TWT Course
Assessment Rubric (Spring 2005)

Name: Scott Simon – TWT Scenario Teacher
Date of Unit Review: April 1, 2005

	F * Score = 0	C Score = 1	B Score = 2	A Score = 3
1. Needs Assessment	☐ 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.	☐ 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.	☐ 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.	☒ 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.

COMMENTS on Scott Simon's Unit: The needs assessment is very well done including both qualitative and quantitative evidence of need, particularly relating to Mr. Simon's English-Language Arts standards. Although Mr. Simon's topic focus is on heroes and relating heroism to responsible citizenship, he seizes the opportunity to formally integrate Language Arts. Mr. Simon did a very good job of using the results of district and state tests and connecting student performance to standards. Although I would have liked to see a little more "evidence" of need regarding the social studies component, Mr. Simon is closer to an "A" than a "B."

	F * Score = 0	C Score = 1	B Score = 2	A Score = 3
2. Enduring Understanding and Essential Questions	☐ Enduring understanding statement(s) and essential questions are not included or are not written correctly.	☐ 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.	☐ 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.	☒ Same as the "B" level with an even clearer sense that students will see a vital connection to their learning beyond the classroom.

COMMENTS on Scott Simon's Unit: The enduring understanding statement is not perfect. It would be better stated as, "Students will relate to the idea that all heroes are not created equal and will be able to discern the positive characteristics of heroes." Mr. Simon's essential questions are very well done – comprehensive, intriguing, and appropriate for the grade level.

	F * Score = 0	C Score = 1	B Score = 2	A Score = 3
3. Instructional Goal(s)	☐ The goal(s) is not well formed. And/Or there is not a good match between the need and the goal.	☐ 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.	☐ The goal(s) is generally aligned with the need and well-formed with only minor improvement possibilities.	☒ The goal(s) is aligned with the need and exceptionally well-formed.

COMMENTS on Scott Simon's Unit: **Mr. Simon's goal for the unit is stated broadly and describes the overall educational target without getting too specific and overlapping with the objectives.**

4. Learning Objectives	☐ Learning objectives are written incorrectly and/or do not match the instructional goal(s).	☐ 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.	☒ Learning objectives are appropriately aligned with very minor improvements needed. May be missing one or two criteria (audience, behavior, condition, degree).	☐ Learning objectives are appropriately aligned and are exceptionally well-written to include all necessary criteria (audience, behavior, condition, degree).

COMMENTS on Scott Simon's Unit: **Mr. Simon made several "good verb" choices (e.g. identify and select). He avoided the use of what are commonly referred to as "bad" verbs that can't be measured such as "students will learn or understand" but did use "students will research" which is more like an activity than an objective. Mr. Simon's objectives include the audience, behavior, and some indication of the degree. An "A" grade on the rubric would require that Mr. Simon change some of the verbs and identify the conditions under which students would perform the objectives--more specificity on the degree or minimum level of acceptability. An example of a re-written objective would be: Given a famous person to research (condition), students (audience) will be able to identify (behavior) at least five characteristics (degree) that make them "famous".**

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

5. Student Assessments	☐ It is unclear how one would determine if the learner achieved the learning objectives.	☒ The assessment methods are identified but vague or limited.	☐ Multiple methods of assessment are identified and include some authentic characteristics.	☐ Multiple and authentic assessment methods are identified. There is a learner role in the assessment process.

COMMENTS on Scott Simon's Unit: **Mr. Simon does not give enough information about his assessment strategies. Examples of quiz questions and/or prompts would help move this to a "B". A more detailed description of the performance task of creating the brochure and the role students will plan in determining the criteria for the brochure would help move this assessment piece to an "A."**

6. Teaching and Learning Strategies	☐ The overall strategies are not identified or do not match the analysis.	☒ The overall strategies are identified and appropriate but are not explained in sufficient detail.	☐ 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.	☐ Same as the "B" level with increased explanation and examples that illustrate a thorough understanding of the variety of engaged learning strategies.

COMMENTS on Scott Simon's Unit: **Although the strategies of problem and inquiry-based learning are appropriate, the explanation on how they are used is vague and could almost apply to any unit. Mr. Simon needs to be more specific - pulling in some of his objectives and discussing how, for example, the use of inquiry-based learning will help students seek knowledge through questioning and investigation. He could be specific about a couple of the open-ended questions he would pose to help direct students in their own investigations of heroes. He could also relate the use of these strategies to his hopes for increase student engagement or self-directedness.**

7. Developing/ Selecting Instructional Materials/ Activities	☐ The instructional materials/activities are not aligned with the instructional goals, objectives and analyses or the quantity is not acceptable.	☐ 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.	☒ 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.	☐ 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 Scott Simon's Unit: Mr. Simon did a fairly nice job of explaining the implementation steps. The activities are aligned with Mr. Simon's objectives and what we know from the assessment area. The activity descriptions are fairly comprehensive and include examples, including a link to a specific resource. Being more descriptive in some of the activities would bump this up to an "A." For example, in Activity #6 more explanation on the planning steps and some of the potential community service projects would be helpful to understand the depth and scope of the activity.

8. Implementation, Student Projects, and Review	☐ The final unit was not implemented.	☐ The unit was implemented and at least one student product is available.	☐ The unit was implemented and multiple student products provide a good illustration of the process.	☒ Same as "B" level with a "tips" reflection on what worked and what didn't.

COMMENTS on Scott Simon's Unit: Mr. Simon submitted two student products that reflected the skills and learning experienced in the classroom. The student products (brochure and pamphlet) that were submitted from the culminating student learning activity were authentic and mirrored the real world. Mr. Simon provided a wonderful reflection in the "High Points, Tips, and Lessons Learned during implementation:" section at the bottom of the template. Clearly, his tips will be valued and appreciated by other teachers who may be interested in implementing the unit.

9. Technology Use and Integration	☐ There is little evidence of technology use or integration.	☐ The technology use and integration is limited and exists at the entry level.	☐ The technology use and integration is appropriate and exists at the adaptation level.	☒ The technology use and integration is exceptional and exists at the transformation level.

COMMENTS on Scott Simon's Unit: Mr. Simon has integrated technology in such a way that it facilitates the use of his identified teaching and learning strategies and supports student achievement of the unit objectives and standards. Technology is a tool that supports the unit content and is not pulled out as a focus of the unit.

10. Grammar & Spelling	☐ Very frequent grammar and/or spelling errors.	☐ Six or more errors.	☐ Very few errors (5 or less).	☒ All grammar and spelling are correct.
11. Timeliness	☐ 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 10th).	☐ TWT interim review was requested late - between April 7th and April 30th, 2005 and/or final project submitted up to one week late (by June 10th).	☐ TWT interim review requested up to two days late (April 6th) and/or final project submitted up to two days late (on June 4th or 5th).	☒ 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 3rd).
Total Score	**27**			

* 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**