### PFF PORTFOLIO RUBRIC

|  | Excellent  | Very Good   | Good  | Unsatisfactory                                     |
|--|--|---|---|--|
| Cover page (e.g.,<br>Contact information,<br>academic program) | Stands out; easy to read; professional   | Complete & professional   | Somewhat professional & slightly difficult to read information                              | Confusing,<br>unprofessional                       |
| Table of contents<br>(Title, sections)                         | Very well<br>organized;<br>professional  | Well organized  | Somewhat well organized   | Poorly organized                                   |
| Personal<br>profile/cover letter<br>(# 3 below)                | Career & personal goals, skills, & purpose of portfolio clearly articulated          | Career & personal goals, skills, & purpose of portfolio articulated     | Career & personal<br>goals, skills, &<br>purpose of<br>portfolio<br>somewhat<br>articulated | Confusing, unclear goals & skills                  |
| Signed & completed<br>PFF Readiness Plan                       | Very professional;<br>includes required<br>materials; sections<br>clearly identified | Professional;<br>includes required<br>materials; sections<br>identified | Includes required materials; sections identified  | Materials have no identified sections; unorganized |
| Research statement   | Very well-<br>articulated<br>description & goals                                     | Well-articulated description & goals                                    | Articulated description & goals   | Language is confusing; grammatical errors          |
| Teaching philosophy  | Very well-<br>articulated<br>description & goals                                     | Well-articulated description & goals                                    | Articulated description & goals   | Language is confusing; grammatical errors          |
| Curriculum Vitae<br>(CV)                                       | Outstanding organization & professionalism   | Complete & professional; just below outstanding                         | Good<br>organization &<br>professionalism   | Missing information raises serious red flags.      |
| Two reference letters supporting PFF Certificate               | Letters very positive & very supportive of PFF                                       | Letters positive & supportive of PFF                                    | Letters neutral & one-sentence support of PFF   | No mention of PFF support                          |
| Unofficial transcript  | Included official transcript   | Unofficial<br>transcript included<br>in its own section                 | Unofficial<br>transcript<br>included  | Transcript was missing                             |
| Artifacts (work samples)                                       | Excellent research, teaching artifacts   | Very good<br>research, teaching<br>artifacts                            | Good research, teaching artifacts   | Artifacts lack<br>breadth of<br>academic prowess   |
| Presentation, grammar, punctuation                             | Distinguishes PFF candidate as professional  | Just below excellent  | Meets<br>requirements but<br>needs polish   | Needs revision                                     |

#### **PORTFOLIO INSTRUCTIONS:**

The PFF Portfolio is the capstone assignment for the PFF Certificate. Whether electronic, web-based or print, the portfolio should have a tab or divider for each section. The contents are as follows:

- 1. Cover page
- 2. Table of Contents
- 3. Personal profile or cover letter (indicates the purpose of the portfolio, your career goals, and your skills such as communication, creativity, critical thinking, leadership)
- 4. Signed Faculty Readiness Plan
- 5. Research statement
- 6. Teaching philosophy
- 7. Curriculum Vitae (CV)
- 8. Reference letters (minimum of two)

## PFF PORTFOLIO RUBRIC

- 9. Unofficial transcript
- 10. Artifacts (work samples such as teaching evaluations, syllabi)

The presentation, grammar and punctuation of the PFF Portfolio will also be evaluated. The PFF Certificate will be completed when 80% of the required portfolio contents earn Good, Very Good, or Excellent using the preceding scoring rubric.

## **CV Rubric**

| CV Rating   | Excellent   | Very Good   | Good  | Unsatisfactory  |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|   |   |   |   |   |
| Overall appearance  | Distinguishes candidate as very professional  | Candidate can<br>produce professional<br>work if uses a<br>template | Somewhat professional & slightly difficult to locate information                              | Makes it impossible to take candidate seriously                                       |
| Contact information   | Stands out, easy to locate and absorb.  | Easy to locate and read   | Easy to locate but incomplete, confusing  | Erroneous   |
| Job title, employer, city, state & dates from current to past | Consistent formatting and thoughtful placement; improves absorption of information. | Adequate formatting & placement                                     | Inconsistent formatting, thoughtless placement  | Missing information raises serious red flags.   |
| Education & qualifications                                    | Education & qualifications quickly evident  | Education & qualifications listed but less evident                  | Qualifications incomplete or confusing  | Difficult to discern qualifications.  |
| Professional skills   | Skills that will be an asset to the employer are carefully highlighted.             | Skills are embedded in other sections of CV. Needs highlighting.    | Skills do not seem applicable to an educational setting.                                      | Difficult to discern professional skills.   |
| Professional<br>Achievements &<br>activities                  | Appears to be a well-<br>rounded individual &<br>very professionally<br>involved.   | Has experienced success in some personal & professional endeavors   | Has participated in activities but no indication of the extent.                               | None listed   |
| Strong, clear statements                                      | Strong, clear<br>statements highlight<br>key skills                                 | Strong statements<br>highlighting some key<br>skills                | Somewhat confusing statements distracting reader from key skills                              | Long, wordy<br>statements<br>prevent reader<br>from noting key<br>skills              |
| Font, formatting, headings                                    | Font enables the reader; formatting & headings guide the eye to key information     | Font style & size appropriate; Consistent formatting & headings     | Font cramped or small; inconsistent formatting & headings interfere with locating information | CV very difficult<br>to read (font &<br>style); confusing<br>formatting &<br>headings |

# **Job Talk Reflection Paper Rubric**

| Faculty Job Talk<br>Reflection Paper  | Excellent  | Very Good  | Fair; return for revision   | Needs<br>improvement;<br>return for<br>revision  |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| Requirements (300 word reflection, typed, 12-point font; date of talk, applicant, topic, preferred position, & academic program identified) | Paper exceeds requirements   | Paper meets requirements but does not exceed them  | Paper meets minimum requirements; return for revision   | Paper does not follow guidelines   |
| Analysis of Job Talk  | Paper is thorough & includes detailed narrative of the job talk, analysis of the talk's effect on the audience & responses to questions                | Paper is complete & includes narrative of the job talk, analysis of the talk's effect on the audience & responses to questions   | Paper briefly describes a narrative of the job talk & the talk's effect on the audience & responses to questions          | Analysis fails to reflect on the job talk  |
| Job Talk<br>Presentation  | Presentation was delivered very articulately, clearly.   | Presentation was delivered articulately, clearly.  | Presentation was delivered fairly articulately, clearly.  | Presentation<br>delivery was<br>difficult to hear,<br>with numerous<br>pauses and filler<br>words. |
| Language<br>(vocabulary, tone)  | Presentation used sophisticated and correct vocabulary; uses subject-specific vocabulary effectively; & maintains a tone appropriate for the audience. | Vocabulary was varied and appropriate; frequently uses subject-specific vocabulary correctly; the tone of the presentation was generally appropriate for the audience. | Vocabulary was used properly though the sentences were simple. Presenter's tone shows some level of audience sensitivity. | Vocabulary was<br>unsophisticated,<br>not used<br>properly in very<br>simple<br>sentences.         |
| Responses to questions  | Candidate's responses were well-developed, delivered confidently, with evidence of very careful data analysis.   | Candidate's responses were organized, delivered confidently, with evidence of careful data analysis  | Candidate's responses were well-developed, delivered slowly, with some evidence of careful data analysis.                 | Candidate hesitated when responding, with some confusion when speaking.                            |