# 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.  
Educational Development Guide No. 1 by Educational Developers Caucus is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. Available for free from http://www.stlhe.ca/constituencies/educational-developers-caucus/guides