

▼ Character Education Based on Key Research

30 points

Criteria Description

Character Education Based on Key Research

5. Target

30 points

Key research expertly shows the effectiveness of character education programs for improving student outcomes.

4. Acceptable

26.1 points

Key research credibly and correctly shows the effectiveness of character education programs for improving student outcomes.

3. Approaching

22.2 points

Key research vaguely shows the effectiveness of character education programs for improving student outcomes.

2. Insufficient

20.7 points

Key research irrelevantly shows the effectiveness of character education programs for improving student outcomes.

▼ Rationale Supports Mission and Vision

30 points

Criteria Description

Rationale Supports Mission and Vision

5. Target

30 points

Rationale for the proposed character education program meaningfully supports the mission and vision of the school.

4. Acceptable

26.1 points

Rationale for the proposed character education program appropriately supports the mission and vision of the school.

3. Approaching

22.2 points

Rationale for the proposed character education program minimally supports the mission and vision of the school.

2. Insufficient

20.7 points

Rationale for the proposed character education program fails to adequately support the mission and vision of the school.

▼ **Original Graphic of Character Traits**

15 points

Criteria Description

Original Graphic of Character Traits

5. Target

15 points

Graphic of character traits included in the program is innovative and meaningful.

4. Acceptable

13.05 points

Graphic of character traits included in the program is original and detailed.

3. Approaching

11.1 points

Graphic of character traits included in the program is somewhat original, but lacking precision.

2. Insufficient

10.35 points

Graphic of character traits included in the program is not original or not related to the program.

1. No Submission

0 points

▼ **Explanation of Program Rigor (B)**

30 points

Criteria Description

Explanation of Program Rigor (C2.2)

5. Target

30 points

Explanation of the comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent manner in which character development is addressed at each grade level is thorough.

4. Acceptable

26.1 points

Explanation of the comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent manner in which character development is addressed at each grade level is clear and concise.

3. Approaching

22.2 points

Explanation of the comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent manner in which character development is addressed at each grade level is overly simplistic

2. Insufficient

20.7 points

Explanation of the comprehensive, rigorous, and coherent manner in which character development is addressed at each grade level is incoherent.

1. No Submission

0 points

Not addressed.

▼ Goals of Program

30 points

Criteria Description

Goals of Program

5. Target

30 points

Description of goals for the program is well-crafted for students and the evaluative data sources that would demonstrate if those goals are met is comprehensive.

4. Acceptable

26.1 points

Description of goals for the program is appropriate for student and the evaluative data sources that would demonstrate if those goals are met is complete.

3. Approaching

22.2 points

Description of goals for the program is missing key details and the evaluative data sources that would demonstrate if those goals are met is ambiguous.

2. Insufficient

20.7 points

Description of goals for the program is incomplete and fails to include or includes irrelevant evaluative data sources that would demonstrate if those goals are met is unconvincing.

1. No Submission

0 points

Not addressed.

▼ Evaluation and Stakeholder Support (B)

30 points

Criteria Description

Evaluation and Stakeholder Support (C1.4)

5. Target

30 points

Explanation of how school progress in the program would be evaluated is in-depth and professional, and how school stakeholders could support the program thought-provoking..

4. Acceptable

26.1 points

Explanation of how school progress in the program would be evaluated is logical and effective, and how school stakeholders could support the program realistic.

3. Approaching

22.2 points

Explanation of how school progress in the program would be evaluated is lacking detail and how school stakeholders could support the program superficial.

2. Insufficient

20.7 points

Explanation of how school progress in the program would be evaluated is insufficient and how school stakeholders could support the program unrealistic.

1. No Submission

0 points

Not addressed.

▼ Comparison to Other Programs (B)

30 points

Criteria Description

Comparison to Other Programs (C6.2)

5. Target

30 points

Comparison to other character education programs convincingly demonstrates how selected program best supports the school's vision and mission and meets students' current needs.

4. Acceptable

26.1 points

Comparison to other character education programs appropriately demonstrates how selected program best supports the school's vision and mission and meets students' current needs.

3. Approaching

22.2 points

Comparison to other character education programs vaguely demonstrates how selected program best supports the school's vision and mission and meets students' current needs.

2. Insufficient

20.7 points

Comparison to other character education programs does not demonstrate how selected program best supports the school's vision and mission and meets students' current needs.

▼ Steps to Take as Principal to Implement Program

30 points

Criteria Description

Steps to Take as Principal to Implement Program

5. Target

30 points

Steps taken as a principal to implement the character education program are specific and include in-depth obstacles. Management of uncertainty, risk, competing initiatives, and politics of change are substantially considered.

4. Acceptable

26.1 points

Steps taken as a principal to implement the character education program are concise. Steps include noteworthy obstacles. Management of uncertainty, risk, competing initiatives and politics of change are directly considered.

3. Approaching

22.2 points

Steps taken as a principal to implement the character education program are lacking detail. Steps include unclear considerations of obstacles and management of uncertainty and risk.

2. Insufficient

20.7 points

Steps taken as a principal to implement the character education program are inadequate or unconvincing.

▼ Description of Goals for the Program

30 points

Criteria Description

Description of Goals for the Program

5. Target

30 points

Description of goals for the program includes comprehensive evaluative data sources that persuasively demonstrate how goals are met.

4. Acceptable

26.1 points

Description of goals for the program includes measurable evaluative data sources that solidly demonstrate how goals are met.

3. Approaching

22.2 points

Description of goals for the program includes incomplete evaluative data sources that are missing key details needed to demonstrate goals are met.

2. Insufficient

20.7 points

Description of goals for the program fails to include or includes irrelevant evaluative data sources.

1. No Submission

0 points

▼ Visual Appeal

15 points

Criteria Description

Visual Appeal

5. Target

15 points

The slide digital presentation is visually pleasing for the audience. There is a good variety and use of graphics, colors, and fonts. The arrangement of material is logically organized for presentation.

4. Acceptable

13.05 points

Thematic graphic elements are used, but not always in context. Visual connections mostly contribute to the understanding of concepts, ideas, and relationships. Differences in type size or color are used well and consistently.

3. Approaching

11.1 points

Minimal use of graphic elements is evident. Elements do not consistently contribute to the understanding of concepts, ideas, and relationships. There is some variation in type size, color, and layout.

2. Insufficient

10.35 points

There are few or no graphic elements. No variation in layout or typography is evident.

▼ Mechanics of Writing

15 points

Criteria Description

includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, language use

5. Target

15 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

13.05 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

11.1 points

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

2. Insufficient

10.35 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

15 points

Criteria Description

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

5. Target

15 points

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

4. Acceptable

13.05 points

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

3. Approaching

11.1 points

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

2. Insufficient

10.35 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 300 points