and other factors that may have influenced the outcome of the described experience/ assignment. There is evidence that the student has carefully considered the relevance of the information and made decisions regarding what information should be presented. Connections are clear to the reader.
Artifact Analysis (Why?):		
Connection between the presented artifact and the standard is not clear. Student's understanding of the NAEYC standard and how it influences practice with young children is broad or not evident.	Connection between artifact and standard is fairly clear and logical. Adequate rationale is given. Evidence that the student has made thoughtful selections based on a broad understanding of the standard and how it influences/relates to practice with young children is present. Connection makes sense to the reader.	There is evidence that critical analysis was performed when selecting entry. It is clear why the student selected this particular artifact and how it relates to the identified standard. Student shows a thorough understanding of the standard and an ability to apply understanding to his/her work with young children.
Artifact Reflection (What did you learn? How can you use this experience to enhance your teaching?):		
Student gives superficial statements with little to no reference to what has been learned or how this information will be used in the future to enhance/improve effectiveness. Student does not accurately consider impact on the children. Information provided and evidence of thought are too broad to impact future experiences effectively.	Reflection begins to explore what has been learned/impacts on the learner. Interpretations may be broad. Student conveys desire to grow/improve as an early childhood educator and is beginning to understand how to use reflection as a tool to grow.	Reflection is clear and convincing. Evidence of thorough critical analysis and ability to use reflection as a tool for growth is present. Student accurately identifies how the experience impacted the children involved and/or their growth as a teacher. Student identifies ability to use or is planning to use the information in the future to enhance work with young children. Student includes goals for the future.
Writing Mechanics:		
Narratives unclear, with many errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation.	Narratives mostly clearly articulated, with few errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation.	Narratives clearly articulated, with no errors in grammar, spelling, or punctuation.
Organization and Appearance:		
Messy, unprofessional appearance, unorganized, and difficult to locate documents.	Neat, with mainly logical organization; most documents easy to access.	Neat, professional appearance, logical organization, and easy access to documents.
Overall Rating:		
Unsatisfactory portfolio that does not support teaching competencies.	Satisfactory portfolio that adequately supports teaching competencies.	Outstanding portfolio that irrefutably supports teaching competencies.