

Evaluation Rubric for Action Assignment Project in EDSP 675

Name: _____ Semester: _____

Program: _____

| Part 1 – Introduction to the Learner and the Instructional Needs (CEC 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences; CEC 2: Learning Environments; CEC 3: Curricular Content Knowledge; CEC 4: Assessment; CEC 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies) | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| Component | Proficient | Acceptable | Emerging | Unacceptable |
| Description of Learner and Instructional Needs CEC ISCI 1.K2, K3, K10, K13; CEC IGC-IIC.1.K4, K10 | Candidate provides detailed demographic and background information, including pertinent cultural and familial information, related to the target learner’s educational needs and abilities. Candidate accurately discusses the educational impact of the learner’s current instructional needs, attitude, interests, values, and behavior and the effect these conditions can have on the education and life of a learner with a disability. Candidate explicitly justifies the need for the development of goals and instructional intervention by providing specific examples. (7 - 8 points) | Candidate provides demographic and background information, including pertinent cultural and familial information, related to the target learner’s educational needs and abilities. Candidate accurately discusses the educational impact of the learner’s disability and current instructional needs, interests, and behaviors and the effect these conditions can have on the education of a learner with a disability. Candidate explicitly justifies the need for the development of goals and instructional intervention. (5-6 points) | Candidate provides limited demographic and background information related to the target learner’s educational needs. Candidate does not accurately discuss the educational impact of the learner’s disability and current instructional needs, interests, and behaviors. Candidate does not explicitly justify the need for the development of goals and instructional intervention. (3-4 points) | Candidate provides limited demographic and background information related to the target learner’s educational needs. Candidate does not discuss the educational impact of the learner’s disability and current instructional needs, interests, and behaviors. Candidate does not justify the need for the development of goals and instructional intervention. (0-2 points) |
| Baseline Assessment Information CEC ISCI 4. S1, S2, S4, S5 | Candidate provides copies of baseline assessment data, provides a narrative that interprets the data, and discusses implications for instruction. (7-8 points) | Candidate provides copies of baseline assessment data, provides a narrative that interprets the data, and discusses the implications for instruction. (5-6 points) | Baseline data is not complete or not clearly tied to the specific skill targeted for intervention. The interpretive narrative is limited or there are inaccuracies. (3-4 points) | Current baseline data is not provided for the specific skill targeted for intervention. Only general statements indicating need are provided. (0-2 points) |
| Instructional Environment CEC ISCI 2. K1, IIGC-IIC 2. K3, K3 | Candidate describes the student’s current learning environments, including the demands of the learning environments and the interaction of the learner’s characteristics with factors such as curriculum expectations, teaching styles, daily routines, and peer interactions. A description of the setting for the intended instructional intervention is provided and if different than the current learning environment, a valid explanation of why a different setting must be used is included. (4 points) | Candidate describes the student’s current learning environments, including the demands of the learning environments and the interaction of the learner’s characteristics with factors such as curriculum expectations, teaching styles, daily routines, and peer interactions. A description of the setting for the intended instructional intervention is provided. (3 points) | Candidate describes the learner’s current learning environments and provides a general description of the interaction of the learner’s characteristics with the learning environment. A description of the setting for the intended instructional intervention is provided. (2 points) | Candidate describes the learner’s current learning environments but does not address the interaction of the learner’s characteristics with the environment. A description of the setting for the intended instructional intervention is not included. (0-1 point) |

