**Ryan-Bain Reflective Journaling Rubric (Revised)**

**Level 1: Reporting and Responding**

Choose a focus (a *critical incident*): an issue or incident that posed a problem or had a positive impact on your learning or practice. Report what happened or what the key issue or incident involved. Why is it relevant?

- **1.1** A *critical incident* is reported in sufficient detail for an audience to draw their own conclusions
- **1.2** The writer’s initial reaction or emotional response to the *critical incident* is identified
- **1.3** An intellectual challenge is identified (opportunity for growth)

**Level 2: Relating**

Relate or make a connection between the *critical incident* challenge (1.3) and your own skills, professional experience, or discipline knowledge. Have you seen this before? Were the conditions the same or different? Do you have the skills and knowledge to deal with this? Explain.

**The incident or issue is related to:**

- **2.1** The writer’s own strengths, weaknesses, personal experience or learning, or to
- **2.1** Professional matters (pedagogy, curriculum, field experience)
- **2.2** As 2.1, but the entry includes a superficial rationale or limited discussion of the connection
- **2.3** As 2.2, but the rationale or discussion includes a significant insight or understanding arising from the connection made.

**Level 3: Reasoning**

Level 3 (Reasoning): Identify at least one key theoretical aspect of the challenges identified in the reflections. Add an additional perspective by researching what others (especially academics) have said about it. How does their experience/insight help to make sense of the critical incident?

- **3.1** At least one significant aspect of the incident(s) is carefully analysed in detail, giving consideration to such matters as:
  - existing theory and/or prior reflective writing on this subject (thought), and
  - lessons or conclusions to be drawn from this additional perspective (reflection). and
  - why the aspect challenges personal or intellectual growth (reflection)
- **3.2** In addition to 3.1, the reflection:
  - includes additional perspectives that complicate and deepen the analysis
  - includes analysis and significance of the critical incident that is expanded to consider questions of ethics or practice, as applicable
- **3.3** In addition to 3.2, the reflection ably considers inter-, multi-, and transdisciplinary applications.
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Level 4: Reconstructing

Reframe or reconstruct future practice or professional understanding. How would you deal with this next time? What might work and why? Are there different options? What might happen if [ . . . ]? Are your ideas supported by theory? Can you make changes to benefit others?

☐ 4.1 In addition to a fully developed Level 3.1+ reflection, the paper’s thought-reflection leads to a conclusion or a plan for future active experimentation

☐ 4.2 As 4.1, but the discussion also considers the reasons for, or possible implications of, the conclusion or plan.

☐ 4.3. As 4.2, but the reasons/complications are also explored using at least Level 3.1 level analysis.

Notes

•