

Clinical Field Experience C: Special Education Teacher Observation and Feedback - Rubric

▼ Collapse All

▼ Summary of Collaboration Experience

7 points

Criteria Description

Summary of Collaboration Experience

5. Target

7 points

Reflection substantially reflects on the collaboration with the mentor of the teacher’s performance including agreed upon ideas for enhancing instructional delivery and student learning outcomes, and how feedback would be delivered in a post-observation conference.

4. Acceptable

6.09 points

Reflection soundly reflects on the collaboration with the mentor of the teacher’s performance including agreed upon ideas for enhancing instructional delivery and student learning outcomes, and how feedback would be delivered in a post-observation conference.

3. Approaching

5.18 points

Reflection shallowly reflects on the collaboration with the mentor of the teacher’s performance including agreed upon ideas for enhancing instructional delivery and student learning outcomes, and how feedback would be delivered in a post-observation conference.

2. Insufficient

4.83 points

Reflection inefficiently reflects on the collaboration with the mentor of the teacher’s performance including agreed upon ideas for enhancing instructional delivery and student learning outcomes, and how feedback would be delivered in a post-observation conference.

▼ Evaluation Tool

7 points

Criteria Description

Evaluation Tool

5. Target

7 points

Reflection includes a thorough examination of the formal evaluation tool, policies regarding how the tool is administered, how ratings are assigned, how and with

whom results are shared, what happens with the results, and if any of these are different for a special education teacher compared to the general educator.

4. Acceptable

6.09 points

Reflection includes a clear examination of the formal evaluation tool, policies regarding how the tool is administered, how ratings are assigned, how and with whom results are shared, what happens with the results, and if any of these are different for a special education teacher compared to the general educator.

3. Approaching

5.18 points

Reflection includes a minimal examination of the formal evaluation tool, policies regarding how the tool is administered, how ratings are assigned, how and with whom results are shared, what happens with the results, and if any of these are different for a special education teacher compared to the general educator.

2. Insufficient

4.83 points

Reflection includes a weak examination of the formal evaluation tool, policies regarding how the tool is administered, how ratings are assigned, how and with whom results are shared, what happens with the results, and if any of these are different for a special education teacher compared to the general educator.

▼ PSEL Standard 5 and Implications for Future Practice

14 points

Criteria Description

PSEL Standard 5 and Implications for Future Practice

5. Target

14 points

Reflection proficiently discusses implications for application as a future practitioner. Elements of PSEL Standard 5 are expertly incorporated into reflection.

4. Acceptable

12.18 points

Reflection logically discusses implications for application as a future practitioner. Elements of PSEL Standard 5 are accurately incorporated into reflection.

3. Approaching

10.36 points

Reflection inexplicitly discusses implications for application as a future practitioner. Elements of PSEL Standard 5 are vaguely addressed.

2. Insufficient

9.66 points

Reflection unrealistically discusses implications for application as a future practitioner. Elements of PSEL Standard 5 are inaccurately addressed.

1. No Submission

0 points

Not addressed.

▼ Organization

3.5 points

Criteria Description

Organization

5. Target

3.5 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

3.05 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

2.59 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

2.42 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

3.5 points

Criteria Description

includes spelling, punctuation, grammar, language use

5. Target

3.5 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

3.05 points

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

3. Approaching

2.59 points

Frequent and repetitive mechanical errors distract the reader. Inconsistencies in language choice (register) or word choice are present. Sentence structure is correct but not varied.

2. Insufficient

2.42 points

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

1. No Submission

0 points

Total 35 points