Revised September, 2016

**Missouri PLC Rubric Artifact Collection Tool**

Please note: Each successive level of implementation reflects the cumulative effect of those preceding it. (i.e., to be deeply implementing, the conditions of proficient and partial must be present and in place)

This organizing tool is designed to help you archive evidence of your PLC implementation. Evidence may come in the form of documents, photos, videos, webpages, social media posts, etc. The color-coded “suggested artifacts for implementation evidence” are provided to give you suggestions of potential evidence. In most cases, the links will go to documents which are all contained in a shared folder (Google, Dropbox, etc.). Please consider how you will give access to the documents to your PLC consultants and others outside your organization. Dates are extremely helpful.

Artifacts may include documents, spreadsheets, photos, videos, links to websites, links to Google Forms, presentations, etc. It is not necessary to have something documented or hyperlinked in every area below. However, attention should be given to providing the “right” documents that are strong evidence of your implementation in a particular strand.

HYPERLINKS TO THE STRANDS

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| [Strand 1: Learning Community Culture and Continuous Improvement](#bigstrand1) | [Strand 2: How Effective Building Level Leadership Teams Work](#bigstrand2) |
| [Strand 3: How Effective Teams Work](#bigstrand3) | [Strand 4: What Should Students Need to Know and Do? (CQ1)](#bigstrand4) |
| [Strand 5: How Will We Know When Students Have Learned? (CQ2)](#bigstrand5) | [Strand 6: How Will We Respond When Students Have/Have Not Learned? (CQ3&4)](#bigstrand6) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[Strand 1: Learning Community Culture and Continuous Improvement](#strand1)** | | | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **A. Mission** | The school community regularly revisits and aligns all relevant decisions to the mission. Staff and students can articulate the mission. | The mission impacts the school in terms of decisions and actions, and is evident to others (i.e., posted in the school, on the website, in announcements). | The school has developed a mission statement that reflects a focus on learning and a belief all students can learn. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Photos, artifacts, and other sources demonstrating multiple opportunities where the mission has been revisited by the school and community. | Link to photos of hallway displays, website.  Evidence of stakeholder input into the development of the mission statement. | Link to mission statement.  Link to photos of hallway displays, website.  Evidence of stakeholder input into the development of the mission statement |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **B. Vision** | The school community regularly revisits the vision, including planning and documenting progress toward achieving the vision. All decisions are aligned to the vision. | Staff members can demonstrate in words and actions a compelling vision for the school. The vision is posted and/or visual to stakeholders. | The school has collectively clarified a compelling vision for the school. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Examples of the vision being displayed and/or communicated in alternative ways.  Evidence of the staff revisiting the vision and documenting progress toward achieving the vision. | Link to evidence of posting in building and/or website through photos, artifacts or other sources. | Link to vision statements.  Link to photos of hallway displays, website.  Evidence of stakeholder input into the development of the vision statement |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **C. Collective Commitments related to Values** | Staff members annually revisit collective commitments and values. Structures are in place to monitor the implementation of these throughout the year. | Staff members have developed and demonstrate in words and actions the values of the school through a set of collective commitments aligned to the mission and vision. Values and commitments are posted and/or visual. | The school has identified and clarified values by developing a written set of collective commitments. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence of the monitoring of progress toward implementation of the collective commitments (surveys, Building SMART goals, data, etc.) | Link to photos or a summary of commitments in use.  Evidence which shows reflection and references to the collective commitments. | Link to collaboratively developed collective commitments related to values.  Link to photos of hallway displays, website.  Evidence of stakeholder input into the development of the mission statement |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **D. Building Level Data Analysis** | There is a collaborative, building wide process in place for examining building level data. When appropriate, changes in practice have been made, and related student data are monitored for anticipated changes. | Relevant data have been identified, collected and shared with appropriate staff in a manner that is easy to use and understand. School staff demonstrate an understanding of these data points and why they have been selected. | Data is collected, but not used in a systematic manner. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Link to action plans based on systemic sharing of data.  Link to the established plan for sharing and using data. | Link to data shared with staff, minutes of meeting(s) where data is shared, minutes of leadership team meetings where data is examined. | Link to list of types of data being collected, but not necessarily used systematically. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **E. Building Level SMART Goals** | The school routinely and annually revises SMART goals. | The school has established a common understanding of a results oriented learning community by creating, implementing, and monitoring building level SMART Goals and Action Plans that align with the mission, vision and commitments. | Building level SMART goals have been created, but they are not monitored, and may not be aligned with the mission, vision, and collective commitments. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence through meeting minutes, documents, etc. of the school staff revisiting and/or revising SMART Goals routinely over time. | Link to school improvement plans/documents showing action plans toward achieving SMART Goals.  