

# Teaching Portfolio Rubric

Detailed rubric which will be used to mark your reflective journal entries.

RSD Assessment Criteria	PORTFOLIO MARKING RUBRIC					
	Level 1. Highly Proficient > 75%		Level 2. Proficient 50 - 74%		Level 3. Limited Proficiency <50%	
<b>Embark &amp; Clarify:</b>	All required sections of the TP are covered	(3.75 – 5m)	Some sections missing or incomplete	(2.5 - 3m)	Many sections incomplete with many missing elements	(0 – 2m)
	Well-grounded in Pacific/ home country context. .	(3.75 – 5m)	Some contextualization.	(2.5 - 3m)	Little/no contextualization.	(0 – 2m)
<b>Find &amp; Generate:</b>	TP appropriate to level/ subject/ students prior knowledge	(7.5 – 10m)	Some parts of TP may be mismatched to level/subject/prior knowledge	(5 – 7m)	Little/no consideration of prior knowledge/ level/subject	(0 – 4.5m)
	Good use of credible sources for teaching & learning resources	(7.5 – 10m)	Heavy reliance on readings, some questionable sources.	(5 – 7m)	Course materials main source of information; and/or, many questionable sources.	(0 – 4.5m)
<b>Evaluate &amp; Reflect:</b>	Clear curriculum alignment between scheme of work, term plan, unit of work and lesson plans	(7.5 – 10m)	Inconsistent alignment between curriculum documents	(5 – 7m)	Little/no alignment evident	(0 – 4.5m)
	Clear and appropriate, measurable and achievable unit and lesson learning outcomes identified	(7.5 – 10m)	Some unit/lesson learning outcomes may be vague, inappropriate, immeasurable or unattainable	(5 – 7m)	Most/all learning outcomes are inappropriate, immeasurable and unattainable.	(0 – 4.5m)
<b>Organize &amp; Manage:</b>	POT developed around relevant ideas/themes and linked cohesively to the development of unit plan(s)	(7.5 – 10m)	Some undeveloped ideas/themes & weak connection between POT and unit plan	(5 – 7m)	Little/ no apparent sequence to themes/ ideas and POT is treated as a separate and unrelated document.	(0 – 4.5m)
	All parts of unit/lesson plans fully covered	(3.75 – 5m)	Content coverage inconsistently paced across lessons with some gaps in unit/lesson plans	(2.5 - 3m)	Little/no consideration of pacing of curriculum with many missing sections/elements	(0 – 2m)
	Good selection & organization of quality resources	(3.75 – 5m)	Some resources selected may be irrelevant and of poor quality	(2.5 - 3m)	Resources unrelated to unit plan/lesson plans and of poor quality	(0 – 2m)
<b>Analyse &amp; Synthesise:</b>	Appropriate use of learned pedagogical approaches	(3.75 – 5m)	Inconsistent application of pedagogical approaches	(2.5 - 3m)	Little /no application of learned pedagogical approaches	(0 – 2m)
	Effective use of inclusive strategies for the Pacific classroom	(3.75 – 5m)	Limited treatment of inclusion	(2.5 - 3m)	Little/no consideration of the inclusive classroom	(0 – 2m)
	Relevant learning activities and effective assessment of and for learning activities in unit plan/ lesson plans	(3.75 – 5m)	Some ineffective learning activities with over-emphasis on assessment of learning	(2.5 - 3m)	Disconnected activities and/or no assessment plan	(0 – 2m)
	Original activities and resources developed	(3.75 – 5m)	Some original activities and may have attempted to design teaching resources	(2.5 - 3m)	All activities and resources are sourced externally	(0 – 2m)
<b>Communicate &amp; Apply Ethically:</b>	Within word limit and uses appropriate/formal academic writing style.	(3 – 4m)	Within word limit but writing style informal/ inconsistent.	(2 – 2.5m)	Ignores word limit and writing style inappropriate.	(0 -1.5m)
	Similarity <23% & consistent referencing style & proper in-text citation and bibliography.	(2.5 – 3m)	Similarity % may be within range, but inconsistency in referencing & bibliography.	(1.5 - 2m)	Similarity % > 35% and many referencing/ bibliographical errors, and may not include a bibliography.	(0 -1m)
	Appropriate titles/sub-headings, few errors in grammar, spelling & punctuation.	(2.5 - 3m)	Long/vague subheadings; common grammatical, spelling & punctuation errors.	(1.5 - 2m)	Long, confusing, off-topic headers. Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation errors affect the overall flow/quality of the paper.	(0 -1m)

