

Rubric Detail

A rubric lists grading criteria that instructors use to evaluate student work. Your instructor linked a rubric to this item and made it available to you. Select **Grid View** or **List View** to change the rubric's layout.

Name: **First Submission**

Exit

Grid View

List View

	Unacceptable	Needs Revision	Target
Are the focus and purpose clear and ideas well supported?	0 (0.00%) Missing thesis; confusion about or misunderstanding of topic; no sense of purpose; absence of support for main points	2.5 (2.50%) Simplistic and unfocused ideas; limited sense of purpose; support is provided, but is not specific; support is only loosely relevant to the main points	5 (5.00%) Developed thesis; represents sound understanding of the assigned topic; focused support is provided and is sound, valid, and logical
Is the writing structured and well organized? Is correct sentence	0 (0.00%) No paragraph structure; or	2.5 (2.50%) Organization	5 (5.00%) Clear organizational structure; easily

structure and proper mechanics utilized?

single, rambling paragraph; series of isolated paragraphs; Contains multiple and serious errors of sentence structure: i.e. fragments, run-ons; unable to write simple sentences; numerous errors in spelling and capitalization; intrusive and/or inaccurate punctuation; communication is hindered

structure is confusing or disjointed; weak paragraph structure; transitions are missing or inappropriate; Formulaic sentence patterns or overuse of simple sentences; errors in sentence structure; contains several punctuation, spelling, and/or capitalization errors (up to 6); errors may or may not interfere with meaning

followed; includes transitions; structured format; Effective and varied sentences; errors (if present) due to lack of careful proofreading; virtually free of punctuation, spelling, capitalization errors (no more than 3); errors do not interfere with meaning

Feedback:
The same exact paragraph from the abstract cannot be used as the introduction to your paper.

Are vocabulary and word usage varied and appropriate?

0 (0.00%)
Vocabulary is unsophisticated; or subject specific vocabulary or sophisticated vocabulary used incorrectly

2.5 (2.50%)
Proper, but simple vocabulary used; subject specific vocabulary used infrequently

5 (5.00%)
Vocabulary is varied, specific and appropriate; uses subject specific vocabulary correctly

Is the source requirement met? Is APA format followed?

0 (0.00%)
Source requirements for

2.5 (2.50%)
Meets minimum requirements for

5 (5.00%)
Five (5) sources

	<p>the appropriate level acceptable met; There are significant format errors present ; multiple (more than 6) of APA formatting errors; in the reference list and/or in-text citations</p>	<p>degree level: Masters – Needs Revision Sources were utilized; Fewer than 6 APA format errors are present in the reference list in-text; citations; header; headings; page numbers; etc.</p>	<p>beyond minimum Target requires were utilized; There are virtually no APA format errors present in either reference list in-text; citations; header; headings; page numbers; etc.</p>
<p>Is proper evidence and support of original work provided in body of the review?</p>	<p>0 (0.00%) Turnitin originality report indicates match percentage of greater than 25 percent.</p>	<p>2.5 (2.50%) Turnitin originality report indicates match percentage of 15 to 25 percent.</p>	<p>5 (5.00%) Turnitin originality report indicates a match percentage of less than 15 percent.</p>
<p>Source of data is credible and data is representative of the scope requirements for the advanced degree being sought. (InTASC 6, 9; CAEP A1.1)</p>	<p>0 (0.00%) The source of the data is ambiguous or lacks credibility; data does not allow for problem/weakness identification appropriate for required project scope</p>	<p>2.5 (2.50%) The source of the data is clear and credible; data does not allow for problem/weakness identification appropriate for required project scope</p>	<p>5 (5.00%) The source of the data is clear and credible; data allows for identification of an of a classroom, multi-classroom, school or district level problem/weakness appropriate to the required project scope</p>
<p>Graphical representation of compiled data allows for easy</p>	<p>0 (0.00%) Graphical format does not present</p>	<p>2.5 (2.50%) Graphical</p>	<p>5 (5.00%) Graphical format(s) is appropriate; clearly</p>

analysis. (CAEP A1.1)

the data in a clear
Unacceptable
only partially
presented

format(s) is
Needs Improvement
clearly presents all
the collected data

presents all the
Target
collected data;
highlights visible
patterns or trends

Feedback:
Looking at your graft
alone. I would have a
hard time determining
what it means.

