**DISTRICT-LEVEL EXPECTATIONS**

**Essential Question:**  How do we close the gap between the district’s current performance and expected outcomes determined by local statute and/or policy?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **SMART Goals –** goals that are Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Results-based, and Time-bound | **Possible evidence** |
| 4 | SMART Goal has allowed the educator to apply the continuous cycle of improvement that changed their practices and improved student achievement. | SMART Goals in place and Common Assessments show gain as well as teaching practice. |
| 3 | SMART Goal developed with high leverage strategies to impact student achievement | SMART Goals that has (few) high leverage strategies as the activities.  |
| 2 | SMART Goal developed but lacks high leverage strategies or has too many strategies in place. | SMART Goals have strategies but have little to minimal impact on student learning. |
| 1 | SMART Goal in the beginning stages and needs some refinement | SMART Goals missing critical components |
| 0 | No SMART Goal is in place. | Can’t produce SMART goal. |

**Essential Question:** How can we effectively analyze student data and impact teacher pedagogical practices to affect student achievement?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Collaborative teams –** Group of educators working interdependently to achieve a common goal | **Possible evidence** |
| 4 | Teams members are interdependent and implement agreed upon strategies that impact student achievement. | Evidence of implementation and improvementAnalysis of student dataLesson plan adjustment |
| 3 | Team members are identified, meet consistently and focus on issues (CIA) ~~that have an impact on student learning~~. | Learning logsAction Plan(s)Commitment statementsData review |
| 2 | Team members are identified, have a clear focus, and meet frequently on operation activities and/or events, i.e., fundraising, fieldtrips. | Agenda(s) |
| 1 | Team members are identified and meet without a clear focus or infrequently | Sign-up sheet(s) |
| 0 | No evidence of a team structure. | No evidence |

**Essential Question:** How do we provide a rigorous and relevant curriculum for ***ALL*** students?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum –** All students in the same grade level will receive the same curriculum | **Possible evidence** |
| 4 | \_\_\_\_\_Collaborative teaming is a routine part of the teacher’s work week and is a normal expectation within the school culture. \_\_\_\_\_School improvement is sustained by the ongoing collaboration of teachers and administrators. \_\_\_\_\_Professional learning times and protocols are honored, whereby meeting agendas and activities intended to positively impact student achievement outcomes are held to the highest priority. \_\_\_\_\_Teachers regularly review student achievement data to create and monitor SMART team goals. \_\_\_\_\_Action plans are periodically reviewed, and adjustments are made after a thorough root-cause analysis and in response to students’ actual performance. \_\_\_\_\_Transparency and accountability are promoted through team review of action plans and current student achievement data. \_\_\_\_\_Administrators are viewed by teachers a collaborative partner in the team process, but also as a resource for guidance, support, and ongoing job-embedded professional development.\_\_\_\_\_PLC Essential Questions are the talking points. | Complete curriculum maps, lesson plans, interviews |
| 3 | \_\_\_\_\_Teachers work regularly into collaborative learning time. \_\_\_\_\_Colloborative learning times are definitely focused on improving student achievement outcomes. \_\_\_\_\_Student performance data is routinely analyzed. \_\_\_\_\_Clear improvement goals are mutually established by members of the collaborative team.\_\_\_\_\_Action steps are carefully implemented and monitored periodically. \_\_\_\_\_Team members are interdependent and hold each other mutually accountable for results. ­­\_\_\_\_\_Administrators meet weekly with one or more collaborative teams and provide additional guidance, support, and training. | Complete curriculum maps with all its critical components |
| 2 |  \_\_\_\_\_All teachers have been assigned to collaborative teams. Meetings are scheduled and time for collaboration during the school day has been provided.\_\_\_\_\_Meetings are somewhat focused on improving student achievement; however, goals for improvement have not been clearly established by team members based on the group’s analysis of existing student achievement data. \_\_\_\_\_Administrators attempt to provide guidance, support, and ongoing training on data-based decision making.  | Curriculum map reflecting a few components |
| 1 | \_\_\_\_\_Not all teachers have been assigned to collaborative teams. \_\_\_\_\_Teachers are encouraged to work together but the division of labor may not be equitable or the assigned teams may not produce evidence of collaborative effort to produce improvements in student achievements. \_\_\_\_\_Meetings are infrequent or inconsistent, and clear protocols for collaboration are non-existent or not followed during the meeting.  \_\_\_\_\_Administrators do not actively meet with teacher teams or do not provide guidance, support, or ongoing training. | Meeting agenda/ minutesTimeline |

