# Educational Developer/Learning Consultant Portfolio Rubric

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Rating \* | Comments |
| *A. Educational Development Philosophy*• Clearly summarizes core beliefs related to educational development and key claims about practice• Core beliefs are grounded in scholarship and personal experience• Briefly illustrates beliefs with examples of educational development strategies and approaches to demonstrate alignment• Provides examples of strategies used to evaluate educational development practices and effectiveness, including impact and influence on educational practice• Demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement and summarizes future goals, professional learning plans and development in practices• Provides a framework for the presentation and organization of the portfolio |  |  |
| *B. Quality and Alignment of Evidence*• Evidence of specific educational development practices and approaches is consistent with the Centre for Innovation and Excellence in Learning priorities, directions as well as institutional initiatives • Evidence is presented from multiple perspectives (e.g., self, instructors, peers, program participants, scholarship) and data sources• Sources of evidence are appropriate given the context of one’s roles, responsibilities, and experiences as well as the purpose of the portfolio• Evidence presented clearly aligns with the claims made in the educational development philosophy statement• Strong alignment is presented across multiple sources of data as it relates to the claims made in one’s philosophy (i.e., triangulation of data is evident) |  |  |
| *C. Competencies of an Educational Developer*• Provide evidence of traits, skills/knowledge/attributes and applications of learning appropriate to the level of educational developer the position is aligned• Evidence will demonstrate understanding and outline plans for further development (examples are listed in last column in document on competencies) |  |  |
| *D. Scholarship and Scholarly Literature*• Links to scholarly literature are provided throughout the portfolio to ground key claims and approaches to practice• Citations are included and sourced in a bibliography• Contributions to the scholarship of educational development and/or teaching and learning are included |  |  |
| Criteria | **Rating \*** | **Comments** |
| *E. Critical Reflection*• Critical reflection is integrated throughout the portfolio• Evaluates how evidence of educational development approaches relate to one’s core beliefs and philosophy• Includes summaries related to the scope, impact and quality of educational development approaches to put evidence into context and highlight key learnings• Evaluates how educational development approaches have evolved over time based on personal contexts and experiences• Presents future implications related to one’s continued professional growth and development |  |  |
| *F. Personal Expression and Context*• Author’s voice is evident, consistent and authentic throughout the portfolio• Narrative summaries are provided to provide personal context related to the evidence included in the portfolio• Philosophy, strategies, and evidence are grounded in one’s experience and personal context |  |  |
| *G. Design and Organization*• Presented as a clear, succinct, and integrated document• Professionally presented in a way that is appropriate for the intended audience and purpose• Logical and consistent structure is provided, including a clear web menu• Assembly and presentation of portfolio demonstrates technology skills in digital use of tools and techniques• All links work and navigation is easy given the structure of the whole portfolio• All documents, pages, resources, links and materials are consistent and professionally presented conforming to Centre formatting guidelines and styles (e.g., header tags, language, link location, file names etc.) |  |  |

 **\* Rating Scale**

4/4+ = all components included, exceeds expectations, no revisions required, with significant depth and breadth

3/3+ = almost all components included, meets expectations, no revisions required, with good depth and breadth

2/2+ = most components included, some revisions required, more depth and/or breadth required

1/1+ = many components missing, major revisions required, needs more work on depth and breadth

Note. This rubric builds upon elements of the structure and content presented in: Britnell, J. (n.d.). Teaching dossier rubric for evaluation. Toronto: Ryerson University. Retrieved from <http://www.ryerson.ca/lt/programs/workshops/dossier_rubric_final.pdf> and Indiana University. (2007). *Rubric for evaluating teaching portfolios for M620 SoTL study.* Bloomington, IN: Indiana University.

Attribution: Small edits done to same rubric found in McDonald, J., Kenny, N., Kustra, E., Dawson, D., Iqbal, I., Borin, P., & Chan, J. (2016). *Educational Development Guide Series: No. 1. The Educational Developer’s Portfolio*. Ottawa, Canada: Educational Developers Caucus.
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