

## Assessment Rubric for Teaching/Learning Philosophy

4=Very Good, ready for publication; 3=Good, some revisions suggested; 2=Fair, needs significant revision; 1=Poor, start over

History/Herstory	Relation to course(s) and discipline	Grounding in theory and/or experience	Appropriateness of language to audience	Organization and succinctness
4 Narrative is engaging, emotionally honest, and reflective. You feel that you know this person as a person and as a professional. You understand her/his approach to teaching, learning and student talent development and why s/he takes it.	4 Philosophy explains goals, assignments, and methods of course(s) taught or planned. Writer explains how teaching is shaped by discipline and/or diverges from disciplinary norms. Writer connects teaching to disciplinary research and service.	4 Writer shows how relevant literature (including theories of teaching and learning) informs teaching and assessment practices OR refers specifically to strategies taken, assessment outcomes, and lessons for future practice OR both.	4 Instructor chooses words with care. Those unfamiliar with the discipline would find the language helpful, while the choice of words is accurate, clear, and perhaps even elegant to those in the discipline.	4 Assertions are arranged logically, with insight, and to rhetorical effect. Every paragraph is relevant and contains illustrative examples. No point is belabored, and no statement is wordy or redundant.
3 Narrative is engaging and reflective. You understand the writer's approach to teaching, learning and student talent development and why s/he takes it. You wish you knew more about this person as a person.	3 Philosophy gives you a good sense of what teaching responsibilities are or will be at the course level. Writer relates philosophy to research and service, but you would like to know more.	3 Instructor notes relevant literature/experience and shows some evidence of systematic work to increase own and students' understanding. May necessarily be limited by point in career.	3 Diction is generally appropriate to audience and does not seriously impede understanding. A few words need to be defined. Specialists may find an occasional imprecise or inelegant word or phrase.	3 Assertions are arranged logically, and no paragraph is irrelevant. Some slight reordering would increase rhetorical effectiveness, as would some economizing at sentence- and/or word-level.
2 You have a limited sense of the writer's approach to teaching, learning and student talent development. You wish you knew more about this person as a person <i>and</i> a professional—what motivates him/her, how s/he relates to students, etc.	2 Philosophy provides a general description of current/expected teaching responsibilities. Writer identifies discipline but does not clearly show how philosophy is shaped by or responding to it.	2 Writer is not reflective about choice of teaching methods and assessment strategies and their outcomes. If experience is very limited, writer shows little awareness of how others go about improving teaching and learning.	2 Diction is distracting. Many words need to be defined for the non-specialist or replaced by more common words that the specialist would find sufficiently accurate for the intended audience.	2 Ordering of assertions is not entirely logical and/or some paragraphs irrelevant. The arrangement mutes or clouds the rhetorical effect that seems intended. Some points labored. Redundancies and wordiness are distracting.
1 The writer's approach to teaching, learning and talent development is unclear. Narrative is not engaging and writer evades all personal disclosure and self-reflection. You have no idea why this person teaches.	1 Philosophy tells the reader nothing about courses taught/planned or how the writer's approach is similar to/different from that of others in the discipline. Nothing on how teaching relates to research & service.	1 Writer neither makes reference to relevant scholarly work on teaching and learning nor to what s/he has learned from experience.	1 Diction is inappropriate and/or incomprehensible. Disciplinary language is overused to the point of obstructing meaning for the non-specialist and belying a lack of clarity for the specialist.	1 Rambling assertions are presented without apparent logical structure, insight, or rhetorical effect. Many parts of the philosophy are irrelevant or redundant. Expression is wordy.

R. Neill Johnson

Schreyer Institute for Teaching Excellence ♦ Penn State University ♦ 301 Rider Building

University Park, PA 16802 ♦ [www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu](http://www.schreyerinstitute.psu.edu) ♦

Last updated 7-15-2007