PROFESSIONAL CEC PORTFOLIO RUBRIC

Directions to rater:

- Check only one box for each criterion. Circle words and phrases within cells that describe your observations

Criteria	MET	DEVELOPING	NOT MET
CEC STANDARDS/ Artifacts	Artifacts included for course work and Teacher Work Sample (TWS) Evidence of student centered lessons as artifacts Artifacts demonstrate clear understanding of CEC STANDARDS (Resume' included for Sr. Synthesis)	Limited artifacts that represent course work and/or TWS Weak evidence of student centered lessons as artifacts Artifacts do not clearly indicate understanding of CEC STANDARDS (Limited resume' at Sr. Synthesis)	Artifacts are vague or absent Missing examples of student centered lessons as artifacts Artifacts do not match CEC standard they are submitted for. (No resume' at Sr. Synthesis)
QUALITY and APPEARANCE	 Portfolio is neat, nicely formatted, appealing. Minimum of two artifacts for each CEC standard Portfolio purpose (to document professional growth) is clearly evident 	 Portfolio covers basics but little attention given to details At least one artifact representing each standard Portfolio purpose generally evident 	 Portfolio seems thrown together with little attention to detail Graphics fail to enhance purpose of portfolio Missing artifacts Purpose of portfolio vague or inappropriate for professional growth
ORGANIZATION	 Portfolio well organized in logical sequence Layout easy to understand Table of Contents makes items and artifacts easy to find Electronic artifacts clearly identified (file names) 	Portfolio somewhat organized, not all artifacts easy to locate Layout plan not clear and obvious Table of Contents included but less than effective Electronic Artifacts identified but not easy to find (file names not helpful)	 Little evidence of organization; difficulty finding artifacts Table of Contents not included Electronic artifacts not easy to find (file names inappropriate, e.g. untitled.doc")
VARIETY OF MATERIALS	Artifacts reflect broad range of knowledge, skills, interests, achievement	Artifacts suggest limited interests and/or talents	Scope of artifacts reflects narrowness of interests and limited experiences
MECHANICS	Professionalism evident in spelling, grammar, punctuation, sentence struct ure, clarity of writing	Several mistakes in spelling, grammar, punctuation, and sentence structure Writing less than clear	Many spelling, punctuation, grammar, and sentence structure errors Writing unclear
REFLECTIONS	Linkages obvious between artifact, experience, and CEC STANDARD Thoughtful reflections explain why pieces included Reflections are relevant, demonstrate personal strengths and weaknesses, show depth in reflecting on practice Future goals indicate a commitment to professional growth	Reflections are surface and need greater depth of processing, but indicate some thought Reflections do not explain why artifacts are included or lack of thought about why artifact included Future goals not thoughtfully chosen	Reflections missing or sporadic No match between standards, artifact, and reflection Reflections lack depth and insight No understanding of why artifact matches CEC STANDARD Lacks future goals or mismatch of goal and standard
PHILOSOPHY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION	Philosophy shows depth of understanding and practicality Clearly and succinctly written	Philosophy beginning to form but not fully developed	Philosophy statement missing