| Part 1 (continued) – Introduction to the Learner and the Instructional Needs (CEC 1: Learner Development and Individual Learning Differences; CEC 2: Learning Environments; CEC 3: Curricular Content Knowledge; CEC 4: Assessment; CEC 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies) | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| Component | Proficient | Acceptable | Emerging | Unacceptable |
| Instructional Intervention Goals CEC ISCI 3. K2, K3, S1; ISCI 5.S5 | Candidate considers the general curriculum and prioritizes the learning needs of the learner with a disability by developing an age and ability appropriate instructional goal and corresponding measurable objectives for the instructional intervention in the areas of literacy or math. Goal and objectives reflect an understanding of the curriculum standards, scope and sequence, and the goal’s importance for the student. Candidate describes the rationale for the instructional goal, including the learner’s characteristics, prior learning rates, and intervention duration. (4 points) | Candidate considers the general curriculum and prioritizes the learning needs of the learner with a disability by developing an age and ability appropriate instructional goal and corresponding measurable objectives for this instructional intervention in the areas of literacy or math. Goal and objectives reflect an understanding of the curriculum standards, scope and sequence, and the goal’s importance for the student. (3 points) | Candidate sets an instructional goal and corresponding measurable objectives for this instructional intervention in the areas of literacy or math, but may not clearly show consideration of the general curriculum or prioritized learning needs. (2 points) | Candidate sets an instructional goal and corresponding objectives for this instructional intervention in the areas of literacy or math, but may not clearly show consideration of the general curriculum or prioritized learning needs. Goals and objectives are not stated in measurable terms. (0-1 point) |
| Part 2 – Instructional Intervention Planning (CEC 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies) | | | | |
| Component | Proficient | Acceptable | Emerging | Unacceptable |
| Justification for Selected Instructional Intervention through Literature Review CEC ISCI 5.K2, S6; IGC-IIC 5.K1, K3, S1, S23, S24 | Candidate is able to draw logical connections from research to practice and select appropriate evidence-based practices and programs/research-based practices and programs to meet the identified need. Candidate identifies and synthesizes at least three primary research studies that have shown positive effects for possible instructional approaches/methods with students whose characteristics and needs are similar to the target learner’s identified instructional needs. Candidate also identifies, summarizes, and correctly utilizes other scholarly sources to justify the selected instructional intervention (e.g., meta-analyses, literature reviews, professional organization reviews of practices), demonstrating a strong ability to interpret educational research and scholarly literature and make the research-to-practice connection. (27 - 30 points) | Candidate is able to draw logical connections from research to practice and select appropriate evidence-based practices and programs/research-based practices and programs to meet the identified need. Candidate identifies and synthesizes at least three primary research studies that have shown positive effects for possible instructional approaches/methods with students whose characteristics and needs are similar to the target learner’s identified instructional needs. Candidate shows an ability to interpret educational research and scholarly literature and use those to make decisions about practice. (21 – 26 points) | Candidate is able to draw logical connections from research to practice and select appropriate evidence-based practices and programs/research-based practices and programs to meet the identified need. Candidate identifies and synthesizes only one or two primary research studies that have shown positive effects for possible instructional approaches/methods with students whose characteristics and needs are similar to the target learner’s identified instructional needs, or the articles selected do not represent educational research (e.g., a program description or practitioner article), or candidate shows a limited ability to interpret educational research and scholarly literature and use those to make decisions about practice. (15-20 points) | Candidate is unable to draw logical connections from research to practice and select appropriate evidence-based practices and programs/research-based practices and programs to meet the identified need. Candidate does not identify any primary research studies that have shown positive effects for possible instructional approaches/methods with learners whose characteristics and needs are similar to the target learner’s identified instructional needs, or candidate’s selected intervention is not related to the literature review provided. (0-15 points) |

