





## STEM Education Service-Learning Project Reflection – Assessment Rubrics of Reflective Journal

## RJ1 -The Impact of Your Service on the Recipients and Community

Our era of technological advancements also brought about information/digital divide in society.

- The social issue: How did your understanding of digital divide change as a consequence of this STEM education service-learning project? (Be specific and explain with detail.)
- Your service: To what extent do you think your STEM education service-learning project helped address in reducing the digital divide? Did you/your team achieve the learning outcomes (e.g., reflect on their role and responsibilities both as a professional in STEM discipline and as a responsible citizen) stated in your project proposal?
- The recipients & community: Did you observe any changes in your service recipients before and after they learnt STEM? What influence do you think the service experience will have on them in the long term?

Grade	Description	
A+	Excellent (9-11)	Content: clearly articulates the issue/concept; cites specific change(s) & gives detailed elaboration; shows in-depth/critical awareness of the
Δ		problem; thoughtful/sincere/reflective/engaged quality; explicitly links ideas to subject/service experience; cogently supported by evidence,
		examples; <u>highly</u> observant of recipients
Α-		Writing: logical flow or structure; highly comprehensible language/expression
		Comprehensive: all three points are answered thoroughly
B+		Content: articulates issue/concept; cites and elaborates change(s); shows awareness of the problem; expresses sensible, balanced thoughts which
В	Good	are relevant to subject/service experience; provides <u>some</u> evidence/examples; observant of recipients
	(6-8)	Writing: sensible flow; comprehensible language/expression
B-		Comprehensive: all three points are addressed
C+		Content: general or emergent discussion of issue/concept and/or change: lacks elaboration, detail, or support; contains superficial, cliched, or one-
	Satisfactory	sided ideas; limited or loose reference to subject/service experience
C	(3-5)	Writing: readable
C-		Comprehensive: Neglects or inadequately answers one point
D+		Content: Limited awareness of issue and recipients; contains biased or implausible ideas; overall vague, underdeveloped, does not apply or link to
<u> </u>	Pass	subject learning
U	(1-2)	Writing: irrelevant writing
		Comprehensive: Only answered one point adequately
F		Content: No awareness of issue and recipients; contains incoherent and misleading ideas; overall disorganized, does not apply or link to subject
	F-:1	learning
	Fail	Writing: Nonsensical writing
		Comprehensive: No point is answered adequately

☑ Sllo.info@polyu.edu.hk

2766 4376

**₹** @ServiceLearningPolyU

















## **RJ2- Learning from Your Experience**

Think critically about your positive and negative experiences from the STEM education service-learning.

- a) What was the most challenging incident or difficult part of your service experience? What did/can you learn from teaching the service recipients STEM?
- b) What was the most memorable incident or rewarding part of your service experience? What did/can you learn from teaching the service recipients STEM?

For each question, identify a concrete experience and go through the following steps: first, **DESCRIBE** what happened (what/who/where/when?); then, **EVALUATE** & **ANALYSE** your reaction (what did you feel/think when it happened? why did you react that way? what does your reaction say about you?); finally, **LEARN** (what did you learn? what would you do in a similar situation in the future?)

Grade	Description		
A+		●incidents behind (a) & (b) are <u>concrete</u> and <u>well</u> -elaborated/supported	
A	Excellent (9-11)	● both (a) and (b) are answered methodically (discussed thoroughly following DEAL steps)	
_		●demonstrates <u>in-depth</u> , <u>personal</u> reflection	
A-		•articulates <u>consequential</u> , <u>practicable</u> learning, in line with service-learning/course objectives	
B+		•incidents behind (a) & (b) are <u>identified</u> and <u>sufficiently</u> elaborated/supported	
В	Good	●(a) <u>and</u> (b) are both considered methodically, one more excellently than the other	
	(6-8)	•sensible/thoughtful consideration of experiences	
B-		●identifies <u>sound/plausible</u> learning points	
C+		●incidents behind (a) & (b) are mentioned but lack elaboration/support	
C	Satisfactory	●(a) or (b) is not examined thoroughly or clearly (superficial or neglects some steps)	
	(3-5)	●tone is <u>disengaged/uncontextualized</u>	
C-		•learning points are implausible/cliched	
D+		●mere/general mention of incidents behind (a) & (b), without elaboration or support	
	Pass	●(a) <u>and</u> (b) are <u>not</u> examined thoroughly or clearly	
D	(1-2)	<ul><li>underdeveloped; irrelevant</li></ul>	
		●learning points are implausible/cliched	
F		●no mention of incidents behind (a) & (b)	
	Fail	●(a) <u>and</u> (b) are <u>not</u> examined	
	Fall	● <u>inaccurate</u> ; <u>nonsensical</u>	
		●learning points are <u>missing</u>	

Funded by



