

Evaluation Rubric for iPad Applications

Framework for assessing the value of iPad applications for teaching and learning

| Domain | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| Links to curriculum content descriptions | Skills reinforced are not clearly connected to the curriculum content descriptions. | Skills reinforced are a prerequisite or requirement of the curriculum content descriptions. | Skills reinforced are clearly linked to the curriculum content descriptions. | Skills reinforced are explicitly linked to the curriculum content descriptions. |
| Cognitive opportunities | <p>Remember: Application allows students to exhibit memory of previously learned materials by recalling facts, terms, basic concepts and answers to describe; name; find; list; tell.</p> <p>Understand: Application allows students to demonstrate understanding of facts and ideas and to explain; compare; discuss, predict, translate, outline, and restate.</p> | <p>Apply: Application allows students to solve problems by applying new knowledge to new situations or by applying acquired knowledge, facts, techniques and rules in a different way to show; complete; use; examine; illustrate; classify; and solve.</p> | <p>Analyze: Application allows students to examine and break information into parts; by identifying motives or causes; making inferences and finding evidence to support generalizations; comparing; examining; explaining; identifying; categorizing; contrasting; and investigating.</p> <p>Evaluate: Application allows students to present and defend opinions by making judgments about information, the validity of ideas or the quality of work based on a set of criteria to justify; assess; prioritize; recommend; rate; decide; and choose.</p> | <p>Create: Application allows students to plan; invent; compose; design; construct; imagine.</p> |
| Level of technology integration | Substitution: Technology acts as direct tool substitute, with no functional change. | Augmentation: Technology acts as a direct tool substitute, with functional improvement. | Modification: Technology allows for significant task redesign. | Redefinition: Technology allows for the creation of new tasks, previously inconceivable. |
| Authenticity | Skills are practiced through rote or in isolation. | Skills are practiced in a contrived game/simulation format. | Some aspects of the application are presented in an authentic learning environment. | Targeted skills are practiced in an authentic learning environment. |
| Interactivity | Application allows students to continually guess until the right answer appears. | No reinforcement of the concept but rather interaction is limited to student guessing the right answer rather than reinforcing the concept. | Interactivity is specific and results in improved student achievement. Application may include tutorials. | Interactivity is specific and results in improved student achievement. Produces data electronically for teacher and student. |
| Differentiation | Application settings cannot be adjusted to meet student needs. | Application offers limited flexibility by providing basic level options of easy, medium or hard. | Application offers more than one level of flexibility to adjust settings to meet student needs. | Application offers complete flexibility to adjust settings to meet student needs. |
| Student use | Students need constant teacher guidance to use the application. | Students require frequent teacher guidance to re-explain how to use the application. | Students require occasional teacher review to use the application. | Students work independently to launch and navigate within the application. |
| Student Motivation | Students avoid using the application. | Students show limited engagement with the application. | Students use the application with some enjoyment and engagement. | Students are highly motivated to engage with the application. |

- Revised with permission from Walker, H., (2010). Evaluation Rubric for iPod Apps, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland. Puentedura, R. R., Ph.D., SAMR model,
- http://www.hippasus.com/rpweblog/archives/2011/10/28/SAMR_TPCK_In_Action.pdf
- Anderson, L.W., and D. Krathwohl (Eds.) (2001). A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: a Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Longman, New York.

Evaluation Rubric for iPad Applications

- Revised with permission from Walker, H., (2010). Evaluation Rubric for iPod Apps, John Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland. Puentedura, R. R., Ph.D., SAMR model,
- http://www.hippasus.com/rrpweblog/archives/2011/10/28/SAMR_TPCCK_In_Action.pdf
- Anderson, L.W., and D. Krathwohl (Eds.) (2001). A Taxonomy for Learning, Teaching and Assessing: a Revision of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives. Longman, New York.