| Part 2 (continued)– Instructional Intervention Planning (CEC 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies) | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| Component | Proficient | Acceptable | Emerging | Unacceptable |
| <p>Planning for Instruction</p> <p>For all: CEC ISCI 5.S5, S8, S9, S10, S11; IGC-IIC 5. S1</p> <p>For math interventions: IGC-IIC 5.K6, S5</p> <p>For literacy interventions: IGC-IIC 5.K11. S4, S14, S15, S16, S17, S18, S19, S20</p> | <p>Candidate provides a clear and concise summary the chosen instructional method or intervention approach and provides a rationale for its choice. Candidate provides a table outlining at least 10 instructional sessions designed to enable the target learner to progress toward the instructional goal and objectives. Candidate provides one complete, detailed daily lesson plan in an appropriate format and attaches instructional materials. Candidate provides a published fidelity of implementation checklist, if one already exists, or creates a checklist if one does not already exist that reflects the key components of the intervention and elements of effective explicit instruction. (27 – 30 points)</p> | <p>Candidate provides a summary the chosen instructional method or intervention approach and provides a rationale for its choice. Candidate provides a table outlining at least 10 instructional sessions designed to enable the target learner to progress toward the instructional goal and objectives. Candidate provides one complete, detailed daily lesson plan in an appropriate format and attaches instructional materials. Candidate provides a published fidelity of implementation checklist, if one already exists, or creates a checklist if one does not already exist that reflects the key components of the intervention and elements of effective explicit instruction. (21-26 points)</p> | <p>Candidate provides a summary of the chosen instructional approach, but may not include a logical rationale for its choice, or vice versa, or the summary or rationale are not clearly understood as written. Candidate provides a table outlining at least 10 instructional sessions. There may be some errors in application of the instructional method or intervention approach that need to be revised in order to reflect appropriate implementation. Candidate may need to supply additional information in order for the reader to clearly understand the gist of the instructional sessions. Candidate provides one daily lesson plan, but may need to clarify specific components or has left out one or two required components in the lesson plan format. Candidate provides a fidelity of implementation checklist, but the list does not reflect <i>all</i> of the key components. (15-20 points)</p> | <p>Candidate does not provide a summary of the chosen instructional method or intervention approach, and does not provide a rationale for its choice. Candidate provides a table outlining instructional sessions, but there may be significant errors in application of the instructional method or intervention approach. The lesson plan provided does not include sufficient detail to allow someone unfamiliar with the intervention to know how to implement it, or the lesson plan is not provided. A fidelity of implementation checklist is not provided. (0-15 points)</p> |
| Part 3 – Implementation, Results and Reflection (CEC 2: Learning Environments; CEC 4: Assessment; CEC 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies; CEC 6: Professional Learning and Ethical Practices) | | | | |
| Component | Proficient | Acceptable | Emerging | Unacceptable |
| <p>Implementation of Selected Instructional Intervention</p> <p>CEC IGC-IIC 5.S1, S4, S5, S6, S11, S14, S15, S16, S17, S18, S19, S20 (depending upon math or literacy focus) ISCI 2 S7</p> | <p>Candidate submits a video of one instructional session. Candidate provides instruction that is clearly aligned with the planned intervention. High fidelity of implementation of the program or practice is evident. Components of effective explicit instruction are evidenced. Professional characteristics and positive rapport with learners are evidenced and support effective instruction. (14 -16 points)</p> | <p>Candidate submits a video of one instructional session. Candidate provides instruction that is clearly aligned with the planned intervention. Fidelity of implementation of the program or practice is evident. Components of effective explicit instruction are evidenced, but one or two aspects could improve. Professional characteristics and positive rapport with learners are evidenced and support good instruction. (11 -13 points)</p> | <p>Candidate submits a video of one instructional session, but clarity of picture or sound is poor. Candidate provides instruction that is somewhat aligned with the planned intervention, but fidelity of implementation needs improvement. Components of effective explicit instruction need significant improvement or there are aspects of interactions with learners that are not productive or supportive of positive growth. (8-10 points)</p> | <p>Candidate does not submit a video of an instructional session or the video is unable to be viewed at all in the format submitted. OR The instruction provided is not matched to the planned intervention, and fidelity of implementation is so weak that the intervention cannot be expected to produce positive outcomes. Significant improvement in explicit instruction and rapport with learners is needed. (0-7 points)</p> |

