

FSEHD Professional Impact Project for Advanced Programs (PIP) Grading Rubric for SPED 648 Fall 2010

question/criteria there are three possible ratings. So for each question/criteria you will earn one of the ratings below as a breakdown of points for each rating are as follows:

<u>Unacceptable</u>	<u>Acceptable</u>	<u>Target</u>
0 – 7.9 points	8 – 8.9 points	9 – 10 points

After each question/criteria has been rated and given a point value, the total number of points earned for the PIP will be calculated. Your final PIP grade will be based on the following scoring:

Below Standard	Below 140 points = D+ 140 - 145 points = C- 146 - 153 points = C 154 - 159 points = C+
Meets Standard	160 - 165 points = B- 166 - 173 points = B 174 - 179 points = B+
Exceeds Standard	180 - 185 points = A- Over points 185 = A

To calculate your numerical grade for the final PIP grade = I will take your point total and divide by 20 and then move the decimal point over to the right one digit.

e.g. You score a 178 = B+ $178 / 20 = 8.9 = 89\% = B+$

PHASE 1: The candidate reviews relevant literature, contextual factors, and views of constituent(s) to define an area targeted for growth.

<p>PHASE 1 DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH</p>	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>What has caused the candidate to focus on this particular area targeted for growth? Domain-Specific Knowledge</p>	<p>Although an area targeted for growth is identified and described, the candidate's statement is too broad or the description fails to establish the importance of the targeted area</p>	<p>The candidate identifies and describes relevant area targeted for growth with reasonable explanation of its importance</p>	<p>The candidate identifies and describes relevant area targeted for growth with significant detail as to importance, including the scope and impact of the area targeted for growth</p>
<p>What professional literature informs the area targeted for growth? Information Literacy</p>	<p>The candidate selects literature from unreliable sources or the literature does not support the stated aim of the impact project</p>	<p>The candidate's literature review reflects relevant, reliable, appropriate professional literature. It identifies several ideas, variables or constructs related to the area targeted for growth, supporting the aim of the impact project.</p>	<p>The candidate's literature review integrates critical and logical details from appropriate professional literature. It identifies important ideas, variables, or constructs related to the area targeted for growth, supporting the aim of the impact project. Attention is given to different perspectives, conditions, and threats to validity.</p>
<p>What data sources support that this is an area targeted for growth in the proposed setting? Contextual Perspective</p>	<p>The candidate's description of data sources is limited or incomplete; lacks relevance to the aim of the impact project, or fails to consider key community, school, or constituent factors.</p>	<p>The candidate identifies data sources that account for some, general community, school, and constituent factors and identifies at least 1 viable approach for working with constituents.</p>	<p>The candidate identifies data sources that account for multiple community, school, and constituent factors, both general and specific; considers viable approaches for working with constituents, including constituent skills and prior understandings</p>

9 - 10 points
9.75

9 - 10 points

9 - 10 points

PHASE I DEFINE AREA TARGETED FOR GROWTH	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>Does the candidate consider input from constituent(s) when defining the area targeted for growth?</p> <p><i>Contextual Perspective</i></p> <p>Based on the professional literature, the proposed setting, and constituent input, what do you hope to learn as a result of doing this Professional Impact Project?</p> <p><i>Information Literacy</i></p>	<p>The candidate does not provide an effective argument for the likelihood of the project's benefit to the constituent(s), or has failed to consider possible negative effects to the constituent(s).</p> <p>The candidate has not provided reasonable opportunities for the constituent(s) to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate provides a reasonable argument for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s) with no to minimal negative impact.</p> <p>The candidate provides reasonable evidence of constituents' opportunities to contribute to the aims and/or design of the project.</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate provides a compelling argument for the likelihood that the impact project will benefit the constituent(s), with no to minimal negative impact.</p> <p>The candidate provides substantial evidence that the constituent(s) have either contributed or had multiple opportunities to contribute to the project's aims and/or design.</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9.5</p>
<p>The candidate is unable to connect professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p> <p>Proposed area of study is inappropriate given the professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate applies and integrates a limited amount of professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p> <p>Proposed area of study is supported by professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate effectively applies and integrates professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input to the intended area of study.</p> <p>Proposed area of study is clearly and succinctly stated and linked to the professional literature, contextual data, and constituent input.</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9.5</p>	

PHASE II: The candidate uses information from the contextual factors, literature, and data that impact constituent(s) to set goals, design an action plan, and assess impact.

