

Classroom Environment Plan (CEP)
Mid-term Assessment
Fall 2009 Bowles



Here are the components for the CEP.

Length: No more than 10 pages excluding cover page.

Cover page: Title, your name, course number (CIED 5022).

Introduction: Definition of CEP, importance of CEP, importance of having a plan for CEP, elements of a good CEP from Chapters 1-4.

Reflective Section: Include philosophy to support your CEP. Mention influences on your plan (text, mentor, guest speaker, experience, observation). How has your plan evolved so far this semester — what did you know about CE planning at the beginning of the semester and how have your views changed? Mention your concerns about the plan.

Your CE Plan: Explain your plan — ideas, techniques, implementation, expected outcomes, ideal environment lay-out with an explanation of how your design connects to your plan (a visual representation of your ideal room arrangement).

Conclusion: A brief summary of your project, including connections to the Pathwise domains and criteria, and how the plan benefits you as an emerging professional.

References: Use if you quote anyone in your paper or if you borrow an idea from something that you have read besides our textbook.

Format your work in APA style for all pages. Number your pages beginning with the introduction page. Write in an academic language voice. Practice smart editing and coherent logic in your writing style.

**Due on Halloween Eve,
or you will turn into a pumpkin!**



Value of this assessment: 100 points
Upload to Chalk and Wire under Bowles, CIED 5022 Tenet Seven
Criteria for assessment:

Criterion

1

Introduction

Level 1	Unacceptable	Score:1.0
	Limited information about plan, little background for reader	
Level 2		Score:2.0
Level 3	Acceptable	Score:3.0

Adequate information about plan, reader has some idea of plan, its importance, and its elements

Level 4 Score:4.0

Level 5 Target Score:5.0

Detailed information about plan including elements of a good plan, thorough description of plan, its importance, and the importance of having a plan

Criterion 2

Reflection

Level 1 Unacceptable Score:1.0

Philosophy omitted or undeveloped, little or no influences mentioned, little or no reflection on evolution of plan, little or few concerns stated

Level 2 Score:2.0

Level 3 Acceptable Score:3.0

Philosophy developed, some influences mentioned, sufficient reflection on evolution of plan, some concerns stated

Level 4 Score:4.0

Level 5 Target Score:5.0

Philosophy well-developed, several influences mentioned, extensive reflection on evolution of plan, concerns articulated well with detail and connections

Criterion 3

Explanation of Your Plan

Level 1 Unacceptable Score:1.0

Ideas, techniques, implementation, and outcomes omitted or poorly

described; poorly executed visual with little or no connection to plan

Level 2 Score:2.0

Level 3 Acceptable Score:3.0

Ideas, techniques, implementation, and outcomes explained with some detail; visual depiction clear with some connection to plan

Level 4 Score:4.0

Level 5 Target Score:5.0

Ideas, techniques, implementation, and outcomes articulated well with detail and connections; visual artifact professionally executed and clearly connected to plan

Criterion 4

Summary of your Plan

Level 1 Unacceptable Score:1.0

Summary omitted or insufficient: limited or little connection to Pathwise

Level 2 Score:2.0

Level 3 Acceptable Score:3.0

Summary sufficient; some connection to Pathwise

Level 4 Score:4.0

Level 5 Target Score:5.0

Summary clearly draws all elements of paper together; detailed connection to Pathwise

Criterion 5

Benefits of Plan to You as an Emerging Professional

Level 1 Unacceptable Score:1.0

Unable to describe benefits, or describes superficially

Level 2 Score:2.0

Level 3 Acceptable Score:3.0

Some benefits listed that relate to plan

Level 4 Score:4.0

Level 5 Target Score:5.0

Thorough discussion of benefits and relationship to plan

Criterion 6

APA Format

Level 1 Unacceptable Score:1.0

Casual language, slang, poor organization, citations incorrect, little coherency

Level 2 Score:2.0

Level 3 Acceptable Score:3.0

Mostly academic language, adequate organization, citations with minimal errors, and some coherency

Level 4 Score:4.0

Level 5 Target Score:5.0

Academic language used exclusively, organization logical with good flow, correct citations, coherent

Criterion 7

Editing

Level 1 Unacceptable Score:1.0

Excessive errors interfere with readability

Level 2 Score:2.0

Level 3 Acceptable Score:3.0

Some errors in spelling, grammar, syntax, and mechanics

Level 4 Score:4.0

Level 5 Target Score:5.0

Minimal errors in all categories