**Essential Question:** How will we assess students’ acquisition of the guaranteed and viable curriculum and ensure that instruction is adjusted to meet the needs of the students?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Common Formative Assessments –** Assessments that are agreed upon by the team teachers to determine students’ skills acquisition and effectuate change in instruction | **Possible evidence** |
| 4 | Common formative assessments are in place and are used to effectuate change in instruction, such that more than 80% of the students demonstrate mastery. | Common formative assessments and data |
| 3 | Common formative assessments are in place and are used to effectuate change in instruction, such that 50% - 80% of the students demonstrate mastery. | Common formative assessments and data |
| 2 | Common assessments are in place and are summative in nature. It is done only during pre- and posttests and does not affect instruction. | Common assessmentsPre-/Posttests |
| 1 | Teacher-made assessments are in place. | Teacher-made tests |
| 0 | No common formative assessments are in place | No evidence |

**Essential Question:** How can we engage high levels of teaching and learning?

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Mini-observations –** informal, impromptu observations lasting 3-5 minutes that measures the following components—Bloom’s taxonomy, Lesson Plan, Instructional strategy, Student sharing\*—with a 5-minute face-to-face feedback with teachers . Inter-rater reliability is crucial in the face to face feedback. | **Possible evidence** |
| 4 | 15-20 mini-observations per week | Data on components |
| 3 | 10-14 mini-observations per week |  |
| 2 | 5-9 mini-observations per week |  |
| 1 | 1-4 mini-observations per week |  |
| 0 | No mini-observations taking place | No evidenced |

\* Student sharing – a random student in the classroom should be able to articulate the objective of the lesson.

**MOVING DISTRICT LEVEL EXPECTATIONS INTO PRACTICE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** | **Level 5** |
| Most of the expectations are institutionalized based on the evidence provided. The expectations are inter-related and the process is occurring collaboratively through constant refinement and adjustments based on the data collected. The school engages in high leverage strategies that reflect student growth not only in their common formative assessments, but they are also consistently closing the gap between their previous score and their agreed upon SMART goal. | Many of the school members are now beginning to implement these high yield strategies with greater fidelity. At this point the collaborative team is becoming the norm and teachers meet quite often to examine their curriculum maps, common assessments, and other relevant data. The language is becoming more precise as their scores, both common formative assessments, and SMART goals, are beginning to close the gap. | The school has began implementing some instructional strategies that the leadership team identified to effectuate change. Currently, the teacher leaders are the first to implement these strategies while the majority may or may not implement them with fidelity. However, it is quite clear that the school is moving in a different direction because the school community has gone through the awareness phase. | The school is now shifting its focus not only on operations but they are beginning to look at instructional leadership and student achievement. They are first working on changing the culture and getting buy-in from their stakeholders. The school is at the awareness phase and the leader/leadership team is starting to identify issues that they must address to reach their goal. | The operation of the school is the primary focus. Data on achievement may be collected but does not guide the actions of the school. |
| A summative score between 18-20 on the rubrics reflect this level. | A summative score between 14-17 on the rubrics reflect this level. | A summative score between 10-13 on the rubrics reflect this level. | A summative score between 8-9 on the rubrics reflect this level. | A summative score between 0-7 on the rubrics reflect this level. |