PHASE II PLAN OF ACTION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>What is the action plan? <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>The candidate's description of planned action is unclear, lacking sufficient detail, or is missing key components such as scope, duration, or intended outcomes</p> <p>The candidate's rationale is unclear or does not indicate potential to have significant impact on constituent(s)</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's description of planned action is clear and includes scope, duration, and intended outcomes</p> <p>The candidate's rationale for action is clear and supports the potential for significant impact on constituent(s)</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's description of planned action is very clearly stated, detailed and includes well-targeted scope, duration, and intended outcomes</p> <p>The candidate's rationale for the action's potential to significantly impact constituent(s) is strong and clearly stated.</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p>
<p>What factors were used to select or design the action? <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making.</i></p>	<p>The candidate's selection/design of planned action fails to account for key contextual factors or possible limitations or constraints</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's selection/design of planned action reflects more than one key contextual factor and acknowledges any significant limitations or constraints</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's selection/design of planned action reflects multiple, highly relevant contextual factors and acknowledges possible limitations and constraints</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p>
<p>Does the action plan demonstrate understanding of the area targeted for growth? <i>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</i></p>	<p>One or more of the candidate's goals are unclear, of marginal significance, or inappropriate for constituent(s)</p> <p>One or more of the candidate's goals are not aligned with best practice or professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>One or more of the candidate's goals are not aligned with the stated parameters of the action plan</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's key goals are clear, significant, and appropriate for constituent(s)</p> <p>The candidate's key goals are aligned with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>The candidate's key goals are aligned with stated parameters of the action plan</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>All of the candidate's goals are clear, significant, and highly appropriate for constituent(s)</p> <p>All of the candidate's goals are clearly aligned with best practice and professional standards, as appropriate</p> <p>All of the candidate's goals are clearly aligned with stated parameters of the action plan</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p>

PHASE II PLAN OF ACTION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>Does the action plan include valid and reliable measures to assess the impact of the action?</p> <p>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>Some of the candidate's assessment criteria are not clear or are not linked to goals</p> <p>The candidate's assessment measures are not valid and/or reliable</p> <p>The candidate's assessment relies on one or more limited measures that are not consistent with goals, contextual factors, and constituent needs and/or do not support intended action.</p>	<p>The candidate's key assessment criteria are clear and linked to goals</p> <p>The candidate's assessment measures appear to be valid and reliable</p> <p>The candidate measures impact through one to two modes and approaches that are consistent with goals, contextual factors, and constituent needs and appropriate to the action</p>	<p>All of the candidate's assessment criteria are clear and explicitly linked to goals</p> <p>The candidate provides strong evidence of validity and reliability of assessment measures</p> <p>The candidate measures impact through multiple modes and approaches that are consistent with goals, contextual factors, and constituent needs and appropriate to the action</p>
<p>Does the proposed action demonstrate consideration of constituent(s)' needs/viewpoints?</p> <p>Diversity of Practice</p>	<p>The candidate's action plan does not solicit or support constituent(s)' views, needs or concerns</p> <p>The candidate's action plan includes few or no adaptations or modifications designed to meet the needs of constituent(s)</p>	<p>The candidate's action plan reflects consideration for constituent(s)' views, needs and concerns, as appropriate during key phases of the action.</p> <p>The candidate's action plan identifies adaptations and/or modifications to meet the needs of most constituent(s)</p>	<p>The candidate's action plan encourages active engagement with constituent(s)' views, needs and concerns, as appropriate throughout the plan of action</p> <p>The candidate's action plan clearly identifies adaptations and/or modifications to meet the identified needs of all constituent(s)</p>
	<p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>9 - 10 points 9.5</p>
	<p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>9 - 10 points 9.5</p>

PHASE III: The candidate implements an action plan aligned with specific goals and constituent characteristics and needs and with strong consideration of contextual factors.

PHASE III IMPLEMENTATION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>What is the nature of the alignment/fidelity of actions with the action plan?</p> <p>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>The candidate provides little to no evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as outlined in the action plan.</p> <p>The candidate provides little to no evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as intended.</p> <p>The candidate provides some evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that the key elements of the action plan (procedures, methods, measures, timeframes) were implemented as intended.</p> <p>The candidate provides detailed evidence that s/he applied competent professional judgment regarding key elements of the action plan.</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p>
<p>Is the action plan implemented with respect to constituent(s)' needs/viewpoints?</p> <p>Evidence-Based Decision-Making or Diversity of Practice?</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action does not integrate constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints in any systematic way</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action integrates constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints throughout most of the implementation of the action plan</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>Candidate implementation of the action systematically integrates constituent(s)' expressed needs/viewpoints throughout implementation of the action plan</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p>
<p>Are adequate data collected and presented in a systematic way?</p> <p>Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>Candidate data collection is not systematic and/or missing data or modification of data collection plan are not accounted for.</p> <p>Candidate represents data inaccurately or in a manner that is not understandable to the intended audience.</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>Candidate systematically collects adequate data and accounts for any missing data or modification of data collection plan.</p> <p>Candidate accurately represents data in a manner understandable to the intended audience.</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>Candidate systematically collects comprehensive data and thoroughly accounts for any missing data or modification of data collection plan.</p> <p>Candidate accurately provides multiple representations of data in a manner understandable to the intended audience.</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p> <p>9.5</p>

