

Scoring Rubric: Required Clinical Experience Reports

Physics 209 – *Introduction to Teaching High School Physics*
 Physics Teacher Education Program
 Illinois State University

| Criterion | <i>Excellent</i> (4 pts) | <i>Good</i> (3 pts) | <i>Fair</i> (2 pts) | <i>Poor/Unacceptable</i> (1/0 pts) | Score |
|--|---|---|--|--|--------------|
| <i>Basis of Observation</i> | Gives both standard number and complete standard. | Gives only standard number but standard itself. | Gives only standard number. | Gives incorrect or no standard reference at all. | |
| <i>Overview of Lesson</i> | Gives a comprehensive and meaningful picture, including sufficient detail to reference in subsequent sections. | Overview fairly complete, but leaves out what appear to be a few details important to the following sections of the report. | Very sketchy overview; leaves out many important details pertinent to following sections of report. | So sketchy as to be meaningless or not provided. | |
| <i>Class Management</i> | Describes how and how well teacher was able to manage student discipline during the lesson, and strategies employed. | Gives a good summary of classroom behavior, but not much about methods used to maintain classroom environment. | Gives a fair summary of classroom behavior, but little about methods used to maintain classroom environment. | States something to the effect that there were no discipline problems without explanation; skips section entirely. | |
| <i>Observations and Reflections</i> | Thorough and includes sufficiently detailed data to support conclusions; addresses all subsections. | Thorough and includes sufficiently detailed data to support conclusions; addresses all major sections. | Somewhat sketchy observations, but addresses all sections and most sections. | Ignores major sections or subsections; does not include observations and reflections. | |
| <i>Post-class Assessment</i> | Cites data recorded in class or during follow-up reflection to draw logical, evidence-based conclusion about how well meets standard. | Draws conclusion and supports with data, but conclusion otherwise weak. | Evaluates teacher without providing meaningful evidence to support conclusion. | Evaluation inconsistent with observations; no evaluation conducted. | |
| <i>Application of Standard</i> | Describes in detail how teacher candidate will apply standard to own professional practice. | Understands standard, but appears only to be able to weakly apply standard to possible future situation. | Seems to lack comprehensive understanding of standard, but makes good effort to apply. | Seems not to know what the standard is about; inappropriate application or no application. | |
| Demerit: | Does not follow specified format; disorganized; not in required folder; not properly ordered, not provided as hard copy, etc. (up to -24 pts) | | | | |
| Demerit: | Unprofessional work, poorly written, misspellings, illegible, soiled, lacks credibility, etc. (up to -24 pts) | | | | |
| Demerit: | Turned in after deadline (-24 pts) | | | | |
| Subtotal (not less than 0): | | | | | |
| Normalization factor (0.4167): | | | | | |
| CE Observation Total: | | | | | |