

# MACUL Outstanding Technology-Using Educator Application Rubric

Nominees are currently employed by an educational institution in Michigan (K-12, ISD/RESA) and are members in good standing with Macul prior to May 1, 2011 and at the time of the nomination. Possible roles to consider: teacher, principal, media specialist, technology leader, educational technology specialist, data and instructional coaches, superintendent

In submitting the application for the Outstanding Technology-Using Educator of the Year, these six areas should be specifically addressed. This statement is **limited to two single-spaced pages of 11 point Helvetica font**. A committee will review the applications based on the following criteria. Rubric scores are included for each point.

1. The nominee has contributed to both colleagues and the profession by attending and presenting at professional conferences, seminars, and workshops. (15 points)

0-3 Points	4-7 Points	8-11 Points	12-15 Points
No example is given showing where the educator has attended or presented at a professional conference, seminar or workshop or contributed any written material to a newsletter, journal or written or online publication.	An example is shown where the educator has presented at a professional conference, seminar or workshop or contributed written material to a newsletter, journal or written or online publication. Some feedback to the presentation or contribution is included.	Several examples are shown where the educator has presented at a professional conference, seminar or workshop or contributed material to a newsletter, journal or written/online publication. Examples of the efficacy and replication of the ideas and positive feedback to the applicant's contributions are also given.	Specific and detailed examples are given of the breadth and depth of the applicant's contributions in this area and in district, ISD, state or national settings. These examples define an individual who contributes in various, innovative ways modeling technology for both students and adult learning.

2. The nominee’s work has had a significant positive impact on students. (20 points)

<b>0–4 Points</b>	<b>5- 9 Points</b>	<b>10-14 Points</b>	<b>15-20 Points</b>
Provides few examples of a positive impact on integration and technology use in the classroom, district or university. The examples show no impact on student learning.	Provides examples of a positive impact on integration and technology use in the classroom, district or university. The examples are not clear, ideas are not easily replicable, and the impact on student achievement is not clearly stated.	There are a few examples of integration and technology. Examples include motivation, improved attitudes, and increased usage. Fewer examples of technology contributing to student achievement are found.	The positive impact on student learning is clear and easy to replicate. There are specific examples of a positive impact on integration and technology use. Technology is used for: academic achievement, motivation, attitude and effective communications.

3. The nominee has made significant efforts to advance his/her school and/or district in accordance with the district’s long range plans. (20 points)

<b>0-4 Points</b>	<b>5-9 Points</b>	<b>10-14 Points</b>	<b>15-20 Points</b>
The nominee has provided some help with the district or organizations technology planning.  There are no concrete examples of technology integration.	The nominee has helped with district and or schools technology planning. They have given some input to a technology committee.  There are a few examples of leadership in technology integration.	The nominee almost always helps with district or schools technology planning. The nominee is a member of the technology committee.  There are some examples of leadership in technology integration.	The nominee is a member or leader in their district/school technology planning committee. They show definite leadership and there are examples where they work with strategic planners in the school or district.  There are examples of unique technology initiatives that have the potential to have a positive impact on their district/school.

4. The nominee has made efforts to involve the community in the initiative/program of the district. (10 points)

<b>0-2 Points</b>	<b>3-5 Points</b>	<b>6-8 Points</b>	<b>9-10 Points</b>
There is little or no mention of community involvement in a district program or initiative.	The nominee has mentioned community involvement in a district program or initiative. There are not many understandable details.	The nominee has an example of community involvement in a district program or initiative. Others may look at the example and want to know more about it.	The nominee has a specific, exciting, example of community involvement in a school or district program or initiative. Others would look at the example and strive to replicate it.

5. The nominee works tirelessly to genuinely improve the quality of education. (15 points)

<b>0-3 Points</b>	<b>4-7 Points</b>	<b>8-11 Points</b>	<b>12-15 Points</b>
Examples given to show where the educator works hard to improve the quality of education are vague or hard to find.	An example is given showing where the educator works to improve the quality of education. The example shows how students and peers may benefit from these efforts but the example is not always clear or replicable.	A few examples are given showing where the educator works tirelessly to improve the quality of education. Examples show how students and peers may benefit from these efforts, the examples are clear and easy to replicate.	Multiple examples exist of the educator's sustained involvement in a broad range of initiatives both in and out of the classroom.  The educator effectively demonstrates this commitment through modeling, collaborating, and mentoring.

6. The nominee has integrated deliberate planning using national and state technology standards into efforts to improve education through the use of technology.  
(20 points)

<b>0-4 Points</b>	<b>5-10 Points</b>	<b>11-15 Points</b>	<b>16-20 Points</b>
<p>No example is given showing where the educator has integrated planning into efforts to improve education through the use of technology.</p>	<p>Few examples are given demonstrating the educator's knowledge and use of national technology standards and models. Few strategies for implementation are offered.</p>	<p>The educator is knowledgeable about national standards and curricula and is a contributor to district curriculum development.</p> <p>Technology integration strategies are effective but not unique.</p>	<p>The educator has skillfully integrated the ISTE technology standards and curricula into the design of an effective technology implementation model.</p> <p>The strategies are inventive and easy to implement. Follow up evaluation indicates the model was effective.</p>