Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macau Universities Student Innovative Teaching Competition by Guangdong-Hong Kong-Macao University Alliance for Teacher Education (GHMUSIT)

Evaluation Criteria for First Round GHMUSIT Competition

Presenters:
University:
Title of Lesson:
Assessed By: **Total Score: /35**

Category	5	4	3	2	1
Objectives/Outcomes of Lesson	Objectives/Outcomes have been clearly stated and are achievable by the students.		Only some of the objectives stated are clear and achievable by the students.		The objectives are vague and are not achievable by students.
Score					
Learning Tasks and Activities	Tasks are clearly aligned to the objectives, appropriately challenging, and effectively stimulate student participation.		Tasks are partially aligned to the objectives, lacking in appropriate challenge and somewhat promote student participation.		Tasks are not aligned to the objectives, involve no or little challenge for students and do not encourage active participation.
Score					
Instructional Strategies	All instructional strategies adopted are innovative, well-thought out		Most instructional strategies adopted seem well-thought out		Instructional strategies adopted indicate a lack of

	and engage students in their learning.		but lack engagement of students in their learning.		planning and do not engage students in their learning.
Score					
Assessment Strategies to Enhance Learning	All assessment strategies adopted are well-thought out and can enhance student learning.		Some assessment strategies adopted seem well-thought out and can somewhat promote student learning.		Assessment strategies adopted are not well-thought out and do not facilitate student learning.
Score					
Feasibility	The teaching schedule overall is well-planned and manageable with a clear progression from activity to activity within the lesson.		The teaching schedule is planned but is somewhat unmanageable or lacking in coherence between activities within the lesson.		The teaching schedule is unsystematically planned and unmanageable with no coherence between activities within the lesson.
Score					
Relevance of UNESCO's AI Education Framework on AI Foundations	The plan shows movement beyond listing or applying AI techniques superficially. It includes meaningful ways of including and/or co-designing instructional activities with AI to perform teaching tasks that are traditionally challenging to perform. The use of AI is clearly conceptualized and meaningfully connected across different parts of the lesson; the potential risks of adopting AI is		The plan shows inclusion of AI techniques that are somewhat meaningful, but AI teaching tasks could be somewhat done without AI to obtain similar outcomes; the use of AI is somewhat conceptualized in the teaching tasks but still has room for clarity; the plan demonstrates little evidence of creativity or transfer beyond single tasks; the potential risks of adopting AI is		The inclusion of AI is not meaningful, or at times even present potential harm to teaching and learning (e.g., privacy risks on student data, hallucinated content); the plan shows minimal conceptualization of AI or the assumption made about AI was incorrect. AI tools may be mentioned, but their use is vague or not

	well-considered and mostly-mitigated.		somewhat considered and partially mitigated.		connected meaningfully to the lesson.
Score					
Relevance of UNESCO's AI Education Framework on AI Pedagogy	The plan integrates AI into teaching strategies in a purposeful way, supporting preparation of teaching material, instructional design, learning process and outcomes, collaboration, care, or assessment. The use of AI clearly follows learner-centered principals.		The plan includes AI mainly as support for a limited set of teaching and learning tasks, but it does not clearly reshape or extend pedagogy in ways that extend beyond traditional pedagogy.		The plan refers to AI only as a basic add-on tool that presents no additional value to teaching and learning, with little or no visible impact on the teaching approach or learning process and learning outcome.
Score					

Other Comments:

Recommendation

This team is/is not recommended to join the 2nd Round of the GHMUSIT Competition.
(please cross out as appropriate)

Name of Recommender:
Signature

Date:

Received by Competition Organizing Committee on:

粤港澳高校教师教育联盟粤港澳大学生创新教学竞赛（GHMUSIT）

第一轮比赛评审标准

主讲人：

大学：

课程名称：

评审人：　　总分：　　/35

类别	5	4	3	2	1
课程目标/结果	课程目标/结果已经陈述明确并且学生可以达到和实现。		只有一些课程目标陈述清楚学生可以实现。		课程目标模糊且学生无法实现。
得分					
学习任务和活动	任务明确且与课程目标一致，适当地具有挑战性，并且有效地激发学生的参与。		任务与课程目标部分一致，稍微欠缺挑战性，一定程度促进了学生的参与。		任务与课程目标不一致，缺乏挑战性，未鼓励学生踊跃参与。
得分					
教学策略	所有采用的教学策略都是创新的，经过深思熟虑的，并使学生参与到他们的学习。		大多数采用的教学策略是深思熟虑的，但学生的参与不足。		所采用的教学策略缺乏计划，未能吸引学生参与学习。
得分					
促进学习的教学评估策略	所有教学评估策略都是经过深思熟虑的并能促进学生的学习。		一些教学评估策略是经过深思熟虑的，一定程度上能促进学生的学习。		采取的教学评估策略未经过深思熟虑且不能促进学生学习。
得分					

可行性	教学计划整体上策划良好且易操作，课程从一个活动到下一个活动有明确的推进。		教学有计划但不易操作，活动与课程之间欠缺连贯性与一致性。		教学计划不系统，活动与课程之间不连贯。
得分					
联合国教科文组织人工智能教育框架在“人工智能基础”方面的相关性	该计划表现出对人工智能技术的运用已超越表层的列举或应用，能够以有意义的方式融入并/或与人工智能共同设计教学活动，以完成传统上较难实施的教学任务。人工智能的使用在概念上清晰、逻辑连贯，并在课程的不同部分之间形成有意义的联系；同时，对采用人工智能可能带来的潜在风险也进行了充分考量并得到了较好的缓解。		该计划展示了对人工智能技术的部分有意义应用，但所设计的AI教学任务在一定程度上可以在没有AI的情况下获得类似的结果；AI在教学任务中的使用具有一定的概念性，但仍有进一步明确的空间；整体上缺乏超越单一任务的创造性或迁移性证据；对采用人工智能可能带来的潜在风险有所考量，但仅得到部分缓解。		人工智能的融入缺乏实际意义，有时甚至可能对教学与学习造成潜在危害（例如：学生数据的隐私风险、虚构内容等）；该计划对人工智能的概念化程度极低，或对AI的假设存在错误。虽然提及了AI工具，但其使用方式含糊不清，且与课程内容缺乏有意义的关联。
得分					
联合国教科文组织人工智能教育框架在“人工智能教学法”方面的相关性	该计划以有目的的方式将人工智能融入教学策略中，支持教学材料的准备、教学设计、学习过程与成果、协作、关怀或评估等环节。人工智能的使用清晰地遵循以学习者为中心的原则。		该计划主要将人工智能用于少量教学与学习任务的支持，但并未在超越传统教学法的层面上，对教学方式进行明显的重塑或拓展。		该计划仅将人工智能视为一种基础的附加工具，对教学与学习没有带来额外价值，对教学方法、学习过程或学习成果几乎没有或完全没有可见的影响。
得分					

其他评语：

建议

这支队伍**建议**／不建议参加第二轮的比赛。（请适当地划掉）

推荐人姓名：

签名：

日期：

竞赛组委会通过日期：