**Rubric and Micro Decisions – Administrators**

Ask Yourself…

* Should the learning content be **whole or part**?
* What is considered **the most important learning** for each content area?
* What is the **source of standar**ds for the content area(s)?
* To what extent should/must the *New York State P-12* ***Common Core Learning Standards*** be included in an SLO?
* What are the **district’s learning content priorities/needs** and must/should they be included?
* Which **data source(s)** and level of review are required or recommended for SLOs?
* What is the level of **vertical alignment** required to be articulated to ensure future course preparedness for each SLO?
* What **format or depth of standards** and indicators will be expected for an SLO?

Learning Content

**Quality Rating 2 Criteria**

* Identifies course name.
* Uses the appropriate body of standards (Common Core, national, state, local).
* Names the exact standards, performance indicators, etc.

**Quality Rating 3 Criteria**

* Meets Quality Rating 2 criteria.
* Selects specific and measurable standards, indicators, etc.
* Selects the most important standards, indicators, etc., for the course.
* Includes Common Core standards to supplement NYS Learning Standards for courses other than ELA or math (e.g., Literacy in History/Social Studies, Science, and Technical Subjects).
* Aligns to district and/or school priorities.\*
* Aligns to future coursework, as well as college and career readiness.\*

*\* Only one of these criteria must be met in addition to the other criteria for Quality Rating 3.*

Notes:

Ask Yourself…

* When no **pre-assessment** is available, will a pre-assessment be developed? If so, by whom?
* Which pre-assessment(s) will be used to establish baseline?
* How strongly must the pre-assessment reflect the content of the course included in an SLO?
* Which staff members will be asked to **score the pre-assessment(s)?**
* For which courses is no **summative assessment** available?
* For which courses will summative assessments be developed, and by whom? When?

* For which courses/teacher groups will attribution of points be **based on performance on State assessmen**ts?
* What summative assessment(s) will be required or recommended?
* What structure will be used for **scoring summative assessments**?
* What level of **parallelism** is required between the pre- and summative assessment(s)?
* To what level of quality should the pre- and summative assessments be **aligned** with the learning content?

Evidence

**Quality Rating 2 Criteria**

* Identifies pre-assessment(s) and summative assessment(s).
* Selects summative assessments from either the State-approved list or those developed and approved by the district/BOCES, and supported by superintendent’s certification of rigor and comparability.
* Offers accommodations as legally required and appropriate.
* Ensures that those with vested interest are not scoring summative assessments.

**Quality Rating 3 Criteria**

* Meets Quality Rating 2 criteria.
* Aligns tightly to the selected learning content using authentic measures.
* Demands higher order thinking of students.
* Uses a clear rubric, scoring guide, and/or answer key to minimize subjectivity of scoring.
* Matches score reporting to the specificity of learning content.
* Selects pre-assessment from either the State-approved list or those developed and approved by the district/BOCES, and supported by superintendent’s approval for comparability.\*
* Provides an opportunity for real-world application of knowledge and skill.\*
* Includes a majority of constructed response and/or performance measures.\*
* Measures a majority of the learning content standards, indicators, etc. in more than one way.\*

Notes:

Evidence Continued…

Notes:

* What **accommodations** and documentation must and/or should be allowed for special populations of students?
* Will the assessment(s) provide the needed scoring specificity, or are additional **reports** needed?
* If additional reports are needed, how and when will they be produced?
* Which department or staff position is responsible to disseminate needed **assessment report**(s)?
* When will the needed report(s) be made **available to teachers**, schools, etc.?
* Will **multiple measures** be required and/or recommended for **pre-assessment(s)**?
* If multiple pre-assessment measures are used, what guidance on weighting will be provided and when?
* Will **multiple measures** be required and/or recommended for **summative assessment(s)?**
* If multiple summative measures are used, what guidance on weighting will be provided and when?

Ask Yourself…

* How many **data sets** are needed to establish the baseline?
* What constitutes a proper amount of **student need for the content**?
* What **depth of knowledge of students** should/must be reflected in the baseline?

Baseline

**Quality Rating 2 Criteria**

* Describes how students performed on the identified pre-assessment(s).
* Provides a baseline score for each student in the SLO.

**Quality Rating 3 Criteria**

* Meets Quality Rating 2 criteria.
* Indicates via pre-assessment data a clear need for focusing on this learning content.
* Uses multiple data sources (in addition to pre-assessment data) to set appropriate targets, make instructional decisions, and drive student growth.