**Identified
problem/weakness
is supported by
trends or patterns
seen in the data.
(InTASC 6, 9, 10;
CAEP A1.1)**

0 (0.00%)
Problem/weakness
is not clearly
identified or does
not align with the
trends and
patterns identified
in the data

2.5 (2.50%)
Problem/weakness
is clearly
identified; aligns
with the type of
data collected, but
connections
between the
trends/patterns in
the data are not
clearly described
in the narrative

5 (5.00%)
Problem/weakness is
clearly identified; aligns
with the type of data
collected; clear
connections between
the trends/patterns are
drawn in the narrative

Feedback:
I gave partial credit
here. Although there is
no problem identified
and no discussion of
the relation to data, I
can guess that the
problem is the opposite
of the things you listed
that exercise could
benefit.

**Best practices are
identified and
supported by the
literature as viable**

0 (0.00%)
Best practice(s) are
not clearly

2.5 (2.50%)
Best practice(s) are
clearly identified;

5 (5.00%)
Best practice(s) are

<p>responses to weaknesses and problems represented by the data. (InTASC 8, 9, 10; CAEP A1.1)</p>	<p>identified; literature reviewed does not support the identified best practice(s) as a viable option to improve achievement</p>	<p>literature reviewed does not support identified best practice(s) as a viable option to improve achievement</p>	<p>clearly identified; literature reviewed supports the identified best practices as viable responses to the problem/weakness identified</p>
<p>Theories and/or trends are identified and connected with best practices in literature. (InTASC 8, 9, 10; CAEP A1.1)</p>	<p>0 (0.00%) Theory or trend is not identified; theory/trend identified are not connected with the best practice(s) via literature</p>	<p>2.5 (2.50%) Theory or trend is clearly identified; literature reviewed does not connect the identified theory/trend with the identified best practice</p>	<p>5 (5.00%) Theory or trend is clearly identified; literature reviewed connects the identified theory/trend with all identified best practices</p>
<p>Proper level of synthesis is achieved in the literature review summary. (InTASC 9, 10; CAEP A1.1)</p>	<p>0 (0.00%) Summaries are provided; are not clear or fail to make clear connections with best practice(s) and/or theory/trend(s) identified as viable responses to problem/weakness</p>	<p>2.5 (2.50%) Summaries are provided; clear connections with best practice and/or theory/trend identified as viable response to problem/weakness may or may not be present</p>	<p>5 (5.00%) Synthesis rather than summaries of content presented in the collection of sources is present, clear connections with best practice and/or theory/trend identified as viable response to problem/weakness present</p>
<p>Description of plan is clear and easy to follow. (InTASC 7, 9, 10; CAEP A1.1)</p>	<p>0 (0.00%) Action plan is not described;</p>	<p>2.5 (2.50%) Action plan</p>	<p>5 (5.00%) Action plan description is provided, and</p>

description is not clear; steps in plan are not in a logical order

description is clear; revision but additional detail may be warranted; steps in plan are outlined, but additional steps may be needed, or the order could be altered for better efficiency

sufficient detail is provided; steps in plan are outlined; exhaustive list of steps and sequence of steps allows for optimal efficiency and outcome

Feedback:

All is clear except your exercise plan. You need to be more concise about your exercise implementation.

Project timeline accounts for all elements in the plan and allocates appropriate amounts of time for each element. (InTASC 7, 10; CAEP A1.1)

0 (0.00%)

Project timeline is missing or incomplete; time allocation is inadequate or too extensive for one or more elements included in the plan

Feedback:

More information is needed.