Evidence of monitoring the progress of SMART Goals. | Link to a copy of Building level SMART goals which have been collaboratively created. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **F. School Culture** | The school culture is routinely examined and evaluated through reflection, survey(s) of stakeholders, etc. Information from those sources is utilized to continuously maintain and improve the culture. | The school has established a common purpose of learning for all, a collaborative culture, and a focus on results. Attention is given to developing, celebrating, and maintaining this culture among students and adults. | The school has created common knowledge of a PLC culture and has begun to examine their current culture. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence that school culture has been communicated to outside stakeholders, as well as involvement of those stakeholders. | Evidence from celebrations related to academic or cultural goals (not behavioral), such as pictures, videos, etc.  Acknowledgement of both adult and student involvement and contributions toward the development of a learning culture. | Link to photos, meeting agendas/minutes, etc. showing where the staff has examined their current reality and held dialogue about the culture of the school. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **G. Action Research** | There is evidence of multiple cycles of action research resulting in changes to practice and are shared with multiple stakeholders, often through appropriate visual displays. | There is evidence that teachers engage in action research on an ongoing basis, using a structured cycle, or in deepening understanding and use of research based practices. | Teachers and/or teams inconsistently engage in action research, or do so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Link to samples of evidence of action research by staff.  Evidence of how action research has modified to changed existing practice of teaching and learning. | Link to description of a structured cycle for action research.  Link to tangible evidence of teachers and teacher teams engaging in action research.  A data team cycle that includes a clearly selected instruction identified by the team including data collection strategy/process. | Evidence that teachers have discussed the use of action research.  List of potential ideas for action research generated by staff. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **H. Sustainability** | Action plans are developed based on monitoring data for improving and maintaining professional learning communities. | Structures and protocols have been developed to insure continuity of PLCs, including education and induction of staff about PLCs and monitoring implementation at the team and building level (BAT, IR, Evidence Tool, etc.) | The school staff recognizes the need to establish processes to sustain their work. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Examples of explicit action plans developed which are based upon cause and effect data collected toward maintaining the professional learning community. | Evidence of induction processes at the district, building, or team level.  Multi-year plans for sharing of roles and responsibilities among team members and leadership team members. | Evidence through meeting agendas and minutes, professional development plans, etc., that the staff has been involved in dialogue concerning the sustaining of their work. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[Strand 2: How Effective Building Level Leadership Teams Work](#strand2)** | | | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **A. Shared Leadership** | Teacher leadership is intentionally developed in members of the leadership team, as well as in other teachers. Attention is given to communication across initiatives and long-term rotation, coordination, and sharing of leadership. All collaborative teams are represented. | The leadership team applies practices of shared leadership with delineation of roles, processes and responsibilities. The leadership team includes representation from collaborative teams . | The leadership team applies practices of shared leadership inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Examples of documents/guidelines/etc. where leadership skills are intentionally being developed.  Schedules of long-term rotation, coordination and sharing of leadership to enhance sustainability over time. | Schedules of leadership team meetings and sample minutes from leadership team meetings depicting sharing of leadership responsibilities.  Examples of leadership team members facilitating professional development opportunities for staff. | A roster of leadership team members on leadership team who represent all factions of the school building community, especially collaborative team representation. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **B. Meeting Conditions** | The leadership team models effective collaborative processes for the rest of the building in a transparent and intentional manner. | The leadership team meets regularly and effectively to provide direction  for implementation. The team uses norms, roles and protocols (i.e., agendas, minutes, decision making tools, inquiry processes, conflict resolution strategies, etc.). | The meeting conditions are inconsistent, or implemented in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Examples of the leadership team modeling specific collaborative processes for the rest of the building and sharing strategies of collaboration (consensus, conflict management, norms of collaboration, etc.) | Evidence through meeting schedules and agendas that the leadership team meets regularly (at least once per month, and often twice per month)  Evidence that leadership team protocols such as norms, roles, agendas, etc. are modeled and utilized during team meetings. | Evidence suggests that the leadership team does meet, but inconsistently. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **C. Communication** | Effective communication processes exist between the PLC leadership team and other building leadership teams in the district, as well as with the central office. | Communication processes are in place for teams and teachers to provide input to the leadership team. The work of the leadership team is communicated and is transparent to staff. | The leadership team uses communication processes inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Examples of routine communication procedures and protocols being used regularly in the building among staff members as well as throughout the district. | Evidence that communication processes are intentionally established in the building.  