

Missouri PLC Implementation Rubric

Revised June 16, 2017

School Name _____

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). Targets: **Year One** **Year Two** **Year Three/Plus**

Strand 1: Learning Community Culture and Continuous Improvement				
Implementation Indicators	Deep (4)	Proficient (3)	Partial (2)	Minimal (1)
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
F. School Culture	The school culture is routinely examined and evaluated through reflection, survey 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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
G. Action Research	There is evidence of routine cycles of action research resulting in changes to practice and are shared with multiple stakeholders, often through appropriate visual displays.	There is documented evidence that teachers engage in action research on an ongoing basis, using a structured cycle (beyond the Data Teams 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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
H. Sustainability	Action plans and/or building guidelines 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 induction of staff about PLCs, and monitoring implementation at the team and building level.	The school staff recognizes the need to establish processes to sustain their work.	Little or no implementation evidence.

Strand 2: How Effective Building Level Leadership Teams Work

Implementation Indicators	Deep (4)	Proficient (3)	Partial (2)	Minimal (1)
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.

Strand 3: How Effective Teams Work

Implementation Indicators	Deep (4)	Proficient (3)	Partial (2)	Minimal (1)
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
D. Focus on Results from Data	Teams engage in a structured protocol for analyzing student data, paying attention to the steps of the data team process: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Collecting/Charting Data ● Analyzing to Prioritize ● Setting SMART Goals ● Selecting Instructional Strategies ● Determining Results Indicators ● Monitoring and Evaluating Results. 	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 inconsistently focus on results using strategies and structures to facilitate data driven decisions, or do so in a limited fashion.	Little or no implementation evidence.
E. Trust / Participation	Teams intentionally monitor and address shifts in trust and participation using tools such as perceptual data, staff surveys, etc. Teams have processes in place to effectively address cognitive 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.	Little or no implementation evidence.

Strand 4: What Should Students Need to Know and Do? (CQ 1)

Implementation Indicators	Deep (4)	Proficient (3)	Partial (2)	Minimal (1)
A. Priority Standards	Priority standards represent the foundation for instruction and assessment and are aligned vertically beyond core subjects.	Priority standards for core subjects are identified through a collaborative building or district process and structure using appropriate criteria (i.e. endurance; leverage; readiness, or state recommendations) and use common curricular terminology in their work.	Teams have inconsistently or incompletely implemented the proficient criteria.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
D. Review & Revise Priority Standards	Systematic processes and structures are in place for review and revision of standards beyond core subjects.	Systematic processes and structures are in place for routine review and revision of standards for core subject areas.	Teams inconsistently and/or incompletely review and revise priority standards.	Little or no implementation evidence.

Strand 5: How will We Know When Students Have Learned? (CQ 2)

Implementation Indicators	Deep (4)	Proficient (3)	Partial (2)	Minimal (1)
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 grade level/course assessments and implement appropriate assessment processes, including <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Informal classroom formatives • Mid-instruction formatives • Summative Assessments • Interim/benchmark Assessments (common assessment when appropriate)	Teams have inconsistently or incompletely implemented the proficient criteria.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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/techniques for providing descriptive feedback, or have done so in a limited fashion.	Little or no implementation evidence.
D. Student Engagement	<p>Student engagement in learning and assessment practices are consistent and pervasive throughout the school.</p> <p>Students self-monitor and reflect on learning; set specific goals and action steps, and communicate their learning with others (i.e. student led conferences, portfolios, regular progress reports).</p>	<p>Student engagement in learning and assessment practices are evident throughout the school.</p> <p>Teachers share clear and understandable learning targets with students (ie. "I can" statements, anchor/criteria charts, rubrics).</p> <p>Students formally track and record their progress toward learning goals.</p>	Teams have inconsistently developed and applied strategies for involving students in the assessment process, or have done so in a limited fashion.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
F. Grading/Reporting Practices	The building has adopted standards referenced reporting practices.	The school has collectively explored and committed to consistent grading and reporting practices that accurately communicate learning (within district parameters).	Teams have inconsistently committed to common grading and/or reporting practices.	Little or no implementation evidence.

Strand 6: How will we respond when students have/have not learned? (CQ 3&4) (Systematic Process for Intervention/Enrichment)

Implementation Indicators	Deep (4)	Proficient (3)	Partial (2)	Minimal (1)
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Evidence based instructional strategies, including differentiation ● Formative assessment practices ● Additional time and support ● Review of targeted data on all students. 	The school inconsistently implements essential components of Tier 1 Core Instruction (see proficient), or does so in a limited fashion.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 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.	Little or no implementation evidence.
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.	Little or no implementation evidence.

