Action Research Final Report Rubric and Presentation Rubric (Revised 5/23/17)

Action Research Final Report Rubric (Revised 5/23/17)

NOTE TO REVIEWERS: A score of zero should be entered for missing criteria.

	Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Basic (2.0)	Proficient (3.0)	Distinguished (4.0)	Score/ Level
Rationale & Context (Revisions from Proposal Plan)	Revisions made to the proposal: • Did not address most reviewer comments and suggestions for improvement of the learning need, content, guiding question, classroom and student contexts. • May not have reflected the use of past tense wording.	Revisions made to the proposal: • One or more major revisions not addressed for improvement of the learning need, content, guiding question, classroom and student contexts. • May not have reflected the use of past tense wording.	Revisions made to the proposal: • All major revisions addressed, few minor revisions not addressed for improvement of the learning need, content, guiding question, classroom and student contexts. • Reflected the use of past tense wording.	Revisions made to the proposal: • Addressed all reviewer comments and suggestions for improvement of the learning need, content, guiding question, classroom and student contexts. • Reflected the use of past tense wording.	
Review of Literature (Revisions from Proposal Plan)	Revisions made to the proposal: • Did not address most reviewer comments and suggestions for improvement of articles.	Revisions made to the proposal: • One or more major revisions for improvement not addressed in three or fewer articles.	Revisions made to the proposal: • All major revisions addressed, few minor revisions not addressed for improvement of	Revisions made to the proposal: • Addressed all reviewer comments for improvement of three or more relevant articles.	

	Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Basic (2.0)	Proficient (3.0)	Distinguished (4.0)	Score/ Level
			three relevant articles.		
Methods (Revisions from Proposal Plan)	The description: • Did not transition proposal plan future tense to project methods past tense, **or** • Did not explain changes from the proposed plan to implementation, **or** • Provided inadequate or no description of the implementation of the project, **or** • Documented less than of two weeks of implementation (or equivalent) without justification.	The description: • Transitioned proposal plan future tense to project methods past tense. • Inadequately explained changes from the proposed plan to implementation, **or** • Provided an unclear overview of the implementation of the project, **or** • Provided limited evidence of two weeks of implementation (or equivalent).	The description: • Transitioned proposal plan future tense to project methods past tense. • Explained changes from the proposed plan to implementation. • Provided a clear overview of the project implementation. • Included evidence of at least two weeks of implementation (or equivalent).	The description: • Transitioned proposal plan from future tense to project methods past tense. • Explained all changes from the proposed plan to implementation in response to differentiated student needs. • Provided a clear, concise overview of the project implementation. • Included clear evidence of two or more weeks of implementation (or equivalent).	
Results & Discussion - Data Analysis	The results section: • Lacked adequate description, **or** • Was unclear; could not determine if analyses were conducted and	The results section included data analysis which provided: • A presentation of process used to analyze data. • A discussion of descriptive	The results section included data analysis which provided: • A clear presentation of the process used to analyze data.	The results section included data analysis which provided: • A clear presentation of the process used to analyze data. • A discussion of descriptive statistics	

	Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Basic (2.0)	Proficient (3.0)	Distinguished (4.0)	Score/Level
	what results were generated, **or** • Lacked or used inappropriate figures or graphs to display results.	statistics (e.g. frequency, mean, median, mode, range). • Inappropriate figures or graphs which fail to aggregate results of formative and summative assessments **and** omitted results of different student groups (e.g. special needs, low/high achievement or skill levels).	• A discussion of descriptive statistics (e.g. frequency, mean, median, mode, range). • Appropriate figures and graphs, but may lack aggregated results of formative and summative assessments **or** omitted results of different student groups (e.g. special needs, low/high achievement or skill levels).	(e.g. frequency, mean, median, mode, range). • Appropriate figures and graphs of aggregated results of formative and summative assessments. • Disaggregated results of different student groups (e.g. special needs, low/high achievement or skill levels).	
Results & Discussion - Explanation of Findings	• Provided inadequate description of the findings, tables, and graphs (e.g. results of surveys, observations, formative assessments) **and**	• Provided a description of the findings, tables, and graphs, which lacked some aspect of the study (e.g. results of surveys, observations, formative assessments) **or** • Explanations of some data displays	• Provided a clear description of the findings, tables, and graphs in the narrative (e.g. results of surveys, observations, formative and summative assessments). • May note any limitations, delimitations, or	• Provided a **thorough description** of the findings, tables, and graphs in the narrative (e.g. results of surveys, observations, formative and summative assessments). • Identified limitations and delimitations in the study.	

	Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Basic (2.0)	Proficient (3.0)	Distinguished (4.0)	Score/ Level
	• Lacked references to data displays.	were missing or incorrect.	irregularities in the data.	• Described any anomalous data.	
Results & Discussion Discussion of findings	The discussion: • Failed to adequately summarize key findings, **or** • Did not describe implications of data (what the data meant).	The discussion: • Summarized key findings. • Described implications of data (what the data meant). • Did not attempt to provide data driven explanations.	The discussion: • Summarized key findings. • Described implications of data (what the data meant). • Attempted to draw inferences about student learning based on data. • Made a clear connection between results and student learning during the study; • Explained how the study informs ongoing data-based decision making.	The discussion: • Summarized key findings. • Described implications of data (what the data meant). • Drew multiple, appropriate inferences about student learning based on data. • Made multiple connections between results and student learning during the study; • Explained how results inform the reflective instructional cycle of planning, instruction, assessment, and ongoing data-based decision making.	
Conclusions & Recommendations	Conclusions about the impact on student learning:	Conclusions about the impact on student learning:	Conclusions about the impact on student learning:	Conclusions about the impact on student learning:	

	Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Basic (2.0)	Proficient (3.0)	Distinguished (4.0)	Score/ Level
- Impact on Student Learning	• Failed to summarize the impact of the project on student learning, **or** • Did not describe the connection of the project to the content.	• Summarized the impact of the project on student learning briefly. • Described the connection of the project to the content briefly.	• Summarized the impact of the project on student learning. • Described the connection of the project to the content. • Described the connection of the project to pedagogy and learning.	• Summarized the impact of the project on student learning and provided elaborations and examples from the implementation. • Described the connection of the project to the content using specific details from the implementation phase of the project. • Described the connection of the project to pedagogy and learning using specific details from teaching the strategy and student response.	
Conclusions & Recommendations – Implications for Personal Practice	Implications for personal practice: • Failed to describe new knowledge, skills, and insights attained from the Action Research project experience, **or** • Failed to identify possible applications for	Implications for personal practice: • Listed new knowledge, skills, and insights attained from the Action Research project experience • Identified a possible application for these skills in her/her future	Implications for personal practice: • Described new knowledge, skills, and insights attained from the Action Research project experience • Identified several possible applications for these skills in	Implications for personal practice: • Described new knowledge, skills, and insights attained from the Action Research project experience making specific references to the results of the project. • Identified possible applications for	

	Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Basic (2.0)	Proficient (3.0)	Distinguished (4.0)	Score/ Level
	these skills in her/her future professional practice, **or** • Failed to generated a professional learning goal related to the use of Action Research in practice	professional practice • Generated a professional learning goal somewhat related to the use of Action Research methods in practice	her/her future professional practice • Generated two professional learning goals related to the use of Action Research methods in practice	these skills in her/her future professional practice by stating several specific ideas for transfer of the Action Research process into future work as a teacher. • Generated two professional learning goals related to the use of Action Research methods in practice	
Writing – Basic Conventions	The report had **numerous** and **distracting** errors in: • Grammar- use of past or past perfect tense, subject-verb agreement, pronoun agreement, and parallel construction • Spelling-use of Standard English • Punctuation- correct us of singular and plural	The report had **four or five** repetitive errors or **eleven to fifteen** different errors in: • Grammar- use of past or past perfect tense, subject-verb agreement, pronoun agreement, and parallel construction • Spelling-use of Standard English • Punctuation-correct us of singular and plural possessives, abbreviations used	The report had **two or three** repetitive errors or **five to ten** different errors in: • Grammar- use of past or past perfect tense, subject-verb agreement, pronoun agreement, and parallel construction • Spelling-use of Standard English • Punctuation- correct us of singular and plural	The report had **one or no** repetitive errors or fewer than **five** different errors in: • Grammar- use of past or past perfect tense, subject-verb agreement, pronoun agreement, and parallel construction • Spelling-use of Standard English • Punctuation-correct us of singular and plural possessives, abbreviations used sparingly, and correctly denotes	

	Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Basic (2.0)	Proficient (3.0)	Distinguished (4.0)	Score/ Level
	possessives, abbreviations used sparingly, and correctly denotes pauses, stoppage, or change in thought • Capitalization- correctly capitalized proper nouns and titles (first word, last word, and all important words). Does not overuse capital letters.	sparingly, and correctly denotes pauses, stoppage, or change in thought • Capitalization- correctly capitalized proper nouns and titles (first word, last word, and all important words). Does not overuse capital letters.	possessives, abbreviations used sparingly, and correctly denotes pauses, stoppage, or change in thought • Capitalization- correctly capitalized proper nouns and titles (first word, last word, and all important words). Does not overuse capital letters.	pauses, stoppage, or change in thought • Capitalization- correctly capitalized proper nouns and titles (first word, last word, and all important words). Does not overuse capital letters.	
Writing – Readability	The report: • Was disorganized; may not have headings or followed required format. • Content was explained using casual language. • Used simple sentence structure; lacked variety.	The report: • Was disorganized; may not have headings or followed required format. • Content was explained, but may not have used academic vocabulary or Standard English. • Had some varied sentence structure. • Had a reference list, which may	The report: • Was organized; used headings and followed required format. • Content was explained using academic vocabulary and Standard English. • Used varied sentence structure. • Had a complete reference list. • Included assessments and	The report: • Was well-organized; used headings, included labeled figures and graphs, and followed required format. • Content was clearly explained using academic vocabulary and Standard English. • Used varied sentence structure.	

	Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Basic (2.0)	Proficient (3.0)	Distinguished (4.0)	Score/ Level
	• Had an incomplete reference list. • Missing appendices.	have been incomplete. • Included the assessment instrument(s).	sample student work, or other documents that contributed to the reader's understanding in the appendices.	• Had a comprehensive reference list. • Included multiple appendices (e.g. assessments, data collection instruments, formative assessments, sample student work, and/or other documents that contributed to the reader's understanding).	
Ethical Considerations	Information in the report was: • Inaccurate **or** • Not ethically reported (fabricated or falsified information) **or** • Did not reflect actual implementation of the results **or** • Lacked citations and references **or** • Not presented in a confidential manner.	Information in the report was: • May have misinterpreted some findings. • Ethically reported (true representation of data and information). • Reflected actual implementation of the results. • Not appropriately cited or referenced. • Presented in a confidential manner.	Information in the report was: • Accurate • Ethically reported (true representation of data and information). • Reflected actual implementation of the results. • Cited in the text and referenced. • Presented in a confidential manner.	Information in the report was: • Accurate • Ethically reported (true representation of data and information). • Reflected actual implementation of the results. • **Correctly** cited in text and referenced all articles. • Presented in a confidential manner.	

	Unsatisfactory (1.0)	Basic (2.0)	Proficient (3.0)	Distinguished (4.0)	Score/ Level

Action Research Presentation Rubric   Revised 5-23-17

	Unsatisfactory - 1	Developing - 2	Proficient - 3	Distinguished -4	Score/ Level
Communication skills	The teacher candidate was: • Not prepared, did not communicate major points **AND** • Did not keep the attention of the audience.	The teacher candidate was: • Somewhat prepared, sometimes seemed "off script", communicated minor points. • Gestures, eye contact, **OR** tone of voice, did not convey a level of enthusiasm in a way that kept the attention of the audience.	The teacher candidate was: • Prepared, clearly communicated major points. • Used gestures, eye contact, tone of voice, and a level of enthusiasm in a way that kept the attention of the audience.	The teacher candidate was: • Well-prepared, effectively and clearly communicated major points. • Consistently and skillfully used gestures, eye contact, tone of voice, and a level of enthusiasm in a way that kept the attention of the audience.	
	InTASC IV, WVPTS 5, ACEI 5.2				
Professional demeanor	The teacher candidate was: • Unprofessional in dress, manner, and in verbal communication (word choice, grammar, use of educational or disciplinary terminology) and/or ethical presentation of information.	The teacher candidate was: • Casual in dress, manner, and in verbal communication (word choice, grammar, use of educational or disciplinary terminology) and ethical	The teacher candidate was: • Professional in dress, manner, and in verbal communication (word choice, grammar, use of educational or disciplinary terminology) and ethical	The teacher candidate was: • Very professional and polished in dress, manner, and in verbal communication (word choice, grammar, use of educational or disciplinary terminology) and ethical presentation of information.	

		presentation of information.	presentation of information.		
	InTASC IV, WVPTS 4, ACEI 5.1				
Technology application	The technology application was: • Ineffective and poorly designed • Disorganized, making it difficult to identify major points • Not proofread. Had numerous and distracting errors in the text.	The technology application was: • Adequate, not attention grabbing • Coherent in design, but lacked graphics or pictures • Confusing to read, but included the required information. • Proofread, but had a major content error, or multiple writing errors	The technology application was: • Designed to hold audience members' attention • Coherent in design, use of graphics and/or pictures, • Easy to read and emphasized the major relevant points for discussion. • Proofread for error (1 or 2 minor errors)	The technology application was: • Attractive and designed to hold audience members' attention • Coherent in design, use of graphics and pictures • Easy to read and selectively emphasized the major relevant points for discussion. • Clearly proofread for errors	
	InTASC IV, WVPTS 5, ACEI 5.2				
Technology presentation	The technology application was: • Not used consistently or skillfully during the presentation. • Not used to support the candidate's discussion.	The technology application was: • Used as a visual aid to support the candidate's discussion of major points.	The technology application was: • Skillfully and consistently used during the presentation as a visual aid to support audience engagement and understanding	The technology application was • Skillfully and consistently used during the presentation as a visual aid to support audience engagement and understanding • A foundation for an engaging and knowledgeable	

			• A foundation for discussion of major points.	discussion of major points.	
	InTASC IV, WVPTS 5, ACEI 5.2				
Knowledge of Learners	Knowledge of learner needs and relevant characteristics of development and diversity were either not discussed or in a way that demonstrated inadequate understanding or misconceptions.	Knowledge of learner needs and relevant characteristics of development and diversity were discussed somewhat superficially.	Knowledge of learner needs and relevant characteristics of development and diversity were discussed in a way that demonstrated solid understanding.	Knowledge of learner needs and relevant characteristics of development and diversity were accurate and demonstrated deep understanding.	
	InTASC I, WVPTS 2, ACEI 1.0				
Knowledge of Content	Content (knowledge, skills) taught during the project was either not identified or was discussed in a way that demonstrated inadequate knowledge or misconceptions.	Content (knowledge, skills) taught during the project was identified and discussed somewhat superficially.	Content (knowledge, skills) taught during the project was identified and discussed in a way that demonstrated solid knowledge and made some connection to learner needs and pedagogy.	Content (knowledge, skills) taught during the project was clearly identified and discussed in a way that demonstrated deep knowledge and understanding of connections to learner needs and pedagogy.	
	InTASC II, WVPTS 1, ACEI 3.1				
Pedagogical/ Instructional Strategy	Pedagogical/instructional strategy was either not discussed or discussed in a way that demonstrated inadequate knowledge or misconceptions.	Pedagogical / instructional strategy implemented during the project was discussed somewhat superficially.	Pedagogical / instructional strategy implemented during the project was clearly identified and discussed in a way that demonstrated solid knowledge and made some connection to learner needs and content.	Pedagogical / instructional strategy implemented during the project was clearly identified and discussed in a way that demonstrated deep knowledge and understanding of connections to learner needs and content.	

	InTASC III, WVPTS 3, ACEI 3.4				
Data Collection and Instructional Decision-making	Data collection and use of assessment data results in instructional decision-making (both during project implementation and for future planning) was either not discussed or discussed in a way that demonstrated inadequate knowledge or misconceptions about assessment.	Data collection and use of assessment data results in instructional decision-making (both during project implementation and for future planning) discussed somewhat superficially.	Data collection and use of assessment data results in instructional decision-making (both during project implementation and for future planning) discussed in a way that demonstrated solid knowledge of assessment.	Data collection and use of assessment data results in instructional decision-making (both during project implementation and for future planning) discussed in a way that demonstrated deep knowledge of assessment.	
	InTASC III, WVPTS 3, ACEI 4.0				
Results and Interpretation of Impact on Student Learning	The teacher candidate: • Inadequately or incompletely presented the results of data analyses and interpretation of results. • Answers to guiding questions and connections between the results and impact on student learning were either missing or unsubstantiated.	The teacher candidate: • Presented the results of data analyses and interpretation of results. • Answers to guiding questions were unclear and/or the connection between results and impact on student learning was not clearly substantiated.	The teacher candidate: • Presented and discussed the results of data analyses and interpretation of results. • Guiding questions were answered – there were connections between results and the impact on student learning.	The teacher candidate: • Effectively presented and accurately discussed the results of data analyses and interpretation of results. • Guiding questions were answered – there were clear connections between results and the impact on student learning.	
	InTASC III, WVPTS 3, ACEI 4.0				
Professional contribution	The teacher candidate:	The teacher candidate:	The teacher candidate:	The teacher candidate:	

• Was unable to provide reasonable answers to audience questions • Did not attempt to engage the audience in a discussion of the project **AND/OR** • Did not demonstrate personal learning or a concern with contributing to the profession.	• Provided answers to audience questions while discussing the project. • Candidate demonstrated personal learning and attempted to contribute to the profession.	• Engaged the audience in a collaborative discussion of the project and its future application. • Demonstrated personal and professional learning and ability • Expressed a commitment to profession. • Candidate could answer audience questions appropriately.	• Engaged the audience in a collaborative discussion of the project and its future application. • Demonstrated personal and professional learning and ability • Provided a commitment and contribution to the profession. • Candidate could answer audience questions clearly and knowledgeably.
InTASC IV, WVPTS 4, ACEI 5.1			