

ORU COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
TESL CURRICULUM DESIGN EVALUATION RUBRIC

NAME _____
 SCORE _____

Criteria	Not Attempted (Unsatisfactory Performance)	Unacceptable (Minimal Performance)	Acceptable (Standard Performance)	Competent (High Performance)	Exemplary (Exemplary Performance)	Score
Cover Page: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project Name Student Name Course number and Title University Name University Address Due date Reference Page 	(0)	Satisfied less than 4 of the criteria for the cover page. Reference page did not follow APA guide. (1-2)	Satisfied 4 of the criteria for the cover page. Reference page generally followed APA guide. (2.5-3.5)	Satisfied 5 of the criteria for the cover page. Reference page followed APA guide. (4-5)	Satisfied all of criteria for the cover page. Reference page followed APA guide. (6)	
Introduction: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Brief discussion of field of ESL (include current public policy issues) Teaching Philosophy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nature of Teaching/learning Teacher role Student role Curriculum Approach <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Addressed Biblical Worldview Effective teaching described. 	(0)	Satisfied less than 3 criteria. Most of the information presented was inaccurate. (4)	Satisfied 3 of the criteria. Some of the information presented was inaccurate. (6)	Satisfied 4 of the criteria. Most of the information presented was accurate. (8)	Satisfied all of the criteria. All of the information presented was accurate. (10)	
Teaching Situation and Learner Profile <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location of course Level of instruction Ages of learners Language backgrounds of students Language proficiency of students Size of classes Resources available to language teachers Other unique information 	(0)	Satisfied less than 6 of the criteria. (4)	Satisfied 6 of the criteria. Some of the information presented was inaccurate. (6)	Satisfied 7 of the criteria. (8)	Satisfied all of the criteria. (10)	

ORU COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
TESL CURRICULUM DESIGN EVALUATION RUBRIC

NAME _____
 SCORE _____

Needs Analysis <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Analysis process outlined Statement of learners needs Decisions about needs before data gathering 2 Needs Assessment instruments Assessment Instrument in separate appendices Discussed purpose of assessment instrument 	(0)	Satisfied less than four criteria. The information presented was not substantive. (6)	Satisfied four criteria. Some of the supporting information for the analysis was weak. The analysis was not documented clearly. (9)	Satisfied five criteria. Most of the supporting information in the analysis was documented clearly. (12)	Satisfied all of the criteria. All information in the analysis was documented clearly and where appropriate, was supported by documented research. (15)	
Goals & Objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Curriculum goals stated Instructional Objectives stated Objectives related to affective domain 	(0)	Included less than 50% of the required information outlined in the criteria. Most of the information presented was inaccurate. (4)	Included 50% of the required information outlined in the criteria. Some of the information presented was accurate. (6)	Included the majority of the required information outlined in the criteria. Most of the information presented was accurate. (8)	Satisfied all of criteria. All of the information presented was documented clearly. (10)	
Syllabus Frameworks and course Content <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Predominant syllabus framework identified Rational for choice of syllabus framework Course content identified Scope & Sequence Chart 	(0)	Satisfied 1 criterion. Supporting information was confusing. (6)	Satisfied 2 criteria. Supporting information was not consistently clear. (8)	Satisfied 3 criteria. Supporting information and chart were documented clearly. (10)	Satisfied all of the criteria. All of the supporting information and chart were documented exceptionally well. (12)	
Sample lesson plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lesson description One 60 min. lesson with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proficiency level/Grade Goals Objectives Materials & Equipment Procedure Evaluation 	(0)	Satisfied 1-5 criteria. The lesson was poorly designed and inappropriate for the proficiency level. Most of the information presented was confusing. (6)	Satisfied 6 of the criteria. The lesson was fairly well designed but inappropriate for the proficiency level. (9)	Satisfied 7 of the criteria. The lesson was fairly well designed and appropriate for the proficiency level. Most of the information presented was documented clearly. (12)	Satisfied all of the criteria. The lesson was exceptionally well designed and appropriate for the proficiency level. (15)	
Testing Plan		Satisfied one of the criteria.	Satisfied 2 of the criteria.	Satisfied all of the criteria.	Satisfied all of criteria.	

ORU COLLEGE OF EDUCATION
TESL CURRICULUM DESIGN EVALUATION RUBRIC

NAME _____
 SCORE _____

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Includes testing points Type of test(s) identified Rationale for chosen test(s) 	(0)	No supporting explanations. (4)	Weak rationale presented for the chosen test(s) (6)	Weak rationale and support for the chosen test(s) (8)	Rich and strong support for chosen test(s). (10)	
Curriculum Evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explained approach to evaluation Explained the instruments & data sources used Explained how data sources will be used in the evaluation process. 	(0)	One of the criteria was addressed. There was little or no explanation provided. (6)	Two of the criteria were addressed with little details. Some of the explanations provided were not expressed clearly. (8)	Satisfied all of the criteria with few details. The explanations were documented clearly. (10)	Satisfied all of the criteria with significant and well presented details, examples, and analysis provided. (12)	
Conclusion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summarized the main sections of the paper. Personal reflection on the process. 	(0)	The conclusion was illogical and was not an accurate summary of the main sections of the paper. No reflection comments. (4)	The conclusion was logical, but generally did not flow from the main sections of the paper. Instead, new areas were introduced. No reflection comments. (6)	The conclusion was logical, flowed from the main sections of the paper, but did not provide a general reflection on the design process. (8)	The conclusion was logical, flowed from the main sections of the paper, and provided a reflection on the design process. (10)	