**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. |
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