Rubric

A unified evaluation rubric across three areas: unit goals and assessment, design for instruction, and analysis of student performance and reflection of teaching.

CRITERIA	BEGINNING	DEVELOPING	PROFICIENT	EXEMPLARY*
SECTION 1 | UNIT GOALS & ASSESSMENT				
UGA 1: Unit Goals KTPS: 1, 4, 5	More than one item is incomplete.	One item is incomplete.	Unit goals are clear with learning outcomes stated in behavioral terms, challenging Bloom's levels, and appropriate for standards and the consideration of students and learners at different levels.	Cites sources to support the appropriateness of learning goals.
UGA 2: Contextual Factors KTPS: 2, 7, 8	Contextual factors are briefly described with minimal implications.	Contextual factors are thoroughly described with 1 important implication per factor.	Thoroughly described contextual factors and implications. Each section has 2 or more important implications for the unit.	Cites data and sources to support contextual factor information and implications.
UGA 3: Pre/Post Assessment KTPS: 1, 4, 5, 6	More than one item is incomplete.	One item is incomplete.	Pre/post assessment aligned to learning goals, standards, and Bloom's level. Appropriate for the grade level. Includes 2 or more assessment types, mastery levels, and scoring tools.	Provides thorough written justification with evidence that the assessment design is reliable and valid. Insert your justification below your pre/post-test table.
SECTION 2 | DESIGN FOR INSTRUCTION				
DI 1: Alignment KTPS: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	Misalignment in more than 1 area.	Misalignment in 1 area. Some omissions or errors.	Unit goals, lesson objectives, targets, Bloom's levels, strategies, and assessments are in complete alignment.	Visual created that demonstrates complete alignment among all instructional parts.
DI 2: Content KTPS: 4, 5, 7, 8	Activity-driven instruction; included minimal content.	Content included but not the focus of lessons, some omissions, or errors.	Content-driven instruction: content is accurate, adequately defined, and scaffolds learners toward attainment of the Unit Goals.	Content-driven instruction: content is in-depth, accurate, clearly defined, and skillfully scaffolds learners toward attainment of the Unit Goals. Cite research-based sources.
DI 3: Cognitive Engagement KTPS: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	Not fully addressing more than 1 area of engagement in daily plans.	Not fully addressing 1 area of engagement in daily plans.	Students are actively involved in high-level thinking tasks, real-world learning, using technology, and a variety of tasks and assessments, as appropriate. Appropriate transitions among strategies.	Engagement tasks are defended by explaining and citing multiple sources of research-based strategies and assessments. Smooth transitions among strategies.
DI 4: Formative Assessment KTPS: 6, 7	Formative assessments included but do not meet validity and reliability standards.	Noted formative assessments; limited variety; most assessments are valid and/or reliable tools with which to document progress toward mastery of the Unit Goals.	Included and adequately described the use of multiple formative assessments; sufficient variety across lessons; assessments are valid and reliable tools with which to document progress toward mastery of the Unit Goals.	Included and fully described the use of multiple formative assessments; significant variety across lessons; all assessments are valid and reliable tools with which to document progress toward mastery of the Unit Goals. Cite research-based sources.
DI 5: Differentiation KTPS: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	Minimal efforts to differentiate.	Several examples of differentiation.	Pre-assessment data and contextual factors are utilized to effectively differentiate daily lesson plans by considering student interests, learning preferences, readiness, and learning environment.	Differentiation methods are defended by explaining and citing multiple sources of research-based techniques.
SECTION 3 | ANALYSIS OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE & REFLECTION OF TEACHING				
ASL 1: Visual Representation of Student Performance KTPS: 1, 2, 6	Missing 2 or more visual representations or visuals do not clearly or accurately communicate data.	All graphs included with minor errors.	Use of technology tools to create all 6 graphs/tables that communicate student learning data legibly and accurately.	Developing a unique chart or graph to enhance analysis.
ASL 2: Analysis of Student Performance Data KTPS: 1, 2, 6	Minimal or unclear analysis of student performance data.	Some analysis of student performance data.	Accurate and logical analysis of the data results to determine the progress of individuals and groups toward learning goals.	Thorough elaboration citing specific and meaningful data beyond the required graphs, data, and student performance.
ASL 3: Instructional Implications from Data/Conclusions KTPS: 1, 2, 5, 6, 7	Minimal or inaccurate conclusions and instructional implications drawn from data or inaccurate data used to draw conclusions.	Some or unclear conclusions and instructional implications drawn from data and reported using both percentages and raw data.	Accurate and meaningful conclusions and instructional implications are drawn from data referencing trends and patterns in student performance and misconceptions of content.	Thorough elaboration and meaningful implications/conclusions drawn beyond the required criteria, referencing a plan for improving instruction.
ASL 4: Identify Teaching Strength and Improvements KTPS: 1, 2, 9	Minimal or inaccurate discussions of strengths and improvements.	Some discussion of teacher's strengths and improvements.	Appropriate, logical, and detailed discussion of 1 of the teacher's strengths and 2 improvements related to student learning.	Includes extra video clip and/or instructional examples showing thorough elaboration and meaningful understanding of strengths and how to improve as a teacher.

**To achieve an Exemplary rating on the rubric, a student must meet all the proficient expectations as well as the items in the Exemplary column.*