| Part 3 (continued) – Implementation, Results and Reflection (CEC 2: Learning Environments; CEC 4: Assessment; CEC 5: Instructional Planning and Strategies; CEC 6: Professional Learning and Ethical Practices) (continued) | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|--|
| Component | Proficient | Acceptable | Emerging | Unacceptable |
| <p>Assessment: Data Collection and Interpretation</p> <p>ISCI.4.S2, S3, S4, S8, S9</p> <p>IGC-IIC.4.S3; IGC-IIC.5.S12</p> | <p>The plan for data collection and progress monitoring is implemented correctly. Technology is used to create a data display that allows easy interpretation of progress or lack of progress. Adjustments to the instructional intervention plan have been made, if made, in response to progress monitoring data. Daily reflections on implementation and student participation and performance are added to the 10 day overview table. Copies of student work samples are included. Candidate reflects appropriately on the student's progress. (18 - 20 points)</p> | <p>The plan for data collection and progress monitoring is implemented correctly. Technology is used to create a data display that allows easy interpretation of progress or lack of progress. Daily reflections on implementation and student participation and performance are added to the 10 day overview table. Copies of student work samples are included. Candidate reflects appropriately on the student's progress. (14-17 points)</p> | <p>The plan for data collection and progress monitoring is implemented correctly. Technology is used to create a data display, but the format does not allow for easy interpretation of progress or lack of progress. Daily reflections on implementation and student participation and performance may not be added to the 10 day overview table. Copies of student work samples may not be included. (10-13 points)</p> | <p>The plan for data collection and progress monitoring is implemented. Technology is not used to create a data display, nor does data presented allow for easy interpretation of progress or lack of progress. Daily reflections on implementation and student participation and performance are not added to the 10 day overview table and/or copies of student work samples are not be included. (0-9 points)</p> |
| <p>Reflections</p> <p>CEC ISCI 6. S9, S11, S13; IGC-IIC 6.S2</p> | <p>Candidate correctly and thoroughly analyzes and evaluates the instructional goal and methods. Candidate discusses how results may be used to modify future instruction for the specific learner and future instruction by the candidate in general. Self-evaluation shows evidence of deep reflection and identifies strengths and areas for improvement in the candidate's implementation of the evidence-based instruction and effective explicit instruction. (18 - 20 points)</p> | <p>Candidate analyzes and evaluates the instructional goal and methods in appropriate manner. Candidate discusses how results will be used to modify future instruction for the specific learner(s). Self-evaluation shows evidence of deep reflection and identifies strengths and areas for improvement in one's implementation of the evidence-based instruction. (14-17 points)</p> | <p>Candidate analyzes and evaluates the instructional goal and methods, but discussion is not thorough or shows some inaccuracies. Candidate discusses how results will be used to modify future instruction for the specific learner(s). Self-evaluation shows minimal reflection or does not identify strengths and areas for improvement in the candidate's implementation of the evidence-based instruction. (10-13 points)</p> | <p>Candidate does not analyze and evaluate the instructional goal or methods. Candidate does not discuss how results will be used to modify future instruction for the specific learner(s). Self-evaluation is missing. (0-9 points)</p> |
| <p>Professional Writing Skills</p> <p>CEC ISCI 6. S8</p> | <p>The final paper is submitted in a format that is professional in appearance. APA Style for manuscript structure, clear and concise writing, mechanics of style, and crediting of sources is adhered to throughout the paper. (9-10 points)</p> | <p>The final paper is submitted in a format that is professional in appearance. APA Style for manuscript structure, clear and concise writing, mechanics of style, and crediting of sources is adhered to throughout the paper, although minor errors may exist that do not interfere with communication of ideas (no more than 5 errors). (7-8 points)</p> | <p>The final paper is submitted in a format that is professional in appearance. APA Style for manuscript structure, clear and concise writing, mechanics of style, and crediting of sources is adhered to in portions of the paper, while other portions require significant editing so that communication of ideas is not impaired. (5-6 points)</p> | <p>The final paper is submitted in a format that is not professional in appearance, or extensive editing for APA Style is required. Errors in manuscript structure, clear and concise writing, mechanics of style, and crediting of sources interfere are extensive. (0-4 points)</p> |

First draft score for Part 1: _____/24

Final submission score for Part 1: _____/24 (first draft and final submission averaged)

First draft score for Part 2: _____/60

Final submission score for Part 2: _____/60 (first draft and final submission averaged)

Total Score for Project: _____/150 points

Overall Rating for Project: _____

Comments: