

TWT Course Assessment Rubric (Spring 2005)

NAME: Mary Martin – TWT Scenario Teacher
Date: April 2, 2005

	F * Score = 0	C Score = 1	B Score = 2	A Score = 3
1. Needs Assessment	<input type="checkbox"/> A “real” need is not evident. The need is not based on student assessment evidence and/or connected to content standards. It is more of a unit description than a needs assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> A real need is identified but the information provided is vague. And/Or evidence of the match between the need and the goal is not strong. The need is based primarily on antidotal comments or general statements.	<input type="checkbox"/> A real need is identified. The need is based on two or more pieces of student assessment evidence and is written with sufficient detail. Quantitative (numeric) assessment information is provided where appropriate. Research based information documenting the need may also be provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> A clear and imminent need is identified. The need is based on two or more pieces of student assessment evidence. The need and assessment evidence is connected to content standards. Both qualitative and quantitative information provide evidence of need. Research based information documenting the need may also be provided.
<p>COMMENTS on Mary Martin’s Unit: Mary Martin’s needs assessment reflects a deficiency in all of the science standards, but she doesn’t explain very well where/how the specific data was collected. Her two year collection of performance-based data and her excellent anecdotal descriptions and examples on the gap of “what is and what needs to be” are very well done. It is clear that her rationale for this unit supports the students’ (gap) inability to meet Science Standard #2. Although Mary Martin is primarily developing a science standards based unit, she is including language arts standards. She should be applauded for reviewing the ND reading assessment scores and connecting the decrease in proficiency to the language arts standards in reading. Her reflection that this is a potential contributing factor to science comprehension as well is commendable.</p>				
2. Enduring Understanding and Essential Questions	<input type="checkbox"/> Enduring understanding statement(s) and essential questions are not included or are not written correctly.	<input type="checkbox"/> Enduring understanding statement(s) and essential questions do not match the guidelines in the curriculum (are too narrow, not “kid friendly,” etc.) and/or lack student appeal.	<input type="checkbox"/> Enduring understanding statement(s) and essential questions are well written, “kid friendly,” and will guide, intrigue and keep the students focused on the unit goal.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Same as the “B” level with an even clearer sense that students will see a vital connection to their learning beyond the classroom.
<p>COMMENTS on Mary Martin’s Unit: The enduring understanding is written to describe what these second graders should remember years and years down the road. The essential questions are written in language that can be easily interpreted by second graders. They align well with the enduring understanding and will make sense to a second grader’s world.</p>				
3. Instructional Goal(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> The goal(s) is not well formed. And/Or there is not a good match between the need and the goal.	<input type="checkbox"/> The instructional goal(s) is not well-formed and/or is written more like a measurable objective or a brief description. And/Or the evidence of the match between the need and the goal is not strong.	<input type="checkbox"/> The goal(s) is generally aligned with the need and well-formed with only minor improvement possibilities.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The goal(s) is aligned with the need and exceptionally well-formed.

COMMENTS on Mary Martin's Unit: Ms. Martin's unit goal is a broad statement which very simply targets the learning. As it should be, her unit goal is a generalized statement and not measurable.

4. Learning Objectives	<input type="checkbox"/> Learning objectives are written incorrectly and/or do not match the instructional goal(s).	<input type="checkbox"/> Learning objectives are appropriately aligned but many are not well-written in terms of verb choice and/or the criteria of audience, behavior, condition, and degree.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Learning objectives are appropriately aligned with very minor improvements needed. May be missing one or two criteria (audience, behavior, condition, degree).	<input type="checkbox"/> Learning objectives are appropriately aligned and are exceptionally well-written to include all necessary criteria (audience, behavior, condition, degree).
-------------------------------	---	--	--	--

COMMENTS on Mary Martin's Unit: Mary Martin really did a nice job in writing the learning objectives. They were appropriately aligned to the learning goals. She made several "good verb" choices (e.g. identify and demonstrate). Each of the objectives identified the audience (student), and the behavior ("gather information on weather") and the criteria ("from given resources") and for the most part, the degree ("A & B area on a rubric"). Including all necessary criteria (audience, behavior, conditions, and degree) would bump this up to an "A" on the rubric score.

There are many good websites on objective writing. Ms. Fields might check out - http://tlt.its.psu.edu/suggestions/research/Write_Objectives.shtml

5. Student Assessments	<input type="checkbox"/> It is unclear how one would determine if the learner achieved the learning objectives.	<input type="checkbox"/> The assessment methods are identified but vague or limited.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple methods of assessment are identified and include some authentic characteristics.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple and authentic assessment methods are identified. There is a learner role in the assessment process.
-------------------------------	---	--	---	---

COMMENTS on Mary Martin's Unit: It is good that the students will be engaged in a variety of assessments. It is not apparent that the students are involved in the development of the assessments. For example, the second grade students could collaboratively assist in the development of a rubric that could be used in the creation of the brochure. Distributing the brochure (final student product) to the community makes this an authentic assessment piece but the lack of description in all of the assessment methods identified gives Ms. Martin a "B."

