

▼ Interviewees Purpose and Collaboration in Unit Planning Including Technology

9 points

Criteria Description

Interviewees Purpose and Collaboration in Unit Planning Including Technology

5. Target 9 points

Reflection skillfully describes the importance of planning and how interviewees collaborate while planning, including with the use of technology.

4. Acceptable 7.83 points

Reflection clearly describes the importance of planning and how interviewees collaborate while planning, including with the use of technology.

3. Approaching 6.66 points

Reflection unclearly describes the importance of planning and how interviewees collaborate while planning, including with the use of technology.

2. Insufficient 6.21 points

Reflection irrelevantly describes the importance of planning and how interviewees collaborate while planning, including with the use of technology.

1. No Submission 0 points

Not addressed.

▼ Interviewees High Expectations, Objectives, and Alignment

9 points

Criteria Description

Interviewees High Expectations, Objectives, and Alignment

5. Target 9 points

Reflection thoroughly describes how interviewees embody high expectations, ensure objectives are met, and confirm lessons are aligned to academic standards while planning units.

4. Acceptable 7.83 points

Reflection effectively describes how interviewees embody high expectations, ensure objectives are met, and confirm lessons are aligned to academic standards while planning units.

3. Approaching

6.66 points

Reflection minimally describes how interviewees embody high expectations, ensure objectives are met, and confirm lessons are aligned to academic standards while planning units.

2. Insufficient

6.21 points

Reflection insufficiently describes how interviewees embody high expectations, ensure objectives are met, and confirm lessons are aligned to academic standards while planning units.

▼ Interviewees Instructional Strategies and Technology

12 points

Criteria Description

Interviewees Instructional Strategies and Technology

5. Target

12 points

Reflection extensively describes how interviewees incorporate instructional strategies and technology during planning.

4. Acceptable

10.44 points

Reflection describes in detail how interviewees incorporate instructional strategies and technology during planning.

3. Approaching

8.88 points

Reflection ambiguously describes how interviewees incorporate instructional strategies and technology during planning.

2. Insufficient

8.28 points

Reflection unfittingly describes how interviewees incorporate instructional strategies and technology during planning.

▼ Interviewees School Vision and Goals

9 points

Criteria Description

Interviewees School Vision and Goals

5. Target9 points

Reflection thoughtfully describes how interviewees integrate the school’s vision and goals during planning.

4. Acceptable7.83 points

Reflection reasonably describes how interviewees integrate the school’s vision and goals during planning.

3. Approaching6.66 points

Reflection over simplistically describes how interviewees integrate the school’s vision and goals during planning.

2. Insufficient6.21 points

Reflection inadequately describes how interviewees integrate the school’s vision and goals during planning.

▼ PSEL Standard 4 and Implications for Future Practice9 points

Criteria Description

PSEL Standard 4 and Implications for Future Practice

5. Target9 points

Reflection proficiently discusses implications for application as a future practitioner. Elements of PSEL Standard 4 and any other standards that apply are expertly incorporated into reflection.

4. Acceptable7.83 points

Reflection logically discusses implications for application as a future practitioner. Elements of PSEL Standard 4 and any other standards that apply are accurately incorporated into reflection.

3. Approaching6.66 points

Reflection inexplicitly discusses implications for application as a future practitioner. Elements of PSEL Standard 4 and any other standards that apply are vaguely addressed.

2. Insufficient6.21 points

Reflection unrealistically discusses implications for application as a future practitioner. Elements of PSEL Standard 4 and any other standards that apply are inaccurately addressed.

Organization

6 points

Criteria Description

Organization

5. Target 6 points

The content is well-organized and logical. There is a sequential progression of ideas that relate to each other. The content is presented as a cohesive unit and provides the audience with a clear sense of the main idea. The summary is within the required word count.

4. Acceptable 5.22 points

The content is logically organized. The ideas presented relate to each other. The content provides the audience with a clear sense of the main idea. The summary is within a reasonable range of the required word count.

3. Approaching 4.44 points

The content is not adequately organized even though it provides the audience with a sense of the main idea. The summary may not be within a reasonable range of the required word count.

2. Insufficient 4.14 points

An attempt is made to organize the content, but the sequence is indiscernible. The ideas presented are compartmentalized and may not relate to each other; or the summary is widely outside of the required word count.

Mechanics of Writing

3 points

Criteria Description

includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, language use

5. Target 3 points

Submission is virtually free of mechanical errors. Word choice reflects well-developed use of practice and content-related language. Sentence structures are varied and engaging.

4. Acceptable 2.61 points

Submission includes some mechanical errors, but they do not hinder comprehension. Variety of effective sentence structures are used, as well as some practice and content-related language.

3. Approaching 2.22 points

Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistent language or word choice is present. Sentence structure is lacking.

2. Insufficient 2.07 points

Surface errors are pervasive enough that they impede communication of meaning. Inappropriate word choice or sentence construction are used.

1. No Submission 0 points

▼ Documentation of Sources 3 points

Criteria Description

citations, footnotes, references, bibliography, etc., as appropriate to assignment and style

5. Target 3 points

Sources are completely and correctly documented, as appropriate to assignment and style. Format is free of error.

4. Acceptable 2.61 points

Sources are documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, and format is mostly correct.

3. Approaching 2.22 points

Sources are documented, as appropriate to assignment and style, although some key formatting and citation errors are present.

2. Insufficient 2.07 points

Documentation of sources is inconsistent and/or incorrect, as appropriate to assignment and style, with numerous formatting errors.

1. No Submission 0 points

Total 60 points