Examples of two-way communication, especially where the leadership team is soliciting and reviewing communications/input from staff. | Samples of communications from the leadership team to the staff. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **D. Progress Monitoring** | The leadership team progress monitors the work of collaborative teams, including team and school goals, as well as the use of team processes and team functioning. As a result of identified needs, the leadership team provides appropriate support and targeted professional development. | The leadership team progress monitors the work of collaborative teams, including team and school goals, as well as the use of team processes and team functioning. | The leadership team progress monitors the work of collaborative teams, including team and school goals inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence of the leadership team reviewing the work of collaborative teams, identifying specific needs for skill/knowledge development, and the leadership team providing appropriate support and targeted professional development to teams. | Minutes of meetings showing multiple discussions of school and team goals.  Evidence of specific targets and benchmarking of goals (timelines, progress reports, etc.) and names of individuals who are responsible for portions of action plans.  Examples of collaborative team minutes being reviewed.  Evidence of SMART goal results being reviewed. | At least one example through leadership team minutes, of the team monitoring the work of the collaborative teams. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **E. Feedback to Teams** | The leadership team collects and analyzes data and artifacts and provides feedback to improve school practices. They are sharing their processes and decisions. The leadership team provides appropriate support and professional development. | The leadership team regularly provides feedback to the collaborative teams through review of agendas and on all teaming practices to ensure fidelity of PLC implementation. | The leadership team provides feedback on teaming practices to teams inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Examples of how the leadership team regularly collects and analyzes data from teams.  Samples of supports and/or professional development given to teams in the form of feedback. | Artifacts of feedback mechanisms used by the leadership team to regularly provide feedback to collaborative teams on teaming practices.  Leadership team minutes reflecting the review of team meeting minutes and resulting feedback. | Sample of leadership team meeting minutes reflecting evidence of feedback on collaborative team practices back to teams. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[Strand 3: How Effective Teams Work](#strand3)** | | | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **A. Meeting Conditions** | Every member of the educational staff participates on a collaborative team specifically aligned with his/her role and teaching assignment. Both horizontal and vertical teaming is evident. | Weekly time for collaborative meetings is scheduled during the school day. Team member participation is expected and supported by administration at all levels. | The meeting conditions for teams are inconsistent, or implemented in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence which shows that every staff member participates on a collaborative team.  Team agendas demonstrating both horizontal and vertical team meetings. | Schedule of team meetings at least once per week.  Samples of team meeting minutes and evidence of work produced by teams. | Rosters of staff members who participate on collaborative grade level teams and/or content teams. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **B. Collaborative Processes** | Teams use a recording and  communication mechanism to maintain an accurate record of conversations and work completed. These records are shared across teams. | Teams use norms, roles and protocols (i.e., agendas, minutes, decision making tools, inquiry processes, conflict resolution strategies, etc.). The work of collaborative teams is aligned to the four corollary questions. | Teams inconsistently use norms, roles and protocols (i.e., agendas, minutes, decision making tools, inquiry processes, conflict resolution strategies, etc.), or do so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Sample of a universally adopted system for teams to record and communicate minutes/work of collaborative teams. | Samples of agenda/minutes templates universally adopted by teams.  Evidence of artifacts produced by collaborative teams.  Evidence that each team has adopted and observes protocols clarifying how members will fulfill responsibilities to the team (roles, norms, etc.)    Minutes/artifacts include attention to common formative and summative assessments, effective instructional practices/strategies, and limited use of meeting time for housekeeping related items. | Samples of teams using agendas, minutes, etc. in team meetings. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **C. Team Monitoring** | Teams regularly use a tool to assess their attention to team structures, protocols and use of the 4 corollary questions, and intentionally reflect upon the results to deepen their collaborative practices. | Teams utilize a monitoring tool such as the “Critical Issues for Team Consideration” to review their teaming practices at least annually. | Teams inconsistently use monitoring tools to guide the work of collaborative teams, or do so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence that collaborative teams have regularly used a universally adopted tool to review their teaming practices **and** have intentionally acted upon this information to improve teaming practices. | Examples of teams using a tool (preferably adopted universally by all teams) to review their practices at least once during the year. | Evidence through team and/or staff meetings/pd that staff have discussed strategies for monitoring their own teaming progress. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **D. Focus on Results from Data** | Teams regularly use an easily accessible format for collecting, recording and analyzing student data to drive instruction and identify students in need of additional assistance. Team results are shared and analyzed regularly within and across teams. | Teams engage in a structured protocol for analyzing student data, paying attention to the steps of the data team process:   * Collecting/Charting Data * Analyzing to Prioritize * Setting SMART Goals * Selecting Instructional Strategies * Determining Results Indicators   Monitoring and Evaluating Results. | Teams inconsistently focus on results using strategies and structures to facilitate data driven decisions, or do so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence that a systematic process is in place and regularly used by all teams for collecting, analyzing and recording student data.  Evidence that data driven decisions are being made to impact instruction and identify students in need of assistance. | Collaborative team documents of the process used  Minutes of team meetings or artifacts showing evidence of discussion of results of SMART goals and action plans  Common lesson plans, common assessments, scoring guides, interdisciplinary teaching units or other evidence of teachers observing and helping one another | Evidence that staff have had professional development related to data driven decision making and have begun to practice this strategy. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **E. Trust / Participation** | Teams intentionally monitor and address shifts in trust and participation using tools such as perceptual data, staff surveys, etc. Teams have protocols in place to effectively address conflict. | Teams demonstrate high levels of trust and engaged participation in collaborative meetings. | Teams inconsistently participate in collaborative meetings, or do so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Examples through team meeting minutes and documents where staff regularly monitor shifts in trust and participation.  Examples of protocols and skill development in addressing conflict among team members. | Evidence that staff have developed and/or adopted a tool or tools which address the monitoring of trust and participation among staff members.  \*Evidence with this indicator is often difficult to quantify. Generally evidence is obtained through teacher interviews. | Evidence that staff members have received professional development related to trust, and that expectations have been expressed about staff participation. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[Strand 4: What Should Students Need to Know and Do? (CQ 1)](#strand4)** | | | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **A. Priority Standards** | Teams regularly review and align learning around priority standards both horizontally and vertically. | Teams have determined priority standards using appropriate criteria (endurance; leverage; readiness) or state recommendations and use common curricular terminology in their work. | Teams have inconsistently or incompletely implemented the proficient criteria. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Examples of teams regularly reviewing and aligning priority standards both horizontally **and** vertically. | Documents showing priority standards which have been collaboratively identified for grade levels and/or subject areas. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support in identifying priority standards. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **B. Unwrapping Priority Standards** | Teacher teams continuously engage in the unwrapping process as an integral part of instruction and assessment. | Teams have unwrapped priority standards including tasks such as:   * Identifying skills and content * Articulating learning targets in student friendly language * Determining Depth of Knowledge * Identifying the Big Ideas and Essential Questions * Identifying prior learning.   Determining success criteria | Teams have inconsistently unwrapped priority standards, or have done so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence through documentation that staff have embedded the unwrapping process as an integral and ongoing component of collaborative team meeting work. | Curriculum and/or documents showing priority standards that have been unwrapped by collaborative teams. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support in unwrapping priority standards. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **C. Instructional Timeline** | Evidence supports an aligned, building wide instructional timeline for all grade levels/content areas. | Teams have developed and implemented instructional timelines for priority standards including identified resources for instruction and assessment. | Teams have inconsistently and/or incompletely developed instructional timelines. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence through documentation that there is an aligned building-wide, systemic timeline for all grades and/or subject areas. | Evidence through documentation that teams have established their own instructional timelines for addressing priority standards by grade/subject area. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support in establishing instructional timelines for addressing priority standards. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **D. Review & Revise Priority Standards** | School wide systematic processes are in place for teams to review, reflect and revise priority standards. | Teams review and revise priority standards regularly. | Teams inconsistently and/or incompletely review and revise priority standards. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence through documentation and/or communications that a school wide, systematic process is in place for teams to review, reflect and revise priority standards. | Evidence that teams have reviewed and revised their priority standards. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or communications that it is the expectation that teams will review and revise priority standards as appropriate. