Preplanning & Design Document Rubric

Name:_____

Outcome	Does Not Meet (.5)	Needs Work (1)	Meets (1.25)	Exceeds (2)
Section One: Pre-planning				
Introduction	☐ Missing intro/intro lacks depth or is incomplete	☐ Intro covers topic but lacks clarity or is missing some information	☐ Present, sets context	☐ Present and elaborate
Rationale (content, resources, and learners)	☐ Rationale missing or shallow; does not address one or more areas	☐ Rationale addresses areas but is vague or nonspecific in one or more aspects or lacks depth	☐ Present, covers main rationale, no areas missing, though links may not be well articulated	☐ Present and high quality—rationale clearly proceeds from main areas, all linked
General approach (simulation, game, tutorial, etc.)	☐ Missing or not tied to rationale; shallow	☐ Rationale for CBT is not clear; could be achieved with other methods as described	☐ Approach is articulated and connected to rationale	☐ Approach is clearly articulated and connected to rationale
Technical requirements (delivery considerations like bandwidth and media)	☐ Not articulated or unrelated to rationale	☐ Missing one or more areas; connection to rationale is not consistent	☐ Articulated and reasonable, given rationale	☐ Complete and clearly articulated; connection to rationale is explicit and obvious
Section Two: Design				
Goal	☐ Not present or inconsistent with project	☐ Goal is vague; not connected to rationale; may focus on knowing rather than doing	☐ Present	☐ NA

Section Two, contineud				
Outcome	**Does Not Meet (.5)**	**Needs Work (1)**	**Meets (1.25)**	**Exceeds (2)**
Objectives	☐ Missing, incomplete, or poorly written	☐ Do not focus on behavior; are difficult to measure; could be interpreted multiple ways; not aligned with goal; missing some objectives (double-barreled or missing)	☐ Covers scope of project, follows 3 or 5-component, few errors or omissions	☐ Covers full scope of project, follows 3 or 5-component with no errors
Learner analysis	☐ Missing, incomplete, or shallow	☐ Not clear who the learners are, what their skills are, or why they need this training; missing details would make it hard to know how to make decisions	☐ Covers main aspects of learners with enough depth to make ID decisions	☐ Complete analysis goes beyond minimum characteristics; clearly drives design
Assessment items	☐ Missing, incomplete, or misaligned with objectives	☐ Objectives either do not measure behavior, are overly reliant on one form (e.g., multiple choice), do not reflect the actual knowledge to be demonstrated, measure inert knowledge; do not reflect strengths of CBT (could be done in paper form), or some combination.	☐ Aligned with objectives; covers essential skills	☐ Multiple assessment items for objectives; alignment to task and objectives clear
Interface metaphor	☐ Missing, shallow, or inconsistent with project; little to no connection to functionality	☐ Reflects idea, but may be over or under-done; metaphor trumps functionality in some cases	☐ Present, clearly articulated, connected to project and functionality	☐ Seamless connection to project and real world; no "forced fit"
Screen design principles	☐ Principles of light, boundary boxes, and consistent locations not addressed	☐ May be one or more contraditions or missing elements	☐ Principles of light, boundary boxes, and consistent locations addressed	☐ Principles of light, boundary boxes, and consistent locations clearly articulated
Treatment	☐ Missing two or	☐ Components present but poorly	☐ All significant components	☐ All significant components

	more significant components or lacks depth	articulated/connected to topic, or missing one component	addressed, most at appropriate depth	addressed in full detail
Section Two, contineud				
Outcome	**Does Not Meet (.5)**	**Needs Work (1)**	**Meets (1.25)**	**Exceeds (2)**
White paper/flowchart	☐ Not present, incomplete, or unconnected to project functionality	☐ Content Outline more than functionality; cant tell how it moves from one to the other; learner control and navigation not clearly visible; may reflect tutorial more than strengths of CBT	☐ Present, outlines basic functionality, provides sufficient detail to design	☐ Present, fully represents functionality of major and minor components; clearly addresses what will need to be done during development
Storyboards that describe each main screen of your project	☐ Storyboards missing significant components (branch points, scene sketch, audio, text) or not documented; few completed	☐ Lacking details (general description of text, audio, graphics rather than actual text); another designer might know what is needed in general but could not develop from them; missing scene sketches or too vague	☐ Storyboads represent full scope of project, few missing components; major aspects documented	☐ Storyboards fully realized, detailed, and cover programming notes, audio, etc.; may extend to actual linked files, media logs, etc.
Implementation/ evaluation report describes problems of functionality, quality control, and instructional efficacy	☐ Not done, not enough people planned/, missing multiple components (objective tables, plans for getting representative sample, process planned/used); missing supporting sheets (quality control, (etc.)	☐ One or two missing components (objective tables, plans for getting representative sample, process planned/used) or components are too shallow/are incomplete; supporting sheets (quality control, (etc.) not fully developed or reasonable for the project as described	☐ All components present with minor erorrs in depth, sequence, or approach only; Full implementation plan/data with at least two people done/planned; addresses all components; item-by-obective tables, full description of what will be/was done to make revisions in between and why; decisions clearly connected to findings from evaluation	☐ Full implementation with more than two people; all components addressed in depth

Comments:

IDT Scholarly Project Assessment Rubric: **Documentation**

MS Candidate Name: _____ Overall Rating: PASS / FAIL

4 = Exceptional	Clearly demonstrates thorough evidence of accurate understanding of the instructional design construct. Employs appropriate relevant information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of extensive personal skills that are relevant, accurate, and consistent with the domain.
3 = Good	Demonstrates an understanding of appropriate instructional design constructs. Employs adequate supporting information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of personal skills that are adequate and consistent with the domain.
2 = Fair	Demonstrates only a very general understanding of instructional design constructs. Employs limited information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of limited personal skills consistent with the domain.
1 = Poor	Demonstrates little or no evidence of understanding design constructs or domain. Product and design are not reflective of personal skills needed to be consistent with the domain,
NA	This construct/criteria is not relevant for this project, requires justification in design documentation.

