

Institute of Technology Tralee Department of Nursing and Health Care Science: e-Portfolio Assessment Rubric (2015)¹

	Inadequate /Poor 0-3 points	Fair/Good 4-6 points	Very Good/Excellent 7-8 points	Outstanding 9-10 points	Points Earned	Comments
Artefacts: Selection and Quality	Contains inappropriate/poor quality & variety artifacts. Artefacts bear little/no relation to the element in which they are contained and/or the purpose of ePortfolio itself. Little/no creativity is demonstrated in the choice/ creation of artefacts. They do not/poorly contribute to the quality of the ePortfolio as a whole. Many artefacts detract from the content.	Contains appropriate artefacts of fair/good quality & variety. Bear reasonable/good association with the purpose of the element in which they are contained and/or ePortfolio itself. Fair/ good creativity in choice/creation of artefacts. They lend to the quality of the ePortfolio as a whole. Some artefacts detract from the content.	Contains very good/excellent clearly appropriate artefacts of very good/excellent quality & variety. Clearly associated to purpose of the element in which they are contained and/or ePortfolio itself. Very good/excellent creativity in choice/creation of artefacts. They contribute significantly to the quality of the ePortfolio as a whole. All serve to enhance the written material and create interest.	Outstanding relevant artefacts of exceptional high quality and variety. Specifically associated with the purpose of the element in which they are contained and/or ePortfolio itself. Exceptional creativity in choice/creation of artefacts. Commendable, all significantly enhance the written material and create interest		
Artefacts: Demonstration of learning integration and cohesiveness	Insufficient to support/demonstrate knowledge, learning and developing competency. Poor and/or no rationale(s) for inclusion. Unclear/poor integration and cohesiveness with written narrative	Sufficient to support/demonstrate knowledge, learning and developing competency. Fair/Good rationale (s) for inclusion. Fair/good integration and cohesiveness. with written narrative	Very good/ excellent at supporting/demonstrating knowledge, learning and developing competency. Very Good/Excellent rationale (s) for inclusion presented. Very good/excellent integration and cohesiveness with written narrative.	Exemplary at supporting demonstrating, comprehensively, knowledge, learning and developing competency. Impressive coherent rationale (s) for inclusion. Superior integration and cohesiveness with written narrative.		

¹ This rubric is an adaptation of rubrics from following authors/institutions;

- Vandervelde J. (2015) e-Portfolio (Digital Portfolio) Rubric. Available from: <https://www2.uwstout.edu/content/profdev/rubrics/eportfoliorubric.html>.
- Gonzalez, F. (2004) Portfolio Assessment Rubrics. Available from http://www.samford.edu/ctls/Portfolio_Assessment_Rubrics.doc.
- University of Tennessee (2015) e-Portfolio Assessment Rubric. Available from www.utc.edu/integrated-studies/docs/eportfolio-rubric.pdf.

	Inadequate /Poor	Fair/Good	Very Good/Excellent	Outstanding	Points Earned	Comments
	0-3 points	4-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points		
Artefacts: Use of Jing, audacity, Wordle You Tube and one of choice (<i>and others</i>)	Audio/video/other artifacts are not edited or exhibit inconsistent clarity or sound (too loud/too soft/garbled). Omissions. Are un-professional.	A few of the audio and/or video artifacts are edited with inconsistent clarity or sound (too loud/too soft/garbled). No omissions. Largely professional.	Most of the audio and/or video artifacts are edited with proper voice projection, appropriate professional language/presentation and clear delivery. No omissions. Professional.	All audio and/or video artifacts are edited with proper voice projection, appropriate professional language/presentation and clear delivery. No omissions. Professional		
Artefacts Hyperlinks Internal/external	Many of the hyperlinks do not connect to the appropriate website or file. Many do not add/contribute meaningfully to narrative and/or are not relevant.	Some of the hyperlinks do not connect to the appropriate website or file, Some do not add/contribute meaningfully to narrative and/or are not relevant.	Most of the hyperlinks connect to the appropriate website or file. All meaningfully add/contribute to the narrative. All are relevant.	All hyperlinks connect to the appropriate website or file. Hyperlinks add exceptional meaning/contribution to narratives. Unambiguous relevancy.		
Reflective Commentaries (as opposed to critical reflection)	The reflections do not adequately reveal learning and/or how that learning is related to, or transferable to nursing. Unconvincing/no links to domains/IOLs	Reflections satisfactorily reveal learning and how that learning is related to, or transferable to nursing. Convincing/some links to domains/IOLs	Learning and how that learning is related to, or transferable to nursing is revealed in a comprehensive manner. Categorically linked to domains/IOLS.	Reflections clearly and comprehensively articulate learning and how that learning is related to, or transferable to nursing. Categorically and comprehensively linked to domains/IOLs		
Critical Reflection (Depts. levels of reflection)	Reflections are not representative of level 3. Do not meet all criteria. Multiple omissions at levels 1,2 &3	Reflections meet all the criteria for level 3 reflection. No omissions. Some criteria require further development at levels 1, 2 & 3.	Reflections meet all the criteria for level 3 reflection. No omissions. Very good/excellently developed entries, comprehensively demonstrating all criteria of levels 1, 2 & 3.	Outstanding in the demonstration of the criteria for level 3 reflection. Entries are exemplary in their development at levels 1, 2 & 3.		
Academic writing (@Level 8)	Predominantly descriptive. No/inadequate analysis, evaluation and synthesis. No evidence of independent thinking. Does not represent academic writing at level 8	Demonstrates fair/good capacity for analysis, evaluation and synthesis. Independent thinking is evident. Is representative of academic writing at level 8, but may need further development.	Demonstrates very good/excellent capacity for analysis, evaluation and synthesis. Creative independent thinking is evident. Is a sound representation of academic writing at level 8.	Demonstrates outstanding capacity for analysis, evaluation and synthesis. Original, sophisticated independent thinking is evident. An exceptional representation of academic writing at level 8.		