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[Strand 5: How Will We Know When Students Have Learned? (CQ 2)](#strand5)** | | | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **A. Assessment Literacy** | Building wide formative and summative assessment processes are systematically used to monitor the impact of curriculum and instruction. | Teams understand the purpose and function of assessment and implement appropriate assessment processes, including   * Classroom formatives * Common formatives * Common summatives   Interim/benchmark Assessments | Teams have inconsistently or incompletely implemented the proficient criteria. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence through documentation and artifacts that there are building-wide processes in place to monitor the impact of curriculum and instruction. | Evidence through documents, team and/or building agendas and artifacts that teachers are implementing appropriate assessment processes in developing classroom formatives, common formatives and summatives, as well as benchmark assessments. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and training in assessment literacy. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **B. Assessment Design** | Teams continuously revise assessment items and scoring guides based on student work and data. | Teams have collaboratively determined valid formative and summative assessment tools aligned to priority standards and administered consistently. | Teams have inconsistently or incompletely implemented the proficient criteria. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence through team meeting agendas and artifacts that assessment design is a regular component of collaborative team work. | Samples of collaboratively developed formative assessments aligned to priority standards. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and training in developing appropriate assessment tools and processes. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **C. Feedback** | Students use feedback to advance their learning; they provide feedback to one another, and to their teachers. | Teams have developed and applied strategies and techniques for providing timely, specific, descriptive, feedback to students. | Teams have inconsistently developed and applied strategies/technique s for providing descriptive feedback, or have done so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence of students using teacher feedback to advance their own learning.  Samples of rubrics/tools students are using to process feedback and to provide feedback to the teacher. | Evidence through team meeting agendas, artifacts, etc. that teachers are utilizing effective strategies and/or tools for providing students with descriptive feedback. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and training in providing descriptive feedback in their classrooms. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **D. Student Engagement** | Student engagement in learning and assessment practices are consistent and pervasive throughout the school. | Teams have developed and applied strategies for engaging students in the assessment process. Evidence would include some of the following:   * Clear and understandable learning targets * Anchor/Criteria charts * Student self monitoring and reflection * Student tracking and recording their own learning * Goal setting and action steps * Student led conferences | Teams have inconsistently developed and applied strategies for involving students in the assessment process, or have done so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Additional examples of student work and evidence that student engagement practices are pervasive and consistent throughout the building and not just in a few areas. | Samples/pictures of learning targets displayed in classrooms and used by students.  Samples of students reflecting upon their own learning.  Examples of students tracking their own learning.  Examples of students goal setting  Records and guidelines documenting student led conferences. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and training in student engagement. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **E. Scoring** | Teams routinely calibrate and collectively score student work. | Teams calibrate scoring tools prior to and/or during the scoring of student work. | Teams inconsistently calibrate scoring tools prior to and/or during the scoring of student work. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Evidence through team meeting minutes, artifacts and samples that teachers routinely score student work collectively. | Evidence through team meeting minutes that teachers have collaboratively calibrated scoring tools and student work. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and training in the how and why of collectively scoring student work. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **F. Grading/Reporting Practices** | Schools have adopted standards referenced reporting practices. | The school has collectively committed to grading/reporting practices that accurately communicate learning. | Teams have inconsistently committed to common grading and/or reporting practices. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Documentation of the building wide adoption of consistent grading and reporting practices. | Evidence through team and staff meeting minutes, as well as documentation, that teachers have committed to specific grading and reporting practices. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and have engaged in dialogue about grading and reporting practices. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **[Strand 6: How will we respond when students have/have not learned ? (CQ 3&4) (Systematic Process for Intervention/Enrichment)](#strand6)** | | | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **A. Collective Responsibility** | The school wide process is  monitored and adjusted over time, across content areas, and success for each student is deeply embedded in the school culture. | Staff members consistently accept responsibility for the success of all students, through a school wide process to support all learners. | Staff members inconsistently accept responsibility for the success of all students, and/or there is not a school wide process established. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Examples of tools and/or processes used school wide for monitoring and adjusting established commitments for the success of all students. | Copies of purpose statements or guidelines depicting collective responsibility for the success of all students.  Copies of goals and/or collective commitments emphasizing collective responsibility for learning. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and have engaged in dialogue concerning collective responsibility for the learning of children. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **B. Data Communication** | There is a school wide communication system for data, which is visible and accessible to all stakeholders, and may involve other district buildings, both vertically and horizontally (when needed). | Teams demonstrate the use of a communication system for data (academic, behavior, attendance, entrance and exit criteria for tiers, etc.). | Teams have an inconsistent or limited communication system for data. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Documented evidence that a school wide communication system has been put in place and is consistently used by all stakeholders. | Samples of emails, team minutes, records, etc. that teachers communication with one another concerning data which impacts the learning of students. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have engaged in dialogue concerning the communication of learning data. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **C. Tier 1 Core Instruction** | The implementation of the core instructional program is monitored, including both cause and effect data, and adjusted to increase fidelity of implementation across all aspects of Tier 1.  Longitudinal data indicates tiered instruction is effective over time. | The school implements the essential components of Tier 1 Core Instruction:   * Evidence based instructional practices, including differentiation * Formative assessment practices * Additional time and support * Universal screening | The school inconsistently implements essential components of Tier 1 Core Instruction (see proficient), or does so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Documentation and evidence that an intentional process is in place throughout the building for monitoring the effectiveness of tier 1 core instruction. | Documentation describing the Tier 1/Core Program for intervention.  Pictures/samples of team data boards, data walls and other mechanisms for tracking student performance. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and training in providing differentiated instruction and intervention in the classroom. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **D. Tier 2 Intervention** | Both cause and effect data are monitored and adjusted to increase fidelity of implementation across all aspects of Tier 2.  Longitudinal data indicates tiered instruction is effective over time. | The school implements the essential components of Tier 2 intervention:   * Targeted, timely and directive instruction and assessment * Identification of intentional non-learners and failed learners * Data driven decisions based upon multiple sources, including formative assessments * More frequent progress monitoring to allow for flexibility in support * Targeted support delivered by the most qualified professionals | The school inconsistently implements essential components of Tier 2 intervention, or does so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Documentation that tier 2 interventions are monitored and adjusted throughout the buildings for all students.  Data evidence that tier 2 interventions are effective and achieving the desired result. | Documentation describing the Tier 2 components of how intentional non-learners and failed learners are provided support.  Examples through collaborative team minutes of teacher review of student data in monitoring and providing appropriate and timely interventions for students in need. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and training in developing Tier 2 interventions for students in need of assistance. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **E. Tier 3 Intervention** | Both cause and effect data are monitored and adjusted to increase fidelity of implementation across all aspects of Tier 3.  Longitudinal data indicates tiered instruction is effective over time. | The school implements the essential components of a Tier 3 intervention plan:   * Multiple sources of data to identify root causes of failed learning * More targeted, more intensive support delivered by the most qualified professionals * Targeted assessments for timely progress monitoring | The school inconsistently implements essential components of Tier 3 intervention, or does so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Documentation that tier 3 interventions are monitored and adjusted throughout the buildings for all students.  Data evidence that tier 3 interventions are effective and achieving the desired result. | Documentation describing the Tier 3 components of how students in need of more focused attention are receiving additional support.  Examples through team minutes of teacher review of student data in monitoring and providing appropriate and timely interventions for students in need. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have received support and training in developing Tier 3 interventions for students in need of more targeted assistance. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |
| **Implementation Indicators** | **Deep (4)** | **Proficient (3)** | **Partial (2)** |
| **F. Protocols for Enrichment** | Data from enrichment & extension work is collected and monitored, and indicates increasing rigor and/or achievement over time. | The school implements intentional protocols and structures for students who have learned what is essential (Corollary Question #4), which includes a balance of enrichment and incentives. | The school inconsistently implements protocols for students who have learned what is essential, or does so in a limited fashion. |
| **Suggested artifacts of implementation evidence** | Documentation that intentional protocols and structures are in place building wide for extensions and enrichments.  Data from enrichments showing systemic monitoring and indicates increasing rigor over time. | School handbooks, resources etc. which document protocols and structures available for students needing extensions and enrichments.  Photos/samples of student work, etc. which depicts the use of extensions and enrichments. | Evidence through staff meeting agendas and/or professional development that teachers have engaged in dialogue about providing extensions and enrichments for students. |
| **Levels of Implementation** | **Date of Entry** | **Link to Artifact Evidence** | |
| Partial |  |  | |
| Proficient |  |  | |
| Deep |  |  | |