# Mark sheet

## Checklist for markers

Assessment Criteria	Check list for marker	Scores
All required sections of the TP are covered	<input type="checkbox"/> Teaching Philosophy (1 mark) <input type="checkbox"/> Scheme of work (1 mark) <input type="checkbox"/> Term plan (1 mark) <input type="checkbox"/> Unit of work + 3 lesson plans (1 mark) <input type="checkbox"/> Teaching and Learning Resources (1 mark)	/5
TP is well-grounded in Pacific/ home country context	<input type="checkbox"/> Very well contextualized (4 – 5 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent (2 – 3 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Weak - Not at all (1 mark)	/5
TP appropriate to level/ subject/ students prior knowledge	<input type="checkbox"/> Very well suited (8 - 10 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent (5 – 7 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Weak - Not at all (1 – 4 marks)	/10
Good use of credible sources for teaching & learning resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate sources (8 –10 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent (5 – 7 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Questionable/inappropriate sources (1 – 4 marks)	/10
Clear curriculum alignment between scheme of work, term plan, unit of work and lesson plans	<input type="checkbox"/> Clear & effective alignment (8 – 10 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> To some extent (5 – 7 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Weak – disjointed (1 – 4 marks)	/10
Clear and appropriate, measurable and achievable unit and lesson learning outcomes identified	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent learning unit/lesson outcomes (8 – 10 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Some good learning outcomes (5 – 7 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Weak – inappropriate (1 – 4 marks)	/10
POT developed around relevant ideas/themes and linked cohesively within unit plan(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Well-developed POT & linked to unit plan (8 – 10 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> POT inconsistent with unit plan in some areas (5 – 7 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Weak POT- No link to unit plan (1 – 4 marks)	/10
All parts of unit/lesson plans fully covered	<input type="checkbox"/> Objectives/learning outcomes (1 mark) <input type="checkbox"/> Prior knowledge (1 mark) <input type="checkbox"/> Introduction (1 mark) <input type="checkbox"/> Body (2 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Learning activities (2 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment (2 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Summation/conclusion (1 mark)	/5
Good selection & organization of quality resources	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent resources & effective organization (4 – 5 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Some good resources, organization needs work (3 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Weak – inappropriate and disconnected (1 – 2 marks)	/5
Appropriate use of learned pedagogical approaches	<input type="checkbox"/> Deliberate application of pedagogical approaches (4 – 5 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Makes some effort to apply p/approaches (3 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Little/no use of p/approaches (1 – 4 marks)	/5
Effective use of inclusive strategies in unit/lesson plans	<input type="checkbox"/> Deliberate use of inclusive strategies (4 – 5 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Makes some effort to apply Incl/strategies (3 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Little/no use of Incl/strategies ( 1 – 4 marks)	/5
Relevant learning activities and effective assessment of and for learning activities in unit plan/ lesson plans	<input type="checkbox"/> Excellent learning activities and use of assessment (4 – 5 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Some good activities and assessment (3 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Weak – inappropriate (1 – 2 marks)	/5
Original activities and resources developed	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of original activities & resources (4 – 5 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Some originality evident (3 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> All activities & resources 'borrowed' from external sources (1 – 2 marks)	/5
Within word limit and uses appropriate/formal academic writing style.	<input type="checkbox"/> Word limit (2 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate academic writing style (2 marks)	/4
Similarity <23% & consistent referencing style & proper in-text citation and bibliography.	<input type="checkbox"/> Similarity <23% (1 mark) <input type="checkbox"/> Consistent referencing and proper citation (1 mark) <input type="checkbox"/> Bibliography(1 mark)	/3
Appropriate titles/sub-headings, few errors in grammar, spelling & punctuation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Relevant titles/sub-headings (1.5 marks) <input type="checkbox"/> Good mastery of English grammar, spelling & punctuation (1.5 marks)	/3
<b>Total score out of 100%</b>		<b>/ 100</b>
<b>Assignment Mark %</b>		<b>/20</b>

## Assessment 2: Teaching Portfolio/Resource Folder

---

**Due date:** 22<sup>nd</sup> May 2015 (Week 13)

**Value:** 20%

---

You are to prepare a resource folder or resource package that includes the following:

1. Your *Teaching Philosophy*
2. A *Scheme of work* (year plan of unit topics to be covered)
3. *Term plan* (Units and lessons)
4. One (1) *Unit of work* made up of no more than three (3) lessons
5. The three (3) *Lesson Plans*
6. *Teaching and Learning Resource materials* relevant to the Unit of work/lesson plans provided.

Your resource folder will be assessed on its suitability to the subject area, content knowledge, level and location of students you have chosen to use this resource for.

**You will notice that the marking rubric on the next page has been adapted to this task. Take the time to review the areas of assessment.**