

▼ Survey Results

9 points

Criteria Description

Survey Results

5. Target 9 points

Survey results provide new insight regarding teachers’ views of holes in the curriculum and methods for filling these holes for students.

4. Acceptable 7.83 points

Survey results provide detailed consideration regarding teachers’ views of holes in the curriculum and methods for filling these holes for students.

3. Approaching 6.66 points

Survey results are underdeveloped regarding teachers’ views of holes in the curriculum and methods for filling these holes for students.

2. Insufficient 6.21 points

Survey results are unintelligible regarding teachers’ views of holes in the curriculum and methods for filling these holes for students.

1. No Submission 0 points

Not addressed.

▼ Map Differentiation

6 points

Criteria Description

Map Differentiation

5. Target

6 points

Summary thoughtfully addresses how the map differentiates to support the individualized needs of students.

4. Acceptable

5.22 points

Summary logically addresses how the map differentiates to support the individualized needs of students.

3. Approaching

4.44 points

Summary lacks detail in addressing how the map differentiates to support the individualized needs of students.

2. Insufficient

4.14 points

Summary unfittingly addresses how the map differentiates to support the individualized needs of students.

1. No Submission

0 points

▼ Instructional Strategies, Curriculum Materials, Technology

6 points

Criteria Description

Instructional Strategies, Curriculum Materials, Technology

5. Target

6 points

Summary substantially describes how the map incorporates the use of improving differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technology to maximize high-quality instruction.

4. Acceptable

5.22 points

Summary concisely describes how the map incorporates the use of improving differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technology to maximize high-quality instruction.

3. Approaching4.44 points

Summary superficially evaluates how the map incorporates the use of improving differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technology to maximize high-quality instruction.

2. Insufficient4.14 points

Summary irrelevantly describes how the map incorporates the use of improving differentiated instructional strategies, curriculum materials, and technology to maximize high-quality instruction.

1. No Submission0 points

Not addressed.

▼ Strengths and Gaps6 points

Criteria Description

Strengths and Gaps

5. Target6 points

Summary extensively addresses the curriculum strengths supported by evidence-centered research and specifically addresses any gaps in the curriculum.

4. Acceptable5.22 points

Summary clearly addresses the curriculum strengths supported by evidence-centered research and completely addresses any gaps in the curriculum.

3. Approaching4.44 points

Summary inexplicitly addresses the curriculum strengths supported by evidence-centered research and marginally addresses any gaps in the curriculum.

2. Insufficient 4.14 points

Summary poorly addresses the curriculum strengths supported by evidence-centered research and ineffectively addresses any gaps in the curriculum.

1. No Submission 0 points

Not addressed.

▼ **Instructional Resources**

6 points

Criteria Description

Instructional Resources

5. Target 6 points

Summary proficiently addresses instructional resources, including how each supports the curriculum.

4. Acceptable 5.22 points

Summary directly addresses instructional resources, including how each supports the curriculum.

3. Approaching 4.44 points

Summary partially addresses instructional resources, including how each supports the curriculum.

2. Insufficient 4.14 points

Summary inaccurately addresses instructional resources, including how each supports the curriculum.

1. No Submission 0 points

Not addressed.

▼ Vision and Mission

6 points

Criteria Description

Vision and Mission

5. Target	6 points
Summary creatively addresses how the map reflects the school's vision and mission.	
4. Acceptable	5.22 points
Summary properly addresses how the map reflects the school's vision and mission.	
3. Approaching	4.44 points
Summary ambiguously addresses how the map reflects the school's vision and mission.	
2. Insufficient	4.14 points
Summary erroneously addresses how the map reflects the school's vision and mission.	
1. No Submission	0 points
Not addressed.	

▼ Refinement Areas

9 points

Criteria Description

Refinement Areas

5. Target	9 points
Summary expertly addresses the areas needed for refinement.	

7.83 points

3. Approaching

6.66 points

2. Insufficient

6.21 points

1. No Submission

0 points

▼ Organization

6 points

Organization

6 points

4. Acceptable

5.22 points

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.

1. No Submission

0 points

Not addressed.

▼ 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

Not addressed.

▼ 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

Not addressed.

Total 60 points