PHASE III IMPLEMENTATION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>Is data analysis appropriate to address the questions asked or area targeted for growth investigated? Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>The candidate's data analysis fails to address indicated questions or area targeted for growth</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's data analysis generally addresses the questions or area targeted for growth investigated</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's data analysis directly addresses the questions asked or area targeted for growth investigated in a meaningful way</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p>
<p>Is data analysis thorough and accurate? Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>The candidate's data analysis is limited or flawed</p> <p>0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's data analysis is adequate with no major errors</p> <p>8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's data analysis is comprehensive and accurate.</p> <p>9 - 10 points</p>

PHASE IV: The candidate uses assessment data to evaluate impact on constituent(s) regarding constituent progress and achievement. The candidate also evaluates the overall effectiveness of implementation on constituent(s) in order to improve his/her own practice long-term.

PHASE IV EVALUATE IMPACT	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>Do the candidate's actions contribute to improving the area targeted for growth in a significant way? Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>Candidate fails to include evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s). 0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>Candidate includes some evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s). 8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>Candidate includes clear evidence of intended and unintended impact(s) of the action plan on the area(s) targeted for growth in terms of degree to which constituent(s) achieved and made progress toward goal(s). 9 - 10 points</p>
<p>What is the relationship between the findings and the research literature/professional best practice? Information Literacy?</p>	<p>Candidate includes poor/limited discussion of the relationship between his/her findings and the research literature or professional best practice; OR the research literature/professional best practice discussed is of little relevance to the candidate's findings. 0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate refers to a few relevant data-based studies or sources of best practice knowledge in his/her discussion of the relationship between his/her findings and the research literature/professional best practice. The candidate provides a satisfactory description of the link between his/her findings and research/professional best practice. 8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate refers to many relevant data-based studies or sources of best practice knowledge in his/her discussion of the relationship between his/her findings and the research literature/professional best practice. The candidate provides a detailed description of the link between his/her findings and research/professional best practice. 9 - 10 points</p>
<p>What were the unintended outcomes of the action? Evidence-Based Decision-Making</p>	<p>The candidate is unable to identify any unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan. 0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate identifies one or more unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan but does not provide plausible explanations for their causes. 8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate identifies one or more unintended outcomes (positive or negative) of the implemented action plan and provides plausible explanations for their causes. 9 - 10 points</p>

PHASE V: The candidate reflects on the process of completing this Professional Impact Project.

PHASE V REFLECTION	Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
<p>How has the impact project contributed to your professional knowledge, skills and dispositions? Professional Identity Development</p>	<p>The candidate's discussion of the impact of the project on his/her professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions is lacking. S/he does not adequately describe the ways in which the impact project has contributed to his/her professional knowledge, skills and dispositions. 0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's discussion of the impact of the project on his/her professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions is <i>satisfactory</i>. S/he describes the ways in which the impact project has contributed to his/her professional knowledge, skills and dispositions. 8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's discussion of the impact of the project on his/her professional knowledge, skills, and dispositions is <i>outstanding</i>. S/he shares critical insights about the ways in which the impact project has contributed to his/her professional knowledge, skills and dispositions in an <i>exemplary and highly detailed way</i>. 9 - 10 points <i>9.5</i></p>
<p>What are your professional goals for furthering your professional growth? Professional Identity Development</p>	<p>The candidate's self-evaluation is weak; he/she is unable to identify areas for professional growth, or the steps for addressing them are insufficient. 0 - 7.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's self-evaluation satisfactorily identifies areas for professional growth and outlines general steps for addressing them. 8 - 8.9 points</p>	<p>The candidate's self-evaluation explicitly identifies areas for professional growth and outlines well-defined steps for addressing them. 9 - 10 points <i>9</i></p>

PIP Grading

Unacceptable	Acceptable	Target
--------------	------------	--------

TOTAL POINTS below 159 points 160 – 179 points over 180 points

Student's Phase Scores

- Phase I: 48.75
- Phase II: 49.5
- Phase III: 49.5
- Phase IV: 30
- Phase V: 19.5

Student's Overall Score: 197.25

Letter grade: A

Rubric rating:

- Unacceptable (Below Standard)
- Acceptable (Meets Standard)
- Target (Exceeds Standard)

Students Name:

Professor: Paul G. LaCava

Date:

12/9/10

Revision Date: