

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 _____