**ICT 659 – Technology Project Development: Final Project Evaluation Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Intro:** | **Unsatisfactory** | **Developing Skills** | **Proficient** | **Exemplary** |
| Overall Portfolio Construction | Missing and disorganized materials. | Materials mostly organized well. Some disorganization. | Materials presented as required. | Materials are thorough and clearly presented. A consistent visual design is seen. |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Standard:****Design (ISTE 2)** |  |  |  |  |
| Writing | Grammatically poor and difficult to follow. Multiple spelling errors.  | Legibly written and presented  | Clear, uncluttered, and attractive  | Well structured and convincing. Clearly demonstrates planning, no obvious grammatical errors and no spelling mistakes.  |
| Content | Not all standards and dispositions are addressed.  | Most dispositions & standards are addressed, but there is an inconsistent quality of response.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed thoroughly. Links between standards and dispositions are shown to demonstrate synthesis.  |
| Relevance to Standards | Entries have no relation to standards or actual work from each course.  | Entries discuss work in each course and standards, but don't make consistent connections. | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. The connections are supported by specific links to examples from work.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Standard:****Development(ISTE 3)** |  |  |  |  |
| Writing | Grammatically poor and difficult to follow. Multiple spelling errors.  | Legibly written and presented  | Clear, uncluttered, and attractive  | Well structured and convincing. Clearly demonstrates planning, no obvious grammatical errors and no spelling mistakes.  |
| Content | Not all standards and dispositions are addressed.  | Most dispositions & standards are addressed, but there is an inconsistent quality of response.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed thoroughly. Links between standards and dispositions are shown to demonstrate synthesis.  |
| Relevance to Standards | Entries have no relation to standards or actual work from each course.  | Entries discuss work in each course and standards, but don't make consistent connections between.  | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. The connections are supported by specific links to examples from work.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Standard:****Management(ISTE 3)** |  |  |  |  |
| Writing | Grammatically poor and difficult to follow. Multiple spelling errors.  | Legibly written and presented  | Clear, uncluttered, and attractive  | Well structured and convincing. Clearly demonstrates planning, no obvious grammatical errors and no spelling mistakes.  |
| Content | Not all standards and dispositions are addressed.  | Most dispositions & standards are addressed, but there is an inconsistent quality of response.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed thoroughly. Links between standards and dispositions are shown to demonstrate synthesis.  |
| Relevance to Standards | Entries have no relation to standards or actual work from each course.  | Entries discuss work in each course and standards, but don't make consistent connections between.  | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. The connections are supported by specific links to examples from work.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Standard:****Utilization(ISTE 3)** |  |  |  |  |
| Writing | Grammatically poor and difficult to follow. Multiple spelling errors.  | Legibly written and presented  | Clear, uncluttered, and attractive  | Well structured and convincing. Clearly demonstrates planning, no obvious grammatical errors and no spelling mistakes.  |
| Content | Not all standards and dispositions are addressed.  | Most dispositions & standards are addressed, but there is an inconsistent quality of response.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed thoroughly. Links between standards and dispositions are shown to demonstrate synthesis.  |
| Relevance to Standards | Entries have no relation to standards or actual work from each course.  | Entries discuss work in each course and standards, but don't make consistent connections between.  | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. The connections are supported by specific links to examples from work.  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| **Standard:****Evaluation(ISTE 4)** |  |  |  |  |
| Writing | Grammatically poor and difficult to follow. Multiple spelling errors.  | Legibly written and presented  | Clear, uncluttered, and attractive  | Well structured and convincing. Clearly demonstrates planning, no obvious grammatical errors and no spelling mistakes.  |
| Content | Not all standards and dispositions are addressed.  | Most dispositions & standards are addressed, but there is an inconsistent quality of response.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed.  | All dispositions and standards are addressed thoroughly. Links between standards and dispositions are shown to demonstrate synthesis. |
| Relevance to Standards | Entries have no relation to standards or actual work from each course.  | Entries discuss work in each course and standards, but don't make consistent connections between.  | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. | Consistent connections between work and standards are established. The connections are supported by specific links to examples from work.  |

 Comments: