

Grading Reaction/Reflection Paper

Most papers reviewed over the years have lacked depth of personal reflection around **Part I** of the assignment. What this means is that the reader did not find evidence or little evidence was provided of how the concepts from the learning experience were new or different from past practice. In other words how and why did the individual change or not change because of what was studied. Many statements such as “I feel”, or “I believe”, or “It became evident” have been made without data or comment to support and explain why the individual felt or believed the way they did. Without such explanation these are very superficial statements and therefore did cause a “depth of reflection” issue for the paper. In addition, little reflection around the impact on future professional practice has been included in most papers and if there was discussion, it too lacked any depth. Many statements have been made such as “I will continue to use” but included little or no discussion of why. Unfortunately many papers submitted have done little with or completely omitted the expectations of **Part II** of the assignment. In those papers that did address Part II only very general statements were made in many cases. All of these issues noted above have caused many papers to receive grades lower than many participants anticipated. The rubric below will outline the thoughts behind the current grading practice.

Grading Practice beginning in the 2004-2005 school year:

<p>Graduate Credit “A”</p> <p>Recertification Credit “P”</p>	<p>Reflection about activities and/or student work well presented with depth and detailed explanation. Impact on individual teaching and reflection about personal practices well presented and examples of changes or reasons for no change supported with data. Part II well done. Good example of quality professional work.</p>
<p>Graduate Credit “B”</p> <p>Recertification Credit “P”</p>	<p>Reflection about activities and how they could/will impact teaching and learning weak (superficial/lacked depth) and needs work. Impact on current teaching lacked depth and showed little personal reflection. Implications for future practice limited or also weak. Part II good but could have gone deeper. Minimal example of quality professional work.</p>
<p>Graduate Credit “C+”</p> <p>Recertification Credit “F”</p> <p>No Credit</p>	<p>Reflection about activities and how they could/will impact teaching and learning very weak and almost non-existent. Impact on current teaching lacked any depth and showed little or no personal reflection. Implications for future practice limited or also very weak. Part II very weak or also non-existent. Poor example of quality professional work.</p>
<p>Graduate Credit “C”</p> <p>Recertification Credit “F”</p> <p>No Credit</p>	<p>Overall the assignment very weak and reflection non-existent. No discussion of why things were new or different. Listed what was studied but little or no discussion with any depth about impact on current or future practice. Discussion of how it will be used in the future very shallow. Responses to Part II are non-existent. Very poor example of quality professional work.</p>