

### Peer Review Rubric

**IMPORTANT:** If you do not meet the peer review deadlines, it will result in an automatic ZERO grade for both the peer review grade as well as your competency submission. Only completing the competency submission (reflection and challenge materials) is not satisfactory for this course. Both challenge materials and peer reviews must be completed and submitted by the deadlines (see Blackboard for specific dates).

**Student Name:** \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Expected Level of Peer Review	Moving Toward Expected Level	Not Acceptable
<b>Artifact Section</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses challenge materials and justifies suggested revisions by providing specific examples. Student explains suggestions with accurate explanations, reasons, or evidence. Statements in peer review are significant and substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses some aspects of challenge materials and justifies most of suggested revisions. Student sometimes gives general feedback with little explanation or reasoning. Statements in peer review are moderate ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not address challenge materials. Student struggles to provide ideas or support for ideas. When provided, ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand. Statements in peer review are non-substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).
<b>Evidence Checklist</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence checklist is completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence checklist is partially completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence checklist is partially completed or not completed.
<b>Reflection Section</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses reflection and justifies suggested revisions by providing specific examples. Student explains suggestions with accurate explanations, reasons, or evidence. Statements in peer review are significant and substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses some aspects of reflection and justifies most of suggested revisions. Student sometimes gives general feedback with little explanation or reasoning. Statements in peer review are moderate ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not address reflection. Student struggles to provide ideas or support for ideas. When provided, ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand. Statements in peer review are non-substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).
<b>Reflection Checklist</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reflection checklist is completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflection checklist is partially completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflection checklist is either partially completed or not completed.
<b>Request for Clarification (if applicable)</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student explains why the requirements have not been met with detailed explanations, reasons, or questions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student gives limited or hard to understand explanation as to why the requirements have not been met.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student does not explain why the requirements have not been met. Does not give reasoning as to why reflection and challenge materials do not align with competency.
<b>Presentation of Submission</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses overall submission's presentation or look. If the submission can be more professional, (portfolio worthy) specific examples are provided to improve the overall look of the submission. Student explains suggestions with accurate explanations, reasons, or evidence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses overall submission's presentation or look. If the submission can be more professional, (portfolio worthy) examples are provided to improve the overall look of the submission. Student sometimes gives general feedback with little explanation or reasoning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Did not address overall submission's presentation or look. Student struggles to provide ideas or support for ideas. When provided, ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand.
<b>Professionalism</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student consistently communicates respectfully by using professional communication and appropriate language. Gives constructive criticism by addressing both weaknesses and strengths (comments are not resistant or defensive).	<input type="checkbox"/> Student generally demonstrates professional communication and appropriate language but is inconsistent. Comments are neutral or non-encouraging.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student exhibits disrespectful behavior and is publicly critical of other students work. Comments might be interpreted as insulting or belittling.

\*developed by Holly Flock

## Peer Review Rubric

### Challenge Materials Submitted on Time

Two points were deducted for not submitting your peer reviews on time. Moving forward please make sure to communicate with me or you will receive a grade of zero (per the highlighted section of this rubric).

Your two peer reviews were nicely done. I liked the review you did for [redacted] - it was strong providing concise strengths and weaknesses for her to work on. In regards for [redacted], I think you did a great job to explain to her what you would have evaluated her if you had access to her artifact and still looked at her reflection. In the future, if you cannot reach a student – copy me on the email so that I'm aware of the situation as well. Thanks!

### Challenge Materials Suggestions:

#### **Participate in professional development activities**

Minor suggestion – add a hyperlink to your reflection text (when you submit in Passport) so that readers can click and directly have access to these organizations. In your artifact alignment section – you use “also” quite a bit – may be consider rewording a few of those. At the end of your reflection, it cuts off: “Through my association with this society, I plan to collaborate more effectively with the maker education community worldwide. Within that” I found no issues with your evidence – I would just rework your reflection a bit more.

#### **Establish and Maintain contacts with other professionals**

The first sentence of your reflection does not read correct to me, “For the challenge Establish and maintain contacts with other professionals, I am submitting my experiences with participating in this activity as artifacts.” I would also suggest using last names after you first introduce a person in your reflection:

I use Twitter to reach out to leaders in education like Jaime Casap, Google Global Education Evangelist. I met Casap in an online talk he gave, and work on staying in touch through social media.

When I met Dougherty, he immediately said, “I know you from Twitter, don't I?”

