

Student: _____

Evaluator: _____

Criteria	Highly Competent	Competent	Not Competent	Points Earned
Narrative of Personal and Professional Goals and Outcomes	4 – 5 points	2 – 3 points	0 – 1 points	
	Provides a concise (3-4 pages) narrative describing reasons for pursuing MS in Technology degree, including personal and professional goals and specific outcomes expected from program of study; all goals and outcomes directly apply to the program. Clearly describes the extent to which reasons for entering the MS program, including stated personal and professional goals, were attained; specifically connects goals to results.	Provides a narrative describing reasons for pursuing MS in Technology degree, including personal and professional goals and specific outcomes expected from program of study. Most goals are directly related to the program. Describes the extent to which reasons for entering the MS program, including stated personal and professional goals, were attained; reasons and goals attained are included but not all directly connect to results/program.	Provides a lengthy narrative describing reasons for pursuing MS in Technology degree. Personal and professional goals included, if any, do not directly relate to program of study. Does not include information related to how personal and professional goals were attained, or this is included but does not relate to program of study.	
Concept/Model/Theory with Most Impact	4 – 5 points	2 – 3 points	0 – 1 points	
	Clearly identifies and accurately describes a specific concept, model, or theory encountered during program of study that has had the most impact on personal and professional life and specifically what changes resulted.	Identifies and briefly describes a specific concept, model, or theory encountered during program of study that has had the most impact on personal and professional life and specifically what changes resulted.	Identifies and describes a specific concept, model, or theory that may or may not have been encountered during program of study. It is unclear if it had an impact on personal and professional life. Changes are not identified.	
Introduction	4 – 5 points	2 – 3 points	0 – 1 points	
	Provides clear, concise, and logical rationale for focus of the case in relationship to its importance for specific area of study: Technology Management, Training, and Development, Career and Technical Education, or Computer Technology.	Rationale for focus of the case or the relationship to its importance for specific area of study (Technology Management, Training, and Development, Career and Technical Education, or Computer) is not clear.	Introduction is not focused on purpose of the study or cites rambling unrelated information that fails to clearly define purpose or relationship to area of study.	
Case Context	4 – 5 points	2 – 3 points	0 – 1 points	
	Presents rich description of context and content of problem/practical issue being addressed as well as an explanation of why the content is important to particular discipline/field of study.	Provides minimal description of context and content of problem/practical issue being addressed and relates it to area of study.	Information provided about context and content is not linked to area of study.	

Summary of Relevant Theories, Models, Principles and/or Concepts Applicable to the Case	11 – 15 points	6 – 10 points	0 – 5 points
	Models/concepts described in depth; complexity of ideas established and supported in pertinent details. Includes specific references to content from at least three graduate courses and at least five primary models/concepts are cited.	Models/concepts described in some detail. Includes specific references to content and concepts from at least two or three graduate courses and five primary models/concepts are cited.	Includes vague references to models, principles, and concepts or applies inappropriate models in solution to problem.
Conclusions and/or Recommendations	11 – 15 points	6 – 10 points	0 – 5 points
	Clearly demonstrates ability to evaluate and synthesize information by providing appropriate solution to case presented by accurately applying theories, models, principles, concepts, and references cited.	Demonstrates ability to draw appropriate conclusions based on materials presented but not always supported by relevant details and references.	Some attempt to evaluate and synthesize information, but fails to provide appropriate solution because of misinterpretation or misalignment of theories, models, principles, concepts.
Reference List	3 points	2 points	0 – 1 points
	Includes more than eight primary references.	Includes between eight and five primary references.	Includes fewer than five primary references.
Mechanics and Organization	8 – 10 points	4 – 7 points	0 – 3 points
	Conventions and mechanics of scholarly writing are followed without errors of grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Correct sentence and paragraph structure are used throughout. Exhibits orderly presentation of ideas with smooth transitions from topic to topic. Displays coherent continuity of words, concepts, and thematic development from opening statement to conclusion. No more than 3 errors.	Conventions and mechanics of scholarly writing are followed with few errors of grammar, spelling, and punctuation. Correct sentence and paragraph structure are used. Exhibits orderly presentation of ideas with somewhat smooth transitions from topic to topic. Displays coherent continuity of words, concepts, and thematic development from opening statement to conclusion with a few exceptions. Between 4 and 6 errors.	Conventions and mechanics of scholarly writing are not followed. Errors in grammar, spelling, and punctuation are disproportionate to length and complexity and interfere with communication. Correct sentence and paragraph structure are not used. Does not exhibit orderly presentation of ideas with transitions from topic to topic. Does not display coherent continuity of words, concepts, and thematic development from opening statement to conclusion. More than 6 errors.
APA Format	6 – 7 points	3 – 5 points	0 – 2 points
	Conforms to most recent edition of APA guidelines including margins, spacing, quotations, headers, footers, typeface, in-text citations, references, tables and figures. Reference list and works cited agree. Between 0 and 3 errors.	A few errors in conforming to most recent edition of APA guidelines including margins, spacing, quotations, headers, footers, typeface, in-text citations, references, tables and figures. A few errors in agreement between reference list and works cited. Between 4 and 6 errors.	Major errors in conforming to most recent edition of APA guidelines including margins, spacing, quotations, headers, footers, typeface, in-text citations, references, tables and figures. Significant lack of agreement between reference list and works cited. More than 6 errors.

Oral Report Evaluation				
	Clearly Evident	Evident	Not Evident	Points Earned
	4-5 points	2-3 points	0-1 point	
Arrangement	The arrangement of ideas is clearly related to the topic; well organized, with introduction, body, conclusion; good transitions; introduction includes statement of problem, credibility information; conclusion includes summary and closure.	The arrangement of ideas is related to the topic; organized, with introduction, body, conclusion; good transitions; introduction includes statement of problem; conclusion includes summary.	The arrangement of ideas is not related to the topic; unorganized, missing introduction, body, or conclusion; no transitions; introduction does not include statement of problem; conclusion does not include summary.	
Media	Appropriate media were used to present the written document in a clear, concise, and orderly manner. The media used were appropriate to the situation and audience.	Media were used to present the written document. The media used were appropriate to the situation and audience.	Media were not used to present the written document or the media used were not appropriate to the situation and/or audience.	
Language	Evidence of precise and vivid language was exhibited. Appropriate standards of language usage for the situation and audience were used. Unfamiliar terms were clearly defined.	Evidence of precise language was exhibited. Appropriate standards of language usage for the situation and audience were used with a few errors. Unfamiliar terms were defined.	Language used was not acceptable for a formal presentation. Appropriate standards of language usage for the situation and audience were not used; many errors in language were detected. Unfamiliar terms were not defined.	
Appearance and Demeanor	The candidate demonstrated a professional appearance and scholarly demeanor, and answered the questions without making excuses, distorting or deflecting questions.	The candidate demonstrated a professional appearance and answered most of the questions without making excuses, distorting or deflecting questions.	The candidate did not demonstrate a professional appearance. Most of the questions were answered by making excuses, distorting or deflecting questions.	
Evaluate and Synthesize	The candidate clearly demonstrated the ability to evaluate and synthesize information by providing an appropriate solution to the case presented.	The candidate demonstrated the ability to evaluate and synthesize information by providing a solution that might work to the case presented.	The candidate did not demonstrate the ability to evaluate and synthesize information. A solution to the case presented was not provided or did not relate to the case.	
Approach and Structure	The approach and structure were highly consistent with the overall purpose; strong evidence of the application of appropriate theories and models was apparent.	The approach and structure were consistent with the overall purpose; evidence of the application of appropriate theories and models was apparent.	The approach and structure were not consistent with the overall purpose; evidence of the application of appropriate theories and models was not apparent.	