The Northeast Ohio Tree Canopy and Environmental Justice Unit Scoring: Student responses will be measured utilizing a rubric adapted from the PSL – Argument Synthesis Rubric and the “Understanding Civic Duty” element of the PSL Problem Solving and Civic Engagement Rubric.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **PERRY SERVICE LEARNING**  **Environmental Justice Performance Based Rubric** | | | | |
| ELEMENT | L E V E L S O F P E R F O R M A N C E | | | |
| Unsatisfactory (0-2.5) | Basic (3) | Proficient (3.5) | Distinguished (4) |
| Understanding of tree canopy benefits | Unaware of tree canopy benefits. | Recognizes at least one category of tree canopy benefits (environment, public health, or economic). | Able to explain at least 2 categories of tree canopy benefits (environment, public health, and/or economic). | Able to explain the 3 categories of tree canopy benefits (environment, public health, and/or economic). |
| Lake County Tree Canopy Comparative Analysis | Student’s summary spreadsheet of sources is inadequate or inaccurate. Student’s reading of source is inaccurate and uncritical. Source is not synthesized into conversation with one another and with the student’s ideas. | Student partially summarizes some of the sources provided on spreadsheet. Student’s reading of source is somewhat accurate. Student’s reading of source could be more critical/analytical. Sources are somewhat synthesized into conversation with one another and with the ideas of the student. | Student accurately summarizes sources used on spreadsheet. Student’s reading of the sources is accurate. Student’s reading of the sources is somewhat critical/analytical. Sources are synthesized into conversation with one another and with the ideas of the author fairly well. | Student accurately and thoroughly summarizes sources used on spreadsheet. Student demonstrates ability to read sources accurately and comprehensively. Student demonstrates ability to read sources critically and analytically. Sources are synthesized into conversation with one another and with the ideas of the student thoroughly and effectively. |
| Propensity for civic engagement | Unable to identify community need(s). Has tried civic activities but does not reflect an internalized understanding of its aims or effect nor expresses commitment to future action. | Low: Identifies community need(s). Has clearly participated in civic action and does begin to reflect or describe how these actions benefit individual(s) or communities. | Medium: Can identify and evaluate community needs. Demonstrates experience and some leadership with civic action, with some degree of reflection about its aims and accomplishments. | High: Can identify and evaluate community needs and articulate the impact of actions taken. Demonstrates ability to participate in and lead complex civic action, with sophisticated reflection about its aims and accomplishments. |
| Understanding of civic duty | Unaware of civic responsibilities. | Recognizes at least one category of democratic citizenship (personally responsible, participatory, or justice-oriented) | Able to explain at least two categories of democratic citizenship (personally responsible, participatory, and/or justice-oriented). | Able to explain the three categories of democratic citizenship (personally responsible, participatory, and justice-oriented). |