2.5 (2.50%)

Project timeline is provided; all elements identified in the plan are included, but additional elements might be needed for an improved outcome; timing and/or time allocation could be improved

5 (5.00%)

Project timeline is provided; all necessary elements are included for optimal outcome

Variables are identified and defined. (CAEP A1.1)

0 (0.00%)

Variables are misidentified

2.5 (2.50%)

Variables are

5 (5.00%)

Variables are identified correctly, with clear

	Unacceptable	<p>identified correctly, Needs Revision clear definitions or explanations as to how they will be measured</p> <p>Feedback: See comments in paper.</p>	<p>definitions and Target explanations as to how they will be measured</p>
<p>Required data needs are identified and plans for retrieving and protecting that data are clear (i.e., methods). (InTASC 6, 9; CAEP A1.1)</p>	<p>0 (0.00%)</p> <p>Data needs are not identified or do not align with the problem; data retrieval plans are missing or inappropriate</p>	<p>2.5 (2.50%)</p> <p>Data needs are identified; data retrieval plans are included, but plans for protecting the data and/or student confidentiality are not provided or are inadequate</p> <p>Feedback: See comments in paper.</p>	<p>5 (5.00%)</p> <p>Data needs are identified; data retrieval plans are included; adequate plans for protecting student confidentiality and/or data are provided</p>
<p>Description of the sample and sampling techniques are provided. (CAEP A1.1)</p>	<p>0 (0.00%)</p> <p>Detailed descriptions of the participants are not given and/or sampling technique is not provided</p>	<p>2.5 (2.50%)</p> <p>Brief overview of the sample is given, and sampling technique may or may not be included</p> <p>Feedback: See comments in the paper. Choose 1 technique. Describe your population and sample in more detail.</p>	<p>5 (5.00%)</p> <p>Full descriptions of the participant sample, sampling technique and justifications for both the sample chosen and the sampling technique are given</p>
<p>Needed resources are identified, justified, and a leverage plan for</p>	<p>0 (0.00%)</p> <p>Resources are</p>	<p>2.5 (2.50%)</p> <p>Resources are identified, but</p>	<p>5 (5.00%)</p> <p>Exhaustive list of resources is identified;</p>

acquiring resources is clear and supported. (InTASC 5, 9, 10; CAEP A1.1)

not identified
Unacceptable
 inadequate; no justification for the resources is provided; unclear how identified resources might be acquired; plan for acquiring resources is inadequate or ill-conceived

additional resources
Needs Revision
 justification for the resources is provided, but leverage plan for acquiring resources is not clear

justification for the
Target
 leverage plan for acquiring resources is outlined

Feedback:
 Description of Data section was not provided.

Justification for how the action plan will address the identified problem is clear. (InTASC 9, 10; CAEP A1.1)

0 (0.00%)
 No connection between the action plan and the identified problem is provided

2.5 (2.50%)
 Connection between the action plan and the identified problem is provided

Feedback:
 You have not clearly identified the problem.

5 (5.00%)
 Connection between the action plan and the identified problem is provided; justification of that connection is included

Connection between action plan and impact on student

0 (0.00%)
 No

2.5 (2.50%)
 Connection between action plan outcome

5 (5.00%)
 Connection between action plan outcome

achievement is clear. (InTASC 9, 10; CAEP A1.1)

connection
Unacceptable
action plan
outcome and
student
achievement
is provided

Feedback:
No limitations are discussed or the impact of the action plan.

and student
Needs Revision
provided; justification of that connection may or may not be included

and student
Target
achievement is provided; justification of that connection is included; limitations or outside interferences to improved student achievement are identified

Do appendices include necessary documentation?

0 (0.00%)

Most items required in the appendices are not presented in the appendices; the plan and necessary steps to protect human subjects in research are not clear.

Feedback:
All are missing.

2.5 (2.50%)

Most required items are presented in the appendices; items and plan for ethical practices in protection of human subjects are weak.

5 (5.00%)

All required items are presented in the appendices; items clearly demonstrate ethical practices in protection of human subjects.

Raw Total: 57.50 (of 100)

Name: **First Submission**

Exit