I would maybe add a section as to why Maker Media, Maker Faire, and Maker Education is important to you – why these type of professionals? This could be addressed in your final paragraph after, “Maker Faire's along with their Maker Education counterpart are created to do connect people all over the world.”

Again, I found no issues with your evidence – I would just rework your reflection a bit more.



## Comments



**Fiock, Holly S** October 19, 2017

...I am submitting evidence of participating and making contacts with professionals in the field?

## Badge Progression Assignment

Badge Progression Scoring Guide		
	Points Possible	Your Score
<b>PEER REVIEW REFLECTION</b> Upload to Blackboard in the Assignments section.	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #1 – Write and edit messages that are clear, concise and grammatically correct</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #2 – Deliver presentations that effectively engage audiences and communicate clear messages.</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #3 – Implement formative evaluation plans</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #4 – Implement summative evaluation plans</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #5 – Apply systems thinking to instructional design and performance improvement projects</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #6 – Apply appropriate interaction design and interactive learning principles</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #7 – Use appropriate message and visual design principles</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #8 – Identify and select materials that support the content analyses proposed technologies, delivery methods, and instructional strategies</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #9 – Integrate existing instructional materials into the design</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #10 – Analyze the characteristics of existing and emerging technologies and their potential use</b>	5	5
<b>PASSPORT APPROVAL #11 – Describe the nature of a learning or performance problem</b>	5	5
<b>Total</b>	<b>60</b>	<b>60</b>

## Peer Review Rubric

Student Name: [REDACTED]

Peer Reviews for: [REDACTED]

Criteria	Expected Level of Peer Review	Moving Toward Expected Level	Not Acceptable
Artifact Section	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses challenge materials and justifies suggested revisions by providing specific examples. Student explains suggestions with accurate explanations, reasons, or evidence. Statements in peer review are significant and substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses some aspects of challenge materials and justifies most of suggested revisions. Student sometimes gives general feedback with little explanation or reasoning. Statements in peer review are moderate ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ). In your review of [REDACTED] (1 <sup>st</sup> challenge), you did not complete the feedback section for the artifact pieces. In the review for [REDACTED], you did not list strengths. Make sure to list both strength and weaknesses for each submission moving forward (you do a good job of this in [REDACTED] second challenge review).	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not address challenge materials. Student struggles to provide ideas or support for ideas. When provided, ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand. Statements in peer review are non-substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).
Evidence Checklist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence checklist is completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence checklist is partially completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence checklist is partially completed or not completed.
Reflection Section	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses reflection and justifies suggested revisions by providing specific examples. Student explains suggestions with accurate explanations, reasons, or evidence. Statements in peer review are significant and substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ). Overall, you did a good job listing strengths and weaknesses. Please continue to include both moving forward (in reflection and artifact sections).	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses some aspects of reflection and justifies most of suggested revisions. Student sometimes gives general feedback with little explanation or reasoning. Statements in peer review are moderate ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not address reflection. Student struggles to provide ideas or support for ideas. When provided, ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand. Statements in peer review are non-substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).
Reflection Checklist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reflection checklist is completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflection checklist is partially completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflection checklist is either partially completed or not completed.
Request for Clarification (if applicable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student explains why the requirements have not been met with detailed explanations, reasons, or questions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student gives limited or hard to understand explanation as to why the requirements have not been met.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student does not explain why the requirements have not been met. Does not give reasoning as to why reflection and challenge materials do not align with competency.
Presentation of Submission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses overall submission's presentation or look. If the submission can be more professional, (portfolio worthy) specific examples are provided to improve the overall look of the submission. Student explains suggestions with accurate explanations, reasons, or evidence. *See below for additional comments	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses overall submission's presentation or look. If the submission can be more professional, (portfolio worthy) examples are provided to improve the overall look of the submission. Student sometimes gives general feedback with little explanation or reasoning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Did not address overall submission's presentation or look. Student struggles to provide ideas or support for ideas. When provided, ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand.

## Peer Review Rubric

Professionalism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student consistently communicates respectfully by using professional communication and appropriate language. Gives constructive criticism by addressing both weaknesses and strengths (comments are not resistant or defensive).	<input type="checkbox"/> Student generally demonstrates professional communication and appropriate language but is inconsistent. Comments are neutral or non-encouraging.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student exhibits disrespectful behavior and is publically critical of other students work. Comments might be interpreted as insulting or belittling.
-----------------	--	---	---

\*developed by Holly Flock

Additional Comments:

[REDACTED] you did a good job in your peer reviews. Please make sure to complete each section of the peer reviews and continue to put at least one strength and opportunity for growth for both the artifact and reflection sections.

As you are aware (per your email), make sure to meet the deadlines for the peer reviews moving forward. This last week, you did not complete this process until Sunday. This makes it difficult for your peers to complete their work on time when you are unable to complete yours.

**(PER THE SYLLABUS) Assignment due dates.** Course activities and projects are due at 11:59 pm, Eastern Time on the day they are due. Points will be deducted for late assignments as follows: assignments that are late by 2 days will be penalized 20% of available points; 3 days or later will be penalized 50% of available points, after 1 week 0 points will be assigned.

\*In the review you conducted for [REDACTED], you had an extensive list of areas to check grammar or spelling. If you find you are spending a lot of time on your reviews, remember you are to review and not edit each other's work. You can list one or two examples and inform the author to check the paper with more detail.

## Peer Review Rubric

Student Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Peer Reviews for: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria	Expected Level of Peer Review	Moving Toward Expected Level	Not Acceptable
Artifact Section	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses challenge materials and justifies suggested revisions by providing specific examples. Student explains suggestions with accurate explanations, reasons, or evidence. Statements in peer review are significant and substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses some aspects of challenge materials and justifies most of suggested revisions. Student sometimes gives general feedback with little explanation or reasoning. Statements in peer review are moderate ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ). <i>Make sure moving forward to list both strengths and weaknesses in each peer review, in some cases you only listed areas of improvement or strengths (not both) (see Hoke and [redacted] submission)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not address challenge materials. Student struggles to provide ideas or support for ideas. When provided, ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand. Statements in peer review are non-substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).
Evidence Checklist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Evidence checklist is completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence checklist is partially completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence checklist is partially completed or not completed.
Reflection Section	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses reflection and justifies suggested revisions by providing specific examples. Student explains suggestions with accurate explanations, reasons, or evidence. Statements in peer review are significant and substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses some aspects of reflection and justifies most of suggested revisions. Student sometimes gives general feedback with little explanation or reasoning. Statements in peer review are moderate ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ). <i>Make sure moving forward to list both strengths and weaknesses in each peer review, in some cases you only listed areas of improvement or strengths (not both) (see Hoke and [redacted] submission)</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not address reflection. Student struggles to provide ideas or support for ideas. When provided, ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand. Statements in peer review are non-substantive ( <i>per Peer Review Guidelines and Examples</i> ).
Reflection Checklist	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reflection checklist is completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflection checklist is partially completed.	<input type="checkbox"/> Reflection checklist is either partially completed or not completed.
Request for Clarification (if applicable)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student explains why the requirements have not been met with detailed explanations, reasons, or questions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student gives limited or hard to understand explanation as to why the requirements have not been met.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student does not explain why the requirements have not been met. Does not give reasoning as to why reflection and challenge materials do not align with competency.
Presentation of Submission	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Addresses overall submission's presentation or look. If the submission can be more professional, (portfolio worthy) specific examples <i>are provided</i> to improve the overall look of the submission. Student explains suggestions with accurate explanations, reasons, or evidence.	<input type="checkbox"/> Addresses overall submission's presentation or look. If the submission can be more professional, (portfolio worthy) examples <i>are provided</i> to improve the overall look of the submission. Student sometimes gives general feedback with little explanation or reasoning.	<input type="checkbox"/> Did not address overall submission's presentation or look. Student struggles to provide ideas or support for ideas. When provided, ideas are extremely limited or hard to understand.

## Peer Review Rubric

Professionalism	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Student consistently communicates respectfully by using professional communication and appropriate language. Gives constructive criticism by addressing both weaknesses and strengths (comments are not resistant or defensive).	<input type="checkbox"/> Student generally demonstrates professional communication and appropriate language but is inconsistent. Comments are neutral or non-encouraging.	<input type="checkbox"/> Student exhibits disrespectful behavior and is publically critical of other students work. Comments <i>might be interpreted</i> as insulting or belittling.
-----------------	--	---	--

\*developed by Holly Fiock

## Additional Comments:

\_\_\_\_\_ as noted above, make sure to include both strengths and weaknesses for each reflection and artifact section. Other than that, I like the format you use just by asking and answering the question, "Why?" It really makes the author understand your point of view. The amount of detail you put into \_\_\_\_\_'s review was impressive.