Design Documentation					
Problem Identification	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional learner/context analysis	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional content analysis	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional mastery (objectives)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Orienting strategies	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructional strategies	N/A	1	2	3	4
Sequencing	N/A	1	2	3	4
Assessment instrumentation	N/A	1	2	3	4
Formative evaluation report	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL DESIGN DOCUMENTATION		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Instructional Unit					
Alignment with Design Documentation	N/A	1	2	3	4
Solves identified problem (is complete)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Instructor Guide	N/A	1	2	3	4
Learner Support/Guide	N/A	1	2	3	4
Support Materials	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL INSTRUCTIONAL UNIT		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Presentation Quality					
Writing quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Editing quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Graphics quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Layout quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Interface quality	N/A	1	2	3	4
Functionality/Navigation	N/A	1	2	3	4
OVERALL PRESENTATION QUALITY		**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**
Comments:					

Faculty Signature_____ Date _____

IDT Scholarly Project Assessment Rubric: **Formative Evaluation Report**
MS Candidate Name: _____ Overall Rating: PASS FAIL

4 = Exceptional	Clearly demonstrates thorough evidence of accurate understanding of the instructional design construct. Employs appropriate relevant information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of extensive personal skills that are relevant, accurate, and consistent with the domain.
3 = Good	Demonstrates an understanding of appropriate instructional design constructs. Employs adequate supporting information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of personal skills that are adequate and consistent with the domain.
2 = Fair	Demonstrates only a very general understanding of instructional design constructs. Employs limited information from instructional design literature. Product and design are reflective of limited personal skills consistent with the domain.
1 = Poor	Demonstrates little or no evidence of understanding design constructs or domain. Product and design are not reflective of personal skills needed to be consistent with the domain,
NA	This construct/criteria is not relevant for this project, requires justification in design documentation.

Design Documentation					
Formative evaluation report	N/A	1	2	3	4
Comments:					

Faculty Signature_____ Date _____

IDT Scholarly Project Assessment Rubric: **Oral Presentation**

MS Candidate Name: _____ Overall Rating: PASS / FAIL

4 = Exceptional	Clearly demonstrates thorough evidence of accurate understanding of this quality. Employs appropriate relevant information from instructional design literature. Presentation reflective of extensive personal skills that are relevant, accurate, and consistent with the domain.
3 = Good	Demonstrates an understanding of this quality. Employs adequate supporting information from instructional design literature. Presentation is reflective of personal skills that are adequate and consistent with the domain.
2 = Fair	Demonstrates only a very general understanding this quality. Employs limited information from instructional design literature. Presentation is reflective of limited personal skills consistent with the domain.
1 = Poor	Demonstrates little or no evidence of this quality. Presentation not reflective of personal skills needed to be consistent with the domain,
NA	This construct/criteria is not relevant for this project, requires justification in design documentation.

Oral Presentation					
Professionalism (attire, demeanor, responsiveness)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Organization (flow, logic, efficient time use)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Completeness (all aspects covered in specified time)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Clarity (readability, wording, typographical errors, etc.)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Peer Interaction (candidate converses with panel and others at appropriate level and supports assertions with data/evidence)	N/A	1	2	3	4
Comments:					

Faculty Signature_____ Date _____

TABLE 4

Summative Assessment, Combination Checklist and Ratings Scale for Assessing Healthy Upper String Technique

Behavior	Not Observed	Observed
Left-hand contact point		
Effective posture		
Relaxed thumb		
All fingers down—"boxed" first finger		
Knuckle angle toward scroll		
Clean string crossing (plays one string only)		
Plays low 2 notes (C or F)		
Interval between low 2 and 3 is a major second		
Bow does not travel in the bout		
Tone is balanced on all four strings		
Relaxed bow hold		
Left wrist gently curved		
Straight bows		
Big bows		
Adjusting intonation		
Consistent tempo maintained		
Began on correct bow direction		
Slurs executed correctly		
Equal amount of bow used in slurs		
Interval accuracy		
Shifted on correct finger		
Entire hand moves as one		
Pitch accuracy on shift		
Third-position finger pattern accuracy		
Shift in time		
	Total points	/25

Project 3: Case Study Analysis Paper Rubric

Requirement	0	1	2	3	Score & Notes
Paper discusses the effectiveness of the course and its learning design. Explanations are supported by research and/or previous course information.					
Paper analyzes highlight three areas of the course the student feels were effective and why. Explanations are supported by research and/or previous course information.					
Paper analyzes three areas of the course the student feels need improvement, and why. Explanations are supported by research and/or previous course information.					
Professionalism: Paper is neat, professional, and follows the conventions of Standard Written English. No typos or grammatical errors are present.					
Research: Paper cites at least 5 sources (in text and in a reference list). Sources are from acceptable channels -- including peer-reviewed journals or books.					
Technical details: Paper is 5-6 pages long, uses APA formatting, 12 pt font, and 1” margins.					
TOTAL out of 18 possible points:					

A total score at or below 12 does not meet expectations for the project.

A total score of 13-16 meets expectations for the project.

A total score of 17 or above exceeds expectations for the project.