PB300 Showcase Portfolio Rubric

	Sophisticated	Excellent	Very good	Good	Fair	Unsatisfactory
	High 1st (80%+)	1st (70%+)	2:1 (60-69%)	2:2 (50-59%)	3rd (40-49%)	F (≤39%)
Generic Assessment Criteria	**Specific Assessment Criteria**					
CONTENT (33.33%)	*Artefact Selection and Alignment:* Artefacts are explicitly aligned with the job description and strongly reflect the ethos and requirements of the target role and organization. Selection showcases a broad, balanced range of highly relevant skills and experiences, curated cohesively with no more than 10 artefacts. The portfolio demonstrates exceptional thoughtfulness, with each artefact contributing purposefully to the narrative of suitability for the professional role. Artefacts are contextualized within the target organization, demonstrating a nuanced understanding of its approach. *Reflection on Skills Demonstrated and Reworking Artefacts:* Sophisticated and detailed reflections articulate how artefacts demonstrate required skills and their creation process. Insightful suggestions for reworking artefacts are presented, demonstrating a deep understanding of how improvements would align artefacts more closely with the job description and organizational ethos. Reflections consider specific feedback and identify targeted, actionable improvements that add significant value.	*Artefact Selection and Alignment:* Artefacts are well-aligned with the job description, showcasing relevant skills and experiences with strong consistency. Minor improvements could be made in curating artefacts to eliminate slight overlaps or gaps. All artefacts contribute positively, but their relevance to the organization's ethos may not always be as nuanced. *Reflection on Skills Demonstrated and Reworking Artefacts:* Strong reflections on how artefacts demonstrate relevant skills, with thoughtful consideration of their alignment with the role and ethos. Suggestions for reworking artefacts are specific and demonstrate a clear understanding of improvement areas, though some could be more fully developed.	*Artefact Selection and Alignment:* Artefacts demonstrate a good range of skills and experiences but may lack breadth or full relevance to the role. Some artefacts may not align strongly with the job description or the organization's ethos. Cohesion is generally good, with minor inconsistencies. *Reflection on Skills Demonstrated and Reworking Artefacts:* Good reflections articulate how artefacts demonstrate relevant skills but may lack depth or focus on the creation process. Suggestions for reworking artefacts are general and lack specificity but show some understanding of areas for improvement.	*Artefact Selection and Alignment:* Artefacts demonstrate limited alignment with the job description, with some missing or only loosely connected to the role. There are gaps in the range or depth of skills showcased, and the portfolio lacks consistency. *Reflection on Skills Demonstrated and Reworking Artefacts:* Basic reflections make limited connections between artefacts and the required skills. Suggestions for reworking artefacts are vague or overly general, with little evidence of targeted feedback being considered.	*Artefact Selection and Alignment:* Artefacts demonstrate minimal relevance to the job description and lack coherence. Few artefacts are useful in showcasing skills, and the purpose of the selection is unclear. *Reflection on Skills Demonstrated and Reworking Artefacts:* Minimal reflection on artefacts or their alignment with skills. Suggestions for reworking artefacts are unclear or disconnected from the job description and feedback.	*Artefact Selection and Alignment:* Artefacts are irrelevant, disorganized, or fail to demonstrate alignment with the role. The selection exceeds or falls short of the required number of artefacts. There is no clear intention or cohesion. *Reflection on Skills Demonstrated and Reworking Artefacts:* No meaningful reflection or consideration of reworking artefacts is evident.

PB300 Showcase Portfolio Rubric

PRESENTATION (33.33%)	*Use of CampusPress:* Outstanding and professional use of CampusPress, demonstrating exceptional creativity, clarity, and functionality. Navigation is intuitive, artefacts are seamlessly embedded, and the design is polished, engaging, and innovative. *Precision, Clarity, and Structure:* Exceptional clarity, precision, and professionalism in language, grammar, and structure. The portfolio is flawlessly organized, with logical flow enhancing the narrative.	*Use of CampusPress:* Excellent use of CampusPress with clear, creative, and functional design. Minor lapses in navigation or embedding slightly detract from the polished presentation. *Precision, Clarity, and Structure:* Excellent clarity and organization, with very minor lapses in structure or language precision.	*Use of CampusPress:* Good use of CampusPress, with functional but less creative or professional design. Some issues with navigation or artefact embedding detract from clarity. *Precision, Clarity, and Structure:* Good clarity and structure, though noticeable lapses or inconsistencies detract from the overall quality.	*Use of CampusPress:* Basic use of CampusPress, with limited design choices and notable issues in functionality or navigation. *Precision, Clarity, and Structure:* Basic clarity and structure, but significant issues in grammar, coherence, or organization.	*Use of CampusPress:* Limited use of CampusPress, with significant issues in design, clarity, and navigation. *Precision, Clarity, and Structure:* Minimal clarity and structure, with frequent language errors and poor organization disrupting comprehension.	*Use of CampusPress:* CampusPress is used ineffectively, resulting in an unclear, disorganized, or unprofessional portfolio. *Precision, Clarity, and Structure:* Language issues severely hinder understanding, and the portfolio lacks coherence and organization.
CRITICAL JUDGEMENT (33.33%)	*Linking Artefacts and Rationale:* Exceptional and cohesive rationale links artefacts to the job description, reflecting deep insight into their relevance. Rationale integrates reflections on the artefact creation process and its role in demonstrating suitability for the role. *Reflection and Adaptability:* Proactive and insightful reflection on feedback, showcasing significant learning and growth. Suggestions for reworking artefacts are highly targeted, integrating specific feedback and demonstrating adaptability.	*Linking Artefacts and Rationale:* Strong rationale effectively links artefacts to the role and demonstrates a clear understanding of their relevance. *Reflection and Adaptability:* Thoughtful reflection with evidence of feedback integration and clear suggestions for improvement.	*Linking Artefacts and Rationale:* Good rationale provides clear connections between artefacts and the role but lacks depth or sophistication. *Reflection and Adaptability:* Good reflection but limited evidence of feedback being incorporated or improvement suggestions being specific.	*Linking Artefacts and Rationale:* Basic rationale with limited connections between artefacts and the job description. *Reflection and Adaptability:* Basic reflection with minimal evidence of feedback being utilized or improvement being targeted.	*Linking Artefacts and Rationale:* Weak rationale, with vague or unclear links between artefacts and their relevance. *Reflection and Adaptability:* Weak reflection with vague improvement suggestions and little consideration of feedback.	*Linking Artefacts and Rationale:* No rationale provided, or links between artefacts and their relevance are entirely missing. *Reflection and Adaptability:* No evidence of reflection, feedback integration, or adaptability.