NAME DUE STATUS SCORE OUT OF

CRITERIA	RATINGS				PTS
Scratch: Greeting Card view longer description	3 to >2 pts Outstanding Card included 3 or more sprites that were named properly and working correctly. Sprites fit together well in making the greeting card look like a well thought- out design.	2 to >1 pts Satisfactory Card included at least 2 sprites that were named properly and working correctly. Sprites selected were appropriately aligned with card theme.	1 to >0 pts Developing  Card included at least 1 sprite that was named and working correctly. Sprite(s) may not be named correctly and/or is not working correctly. Sprite(s) may not align well with the overall card design.	0 pts Unacceptable No sprites included in card design.	3 / 3 pts
Scratch: Greeting Card view longer description	3 to >2 pts Outstanding Backdrop (i.e., background) highly compliments the design of the card, and 'fits' the greeting theme selected.	2 to >1 pts Satisfactory Backdrop (i.e., background) is present and compliments the design of the card.	1 to >0 pts Developing  Backdrop (i.e., background) is present, but may not compliment the design and/or 'fit' the greeting theme selected.	0 pts Unacceptabl e No backdrop was used on the card.	3 / 3 pts

NAME DUE STATUS SCORE OUT OF

CRITERIA	RATINGS				PTS
Scratch: Greeting Card view longer description	3 to >2 pts Outstanding Scripts are all working, very well designed and uses solid programming techniques. Student has very good understandin g of scripts and how they work.	2 to >1 pts Satisfactory Scripts are working. Illustrates student's understandin g of using scripts in a project.	1 to >0 pts Developing Scripts may have some errors, so program(s) does not work perfectly. Student effort is present in trying to understand the programming aspect of the project.	O pts Unacceptable Scripts do not work, so program(s) does not run at all. Little or no effort was given to understand the programming aspect of the project.	3/3p
Scratch: Greeting Card view longer description	3 to >2 pts Outstanding Two or more sounds/music used on card. Uniquely compliments the design and purpose of the card.	2 to >1 pts Satisfactory At least one sound/music is used on card. Compliments the design and purpose of the card.	1 to >0 pts Developing Included sound/music on the card but did not work properly. Sound/music did not compliment the design and/or purpose of the card.	0 pts Unacceptable No sound/music was used on the card.	3 / 3 pts

NAME DUE STATUS SCORE OUT OF

CRITERIA	RATINGS				PTS
Scratch: Greeting Card view longer description	3 to >2 pts Outstanding Card shows a considerable amount of original thought and creativity. Card is interesting and engaging. Ideas incorporated into the card are highly creative and innovative.	2 to >1 pts Satisfactory Card shows some original thought and creativity. Work shows some new ideas and insights.	1 to >0 pts Developing Minimum requirements were done on project. Creative ideas were limited or not incorporated into the card design.	O pts Unacceptable  Little or no evidence of creative thinking. Overall, the card lacked creativity and innovative thought.	3/3p
FlipGrid Response: Coding!	5 to >4 pts Outstanding Thoughtful reflection on the coding exercises completed in class (i.e., Blue Bot, Osmo Coding, Osmo Coding Jam, Scratch, etc.). Thoughtful insights shared and summarized that illustrate	4 to >2.5 pts Satisfactory Satisfactory reflection on the coding exercises completed in class (i.e., Blue Bot, Osmo Coding, Osmo Coding Jam, Scratch, etc.) is given. Some insights shared and summarized that illustrate how such	2.5 to >0 pts Developing  Video response to activity is not deemed satisfactory. Reflection on the coding exercises completed in class (i.e., Blue Bot, Osmo Coding, Osmo Coding Jam, Scratch, etc.) was not reflective and	O pts Unacceptable  No FlipGrid response was completed to summarize the coding experiences completed in class.	3/5p

/IE		DUE	STATUS SCORE	OUT OF
SCRATCH CODING:	GREETING CAR	D		
CRITERIA	RATINGS			PTS
			helpful in determining impact on learning about coding. Did not critically reflect upon how "coding" will impact how future teachers (like you!) incorporate coding into instruction. No reference to specific readings on coding (Brickley & Gaske, 2017; Harrell, 2015) was incorporated into the response.	

## 2.17 Triple E - Lesson Plan Evaluation

Assignments

Feb 25 by 11:59pm



10