	Inadequate /Poor	Fair/Good	Very Good/Excellent	Outstanding	Points Earned	Comments
	0-3 points	4-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points		
Evidence of learning and coherence.	Contains unclear or contradictory evidence of learning, personal, professional development. Evidence of enhanced knowledge, competency/improvement in professional practice is missing. Demonstrates a lack of coherence; fragmented.	Some evidence of learning, personal, professional development. Some evidence of enhanced knowledge, competency/improvement in professional practice. Generally coherent; some evidence of fragmentation.	Clear evidence of learning, personal, professional development throughout. Solid evidence of enhanced knowledge, competency/improvement in professional practice throughout. Coherent; consistent meaningful connections are evidence.	Persuasive evidence of learning, personal, professional development throughout. Cogent evidence of enhanced knowledge, competency/improvement in professional practice throughout. Represents a sophisticated strongly coherent unified portfolio.		
Academic Scholarship & Professionalism	Many errors in grammar, syntax, paragraphing, capitalisation, punctuation, and spelling requiring major editing and revision. Omissions related to project guidelines. Inadequate reading and engagement with literature; many outdated and irrelevant. Overuse of non-scholarly and/or secondary sources. Unfit for purpose and target audience e.g. employer/NMBI.	Some errors in grammar, syntax, paragraphing, capitalisation, punctuation, and spelling requiring editing and revision. Minor omissions related to project guidelines. Adequate reading and engagement with up-to date relevant literature. Scholarly and primary sources feature as a majority. With minor revisions would be fit for purpose and target audience e.g. employer/NMBI	No errors in grammar, syntax capitalisation, paragraphing, punctuation, and spelling. No omissions related to project guidelines. Ample reading and engagement with up-to-date relevant literature. Pre-dominant use of scholarly and primary sources. As presented, is fit for purpose and target audience e.g. employer/NMBI	Exceptional scholarship. No omissions related to project guidelines. Extensive reading and engagement with a broad range of up-to date relevant literature. Scholarly and primary sources only. Exceeds purpose and needs of target audience e.g. employer/NMBI		

	Inadequate /Poor	Fair/Good	Very Good/Excellent	Outstanding	Points Earned	Comments
	0-3 points	4-6 points	7-8 points	9-10 points		
Presentation and Referencing (Adherence to ITT guidelines)	Poor/inadequate application of ITT referencing guidelines. Substantial errors/many missing references. Colour/style of personalised background, fonts and links, decrease the professional appearance and readability; are distracting and used inconsistently throughout the eportfolio.	Fair/Good application of ITT referencing guidelines. Some errors/a few missing references. Colour/style of personalised background, fonts, and links, generally enhance the professional appearance and readability; are generally used consistently throughout the eportfolio.	Good/very good application of ITT referencing guidelines. Minor errors/no missing references. Colour/style of personalised background, fonts, and links clearly enhance the professional appearance, readability and aesthetic quality, and are used consistently throughout the eportfolio.	Exceptional application of ITT referencing guidelines. No errors/no missing references. Colour/style of personalised background, fonts, and links are superb, and greatly enhance the professional appearance, readability and aesthetic quality, and are used consistently throughout the eportfolio.		
Comments:					Total Points	
Assessor Signature:						