Targets

**Quality Rating 2 Criteria**

* Provides a target statement.
* Provides a specific growth goal for each student.
* Sets targets consistent with district-level expectations for target-setting in this grade/subject.

**Quality Rating 3 Criteria**

* Meets Quality Rating 2 criteria.
* Requires students to make at least a year’s growth in a year’s time, with students below grade level being required to grow more than a year’s growth in a year’s time.
* Requires 80% or more of students, including special populations, to meet their individual goals.
* Includes goals for special student populations that are equally challenging and rigorous as those for other students, considering each student’s starting point.

Ask Yourself…

* What **amount of growth** defines a year's worth of growth?
* What is the appropriate amount of growth for students who are behind grade level?
* What impact will **dosage** (amount of time a staff member has with each student) have on target-setting?
* What method(s) will be used to **document student pre- and summative results**, including targets?
* What process will be used to decide how to set targets for **special student populations**?
* What **types of approaches will be permitted**/encouraged for target-setting? (common growth, growth to mastery, banding, etc.)
* Is there **a minimum threshold** for the percentage of students that must meet targets?
* Is there a minimum threshold for individual student targets?
* What **data sources** could/must be used to set targets?

Notes:

Student Population

**Quality Rating 2 Criteria**

* Provides course sections included in the SLO.
* Includes all students in selected course sections.
* Provides student names and/or ID numbers for all students in the SLO.

Ask Yourself…

* How will the district monitor to **ensure that at least 50%** of a teacher’s students are included in the SLO student population?
* How will the district monitor that **all enrolled students** for an included course section are included in the SLO?
* To what degree of specificity will **special student populations** be denoted on rosters?
* What method of **documenting student performance** will be used? (e.g., names, ID numbers)
* What types of data points should be included on the student rosters?
* What courses are designated to be **less than one academic year**?

Interval of Instructional Time

**Quality Rating 2 Criteria**

* Indicates a clear start and end date.
* Provides a rationale if the interval is less than one year (e.g., course length is less than one year).

Rationale

**Quality Rating 2 Criteria**

* Provides reasoning for the selection of the learning content, evidence, and target.
* Describes how the elements will be used together to prepare students for future coursework, as well as college and career readiness.

**Quality Rating 3 Criteria**

* Meets Quality Rating 2 criteria.
* Indicates a thoughtful level of detail resulting in defensible decisions for the following elements, learning content, evidence, target(s), baseline, and HEDI.
* Explains how learning content and target(s) align to future coursework, as well as college and career readiness.
* Explains how multiple and appropriate data points are used to select the learning content and target(s) for the student population.
* Articulates cohesion among all of the elements to effectively prepare students for future coursework, as well as college and career readiness.\*
* Plans for ongoing reflection on student progress and uses that information to differentiate instruction to ensure students’ targets are met.\*

Ask Yourself…

* To what extent must **district priorities** be reflected?
* To what level **must vertical alignment** be articulated in the rationale?
* What will be expected in terms of **articulating instructional implications** and approaches in the rationale?

Notes:

Ask Yourself…

* Will **different HEDIs** exist for teachers **of different class sizes**?
* Will different HEDIs exist for teachers of **different content areas**?
* Will different HEDIs exist for teachers based on their **dosage** of instruction?
* Will different HEDIs exist for teachers using **performance-based** summative assessments?
* How many **"effective" points** will be earned for achieving the target exactly?
* How will the **spread of student results** exist within each HEDI rating category?


HEDI Scoring

**Quality Rating 2 Criteria**

* + Categorizes all possible scoring results in the HEDI structure such that
    - Highly effective = exceeds district expectations
    - Effective = meets district expectations
    - Developing = is below district expectations
    - Ineffective = is well below district expectations.
  + Is mathematically possible for the teacher to obtain every point value within a rating category.
  + Allocates points clearly and objectively within a HEDI rating category.

**Quality Rating 3 Criteria**

* Meets Quality Rating 2 criteria.
* Requires 80% or more of students, including special populations, to meet their individual goals to earn 9 points (minimum rating in the “effective” category).
* Defines HEDI rating categories that are rigorous, attainable, and in-line with district growth expectations or goals.
* Includes special populations explicitly in the HEDI structure.



Notes: