

**Colorado Mesa University  
Center for Teacher Education  
Portfolio Rubric**

**Candidate Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

**General Portfolio Quality:** The portfolio must meet the following criteria in order to be reviewed. Portfolios that do not meet these requirements will be given back for revision and may result in delay of program completion or non-completion.

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No     **Artifacts:** Artifacts provided are aligned to the appropriate standard and support the proof of candidate meeting a majority of the knowledge and performance standards.

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No     **Organization:** Portfolio is typed, neat, and professionally formatted; artifacts are organized in logical sequence, identified with tabs, and easy to access (plastic sheets are **not** recommended). Cover page and table of contents are included.

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No     **Mechanics:** Professionalism evident in APA citation style, spelling, grammar, punctuation, sentence structure, and clarity of communication.

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No     **References:** Each reflection is supported with a minimum of three to five outside resources. Candidate has used APA in-text citation in the SRF and includes a final reference page with minimum of thirty resources.

\_\_\_\_ Yes \_\_\_\_ No     **Professional Growth Reflection:** A final reflection on overall growth as a professional in the teaching field as represented by experiences in the CMU teacher education program, coursework and field experiences to date for each semester is included.

Date Accepted / Returned: \_\_\_\_\_

**Center for Teacher Education  
Portfolio Rubric Scoring Criteria**

<b>Category</b>	<b>4 EXEMPLARY</b>	<b>3 PROFICIENT</b>	<b>2 PARTIALLY PROFICIENT</b> ( <i>requires corrections that may postpone program completion</i> )	<b>UNACCEPTABLE</b> ( <i>potentially not recommended for licensure</i> )
<b>Rationale</b>	Explanation is complete: Rationale clearly uses the verbs/language of the standard to connect artifact(s) to the named standard. Provides compelling evidence that explains how and why artifact(s) demonstrate(s) proficiency of <i>Performance</i> and <i>Knowledge</i> standard elements.	Explanation is reasonably thorough: Rationale, using limited verbs/language of the standard, connects artifact(s) to named standard. Provides evidence that describes how and why artifact(s) demonstrate(s) proficiency of <i>Performance</i> and <i>Knowledge</i> standard elements.	Explanation is lacking: rationale does not explicitly connect artifact to standard. Evidence of artifact demonstrating proficiency in <i>Knowledge</i> and <i>Performance</i> standards is not clear and/or convincing.	Explanation is unacceptable in all areas.
<b>Reflection</b>	Reflection/Analysis is insightful: clearly describes the candidate's learning as a teacher and his/her impact on student learning; Focus on a majority of the <i>Knowledge</i> and <i>Performance</i> standard elements is explicit and clear; Provides a higher order analysis—not a retelling or description; Describes how experiences will help set future goals and shape <i>Critical Dispositions</i> in future teaching. Provides specific supporting anecdotes/examples from the classroom. Cites appropriate source(s) for research base.	Reflection/Analysis is adequate: reasonably describes candidate's learning as a teacher and his/her impact on student learning; Focus on the standards is evident. Provides a higher order analysis but more general—some retelling or description; Provides more general supporting anecdotes/examples. Cites appropriate source(s) for research base.	Reflection/Analysis is lacking: candidate's learning as a teacher and his/her impact on student learning is unclear and too general; Connection to standards is not clear; Does NOT provide a higher order analysis--more descriptive than reflective; Does NOT provide supporting anecdotes/examples or cite appropriate source(s).	Reflection/Analysis is unacceptable in all areas.

**Center for Teacher Education  
Portfolio Rubric Scoring Criteria**

**Candidate Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

<b>InTASC STANDARDS</b>	<b>4 EXEMPLARY</b>	<b>3.5</b>	<b>3 PROFICIENT</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2 PARTIALLY PROFICIENT</b>	<b>Comments</b>	<b>Score</b>
Standard 1: <i>Learner Development</i>							
Standard 2: <i>Learning Differences</i>							
Standard 3: <i>Learning Environments</i>							
Standard 4: <i>Content Knowledge</i>							
Standard 5: <i>Application of Content</i>							
Standard 6: <i>Assessment</i>							
Standard 7: <i>Planning for Instruction</i>							
Standard 8: <i>Instructional Strategies</i>							
Standard 9: <i>Professional Learning &amp; Ethical Practice</i>							
Standard 10: <i>Leadership &amp; Collaboration</i>							

Average Score: \_\_\_\_\_ Overall Rating: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Coordinator Signature/Date