

Criteria	Level 5	Level 4	Level 3	Level 2	Needs further development
<i>SOLO (Biggs 2003)</i>	<i>Unanticipated extension</i>	<i>Logically related answer</i>	<i>Multiple unrelated points</i>	<i>Single point</i>	<i>Misses the point</i>
(Reflection <i>on</i> action) Ability to synthesise reflections <i>on action</i> and key learnings from the FULT program	Multiple learnings from the program (learning and teaching issues, educational design and enhancing learning) are identified and synthesised, together with how they relate	Multiple learnings from the program (learning and teaching issues, educational design and enhancing learning) are identified, together with how they relate	The reflection includes several learnings from the program (learning and teaching issues, educational design and enhancing learning) but they are unrelated	The reflection focuses on only one, or few, learnings from the program (learning and teaching issues, educational design and enhancing learning)	No evidence of engagement with reflection on action or key learnings from FULT is evident.
(Reflection <i>for</i> action) Ability to synthesise reflections on key learnings from the FULT program <i>for action</i>	Extension of key learnings to novel/innovative/or new applications are proposed	Application of key learnings to future practice are clearly outlined.	Some demonstration of how key learnings may be applied to future practice are outlined.	Limited demonstration of how key learnings may be applied to future practice.	No demonstration of reflection for action or future practice is evident.
Evidence-based* reflections are drawn from multiple perspectives	Deep engagement with the reflective process is demonstrated and evidenced through the use of multiple perspectives (autobiographical or own lens, peers, students, literature).	Engagement with the reflective process is demonstrated and evidenced through the use of multiple perspectives (autobiographical or own lens, peers, students, literature).	Engagement with the reflective process is demonstrated through the use of more than the autobiographical or own lens perspective.	Engagement with the reflective process is shallow, supported with little evidence and/or limited to a single perspective.	No evidence of engagement with the reflective process is demonstrated.
The ePortfolio is clearly written	Writing is clear, concise and persuasive. There are no spelling or grammatical errors.	Writing is clear but may lack conciseness. There are few minor spelling or grammatical errors.	Writing is mostly clear and/or concise. There are few minor spelling or grammatical errors, or learning.	Writing lacks clarity and conciseness. There are frequent spelling and/or grammatical errors making understanding difficult.	Writing and meaning is not clear.
The ePortfolio adopts a scholarly approach to its presentation	Critical reflection is supported by the literature, that is: Sources are exceptionally well-integrated and they support the reflective writing very effectively. Information is correctly referenced –in-text and in the reference list.	Reflective writing is supported by the literature, that is: Sources are well integrated and support the reflection. There are few referencing errors, and referencing conforms to one academic style (APA, Harvard, Chicago, etc).	Reflective writing attempts to incorporate relevant literature, that is: Sources support some of the reflective writing, but might not be well integrated well. There are a few errors in referencing	There is little or no attempt to incorporate literature, that is: The paper does not use adequate research or if it does, the sources are not integrated well. Sources are either not cited correctly or are omitted/ missing.	There is no attempt to incorporate literature.

* Evidence of reflective practice is provided: e.g., cited quotes from a journal or other modes of reflection, from online discussion, table discussions or other communications.