

# Teaching Philosophy Statement Rubric

Christine Maidl Pribbenow

Adapted from: Schonwetter, D.J., Sokal, L., Friesen, M., & Taylor, K.L (2002).

**Teaching philosophies reconsidered:**

**A conceptual model for the development and evaluation of teaching philosophy statements.**

*The International Journal for Academic Development (7)1.*

<b>Definitions of Teaching and Learning</b>	
<p>Superior: The writer clearly and personally defines and discusses the terms <i>teaching</i> and <i>learning</i> and their relationship. Extensive and appropriate examples, and reflection on experiences with others are discussed.</p> <p>Average: The writer defines and discusses the terms <i>teaching</i> and <i>learning</i> and their relationship. Some appropriate examples and reflection on experiences with others are discussed.</p> <p>Poor: The writer neither defines nor discusses the terms <i>teaching</i> and <i>learning</i> and their relationship. The examples and reflection on experiences with others are inappropriate or missing.</p>	
<b>Pre</b>	<b>Post</b>
<b>View of the Learner</b>	
<p>Superior: The writer clearly articulates his or her view of the learner within the classroom or other learning environment. The writer demonstrates superior understanding of the learner's characteristics and their influence on his or her success in the learning environment.</p> <p>Average: The writer articulates his or her view of the learner within the classroom or other learning environment. The writer demonstrates some understanding of the learners' characteristics and their influence on his or her success in the learning environment.</p> <p>Poor: The writer fails to articulate his or her view of the learner within the classroom or other learning environment. The writer demonstrates little understanding of the learners' characteristics and their influence on his or her success in the learning environment.</p>	
<b>Pre</b>	<b>Post</b>
<b>View of the Teacher</b>	
<p>Superior: The writer clearly articulates his or her view of the role of the teacher within the classroom or other learning environment. The writer demonstrates superior understanding of an effective teacher's characteristics and their influence on students' success in the learning environment.</p> <p>Average: The writer articulates his or her view of the role of the teacher within the classroom or other learning environment. The writer demonstrates some understanding of an effective teacher's characteristics and their influence on students' success in the learning environment.</p> <p>Poor: The writer fails to articulates his or her view of the role of the teacher within the classroom or other learning environment. The writer demonstrates little understanding of an effective teacher's characteristics and their influence on students' success in the learning environment.</p>	
<b>Pre</b>	<b>Post</b>

<b>Goals and Expectations of the Student-Teacher Relationship</b>	
<p>Superior: The discussion of this relationship is congruent with the writer's definitions of teaching and learning and with his or her view of the learner. Examples and reflections strongly illustrate both the nature of the student-teacher interactions as well as the identified critical elements of the relationship.</p> <p>Average: The discussion of this relationship shows some congruence with the writer's definitions of teaching and learning and with his or her view of the learner. Examples and reflections illustrate either or both the nature of the student-teacher interactions and the identified critical elements of the relationship.</p> <p>Poor: The discussion of this relationship shows little congruence with the writer's definitions of teaching and learning and with his or her view of the learner. Examples and reflections illustrate neither the nature of the student-teacher interactions nor the critical elements of the relationship.</p>	
<b>Pre</b>	<b>Post</b>
<b>Teaching Methods and Evaluation</b>	
<p>Superior: Grounded within an extensive knowledge of discipline-specific expectations and learner characteristics, the writer clearly demonstrates evidence of his or her superior ability to use a wide variety of teaching and assessment strategies. Selection of specific strategies is congruent with the writer's definitions of teaching and learning, views of the learner and understanding of the student-teacher relationship.</p> <p>Average: Grounded within some knowledge of discipline-specific expectations and learner characteristics, the writer demonstrates evidence of his or her ability to use a variety of teaching and assessment strategies. Selection of specific strategies is somewhat congruent with the writer's definitions of teaching and learning, views of the learner and understanding of the student-teacher relationship.</p> <p>Poor: Grounded within little or no knowledge of discipline-specific expectations and learner characteristics, the writer fails to demonstrate evidence of his or her ability to use a variety of teaching and assessment strategies. Selection of specific strategies is incongruent with the writer's definitions of teaching and learning, views of the learner and understanding of the student-teacher relationship.</p>	
<b>Pre</b>	<b>Post</b>
<b>Professional Development as a Teacher</b>	
<p>Superior: The writer demonstrates an understanding of his her own development by identifying the need for at least two of the following: continuing education and/or life-long learning experiences, ongoing reflection of teaching practices, or the application of "scientific teaching" methods (i.e., teaching as research, assessing teaching practices, etc.).</p> <p>Average: The writer demonstrates an understanding of his her own development by identifying the need for one of the following: continuing education and/or life-long learning experiences, ongoing reflection of teaching practices, or the application of "scientific teaching" methods (i.e., teaching as research, assessing teaching practices, etc.).</p> <p>Poor: The writer fails to demonstrates an understanding of his her own growth as a teacher by not identifying any examples of continued professional development.</p>	
<b>Pre</b>	<b>Post</b>

<b>Personal Context of Teaching</b>	
<p>Superior: Through use of discipline appropriate language, the writer clearly illustrates both an extensive knowledge of a specific institutional climate and articulates how his or her teaching fits into that setting. These considerations are evident in all other components of the TPS. The statement reflects an appropriate balance of personal vs. institutional goals and style.</p> <p>Average: Through use of some discipline appropriate language, the writer illustrates both his or her knowledge of general institutional climates and articulates how his or her teaching fits into these types of settings. These considerations are evident in some of the components of the TPS. The statement reflects some balance of personal vs. institutional goals and style.</p> <p>Poor: With little use of discipline appropriate language, the writer illustrates poor knowledge of general or specific institutional climates and fails to articulate how his or her teaching fits into these types of settings. Consideration of the context of teaching is not evident in many components of the TPS. The statement does not address any balance of personal vs. institutional goals and style.</p>	
<b>Pre</b>	<b>Post</b>
<b>Organization of Statement</b>	
<p>Superior: The writer has framed the TPS within a highly illustrative metaphor or critical incident that demonstrates many links to the various components of the teaching philosophy statement. For each component of the model, the writer presents a congruent progression throughout beliefs, practice, and goal dimensions. In addition, the writer provides congruence between components of the model. Critical and reflective thinking as well as specific examples are in evidence in the writer's articulation of his or her beliefs, actions and goals.</p> <p>Average: The writer has framed the TPS within a metaphor or critical incident that demonstrates some links to the various components of the teaching philosophy statement. For some components of the model, the writer presents a congruent progression throughout beliefs, practice, and goal dimensions. In addition, the writer provides congruence between some components of the model. Reflection, as well as examples are in evidence in the writer's articulation of his or her beliefs, actions and goals.</p> <p>Poor: The writer has not framed the TPS within a metaphor or critical incident that demonstrates links to the various components. For many components of the model, the writer fails to present a congruent progression throughout beliefs, actions and goal dimensions. In addition, the writer fails to provide congruence between some components of the model. Reflection, as well as examples are lacking in the writer's articulation of his or her beliefs, actions and goals.</p>	
<b>Pre</b>	<b>Post</b>