6. Teaching and Learning Strategies	<input type="checkbox"/> The overall strategies are not identified or do not match the analysis.	<input type="checkbox"/> The overall strategies are identified and appropriate but are not explained in sufficient detail.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The strategies are identified and appropriate. Details on cooperative learning, inquiry-based, problem-based, and/or project-based learning illustrate how these strategies elevate student learning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as the "B" level with increased explanation and examples that illustrate a thorough understanding of the variety of engaged learning strategies.
--	--	--	---	--

COMMENTS on Mary Martin's Unit: Mary Martin describes the strategies used relating to the specific student learning activities, including the inquiry steps in the investigation process (gather, record and discuss). More explanation on the project-based learning steps and why it is used in putting together the brochure would move this score up to the "A" category on the rubric.

7. Developing/ Selecting Instructional Materials/ Activities	<input type="checkbox"/> The instructional materials/activities are not aligned with the instructional goals, objectives and analyses or the quantity is not acceptable.	<input type="checkbox"/> The instructional materials/activities are aligned and minimally acceptable. The explanations are vague or hard to follow. It would be difficult for another teacher to implement this based on the information provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The instructional materials/activities are aligned and the explanations are acceptable. Specifics such as websites used or other examples are provided. Minor improvements could be made by providing more examples, more details on context, grouping, assessment, tools, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> The instructional materials/activities are aligned and the explanations are exceptional. A comprehensive explanation is provided – allowing for easy implementation by another teacher. Specific examples are plentiful within the explanation.
COMMENTS on Mary Martin's Unit: The student learning activities are clearly aligned to the standards, goals, and objectives. They will engage the students in a variety of activities. Mary Martin would raise her score dramatically in this section of the rubric if she would provide more information when describing the student activities. She should ask this question as she describes each activity, "As a teacher, what would provide me with a clear picture of what the students will be doing in this activity?" For example, in Learning Activity #4 the students will "enter and manipulate this data on a spreadsheet." Mary Martin should clearly explain what the students will be doing to manipulate this data.				
8. Implementation, Student Projects, and Review	<input type="checkbox"/> The final unit was not implemented.	<input type="checkbox"/> The unit was implemented and at least one student product is available.	<input type="checkbox"/> The unit was implemented and multiple student products provide a good illustration of the process.	<input type="checkbox"/> Same as "B" level with a "tips" reflection on what worked and what didn't.
COMMENTS on Mary Martin's Unit: Ms. Martin submitted two student products that reflected the skills and learning experienced in the classroom. The brochure that was submitted from the culminating student learning activity was authentic and mirrored the real world. Ms. Martin provided a wonderful reflection in the "High Points, Tips, and Lessons Learned during implementation:" section at the bottom of the template. Clearly, her descriptions will be valued and appreciated by other teachers who may be interested in implementing the unit.				
9. Technology Use and Integration	<input type="checkbox"/> There is little evidence of technology use or integration.	<input type="checkbox"/> The technology use and integration is limited and exists at the entry level.	<input type="checkbox"/> The technology use and integration is appropriate and exists at the adaptation level.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The technology use and integration is exceptional and exists at the transformation level.
COMMENTS on Mary Martin's Unit: Ms. Martin is very appropriately involving her students with technology integration tools that will support their learning. The focus remains on the content and not on the technology. It is integrated in a way that will be engaging for elementary students.				
10. Grammar & Spelling	<input type="checkbox"/> Very frequent grammar and/or spelling errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Six or more errors.	<input type="checkbox"/> Very few errors (5 or less).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All grammar and spelling are correct.
11. Timeliness	<input type="checkbox"/> TWT interim review was never requested or was requested after April 30, 2005 and/or final project submitted more than one week late (after June 10 th).	<input type="checkbox"/> TWT interim review was requested late - between April 7 th and April 30 th , 2005 and/or final project submitted up to one week late (by June 10 th).	<input type="checkbox"/> TWT interim review requested up to two days late (April 6 th) and/or final project submitted up to two days late (on June 4 th or 5 th).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TWT interim review was requested on or before the April 4, 2005 deadline and the final project was submitted on time (on or before June 3 rd).
Total Score	29			

* If a rubric category from rows 1-9 is designated an "F" the entire project is deemed unacceptable.

Grading Guidelines:

A	30-33 points	Consistently Exceptional Performance – All work illustrates the highest quality and is beyond what is assigned in terms of amount and quality.
B	22-29 points	Fully Satisfactory Performance – All assigned work is completed and the quality exceeds the minimum expectations.
C	11-21 points	Minimum Performance – The amount and/or quality of work is less than expected on one or more course deliverables.
F	<11 points	Unacceptable Performance