BLUEPRINT FOR MARYLAND'S FUTURE

## Blueprint for Maryland's Future:

# Expert Review Team Rubric

Office of Teaching and Learning School Implementation Review Branch

Initial 2023-2024 Version

Domain 1

**Thomas Wootton High School**

Maryland STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

# Introduction and Overview

The Maryland State Department of Education (MSDE) is committed to supporting local education agencies (LEAs) in improving student outcomes through the Blueprint Expert Review Team program. A comprehensive school review process is used to identify promising practices and opportunities for growth in curriculum, instruction, interventions, socio-emotional and mental health services, educator support, and school management to support continuous improvement. School reviews are a collaborative process among LEAs, schools, and MSDE aimed at accelerating student learning to narrow opportunity and achievement gaps and enhancing the professional practice of educators.

All school reviews are facilitated by an Expert Review Team led by MSDE. Expert Review Team members consist of teachers, school leaders, and education experts with experience in accelerating student achievement. Team members participate in extensive training to calibrate the review process to ensure a consistent approach to school reviews. The Expert Review Team analyzes school data, reviews documents submitted by the school, facilitates classroom observations, and conducts focus groups and interviews to identify effective practices and opportunities for growth in a school.

### DESIGN AND STRUCTURE OF THE RUBRIC

Evidence collected during the review process is assessed on criteria outlined in the Expert Review Team Rubric. The rubric consists of three domains grounded in effective practices to improve student outcomes.

- **Domain 1:** Curriculum and Instruction - High-quality curriculum, instructional materials, teaching practices, and assessments are implemented to support student learning.
- **Domain 2:** Student Support - Schools use data to identify students and implement a multi-tiered approach to support all student groups.
- **Domain 3:** Educator Support - Educators at all levels are provided with support to improve results and shift instructional practice.

Each domain contains indicators and measures. Indicators specify criteria within the domain that will be reviewed. Measures identify the component that will be rated within the indicator. Each measure can earn one of four ratings:

- **Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement** - evidence reviewed demonstrates that a school fully addressed action(s) while implementing measures and attaining outcomes and demonstrates a commitment to continuous improvement.
- **Accomplishing** - evidence reviewed demonstrates that a school fully addressed action(s) while implementing measures and attaining outcomes.
- **Developing** - a plan and/or process is observed; however, actions towards attaining measures and outcomes have not yet been implemented.

- **Not Evident** - a plan and/or process towards implementing measures or obtaining outcomes was not observed.

In cases where the measure and/or component does not apply, it will be marked as not applicable.

## IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RUBRIC

The Expert Review Team Rubric is used by the review team to form a consensus on a rating for each measure based on all collected evidence. Collected evidence includes documents submitted by the school prior to the on-site review; outcomes of classroom observations; answers to focus group questions from teachers, administrators, students, and parents/guardians; and student data. Expert Review Team members and MSDE specialists review, analyze, and triangulate data from collected evidence to assign ratings. MSDE will collaborate with LEAs for any school that earns a rating of Developing or Not Evident for any measure to develop recommendations, a support plan, and a timeline for the school to make progress toward the Accomplishing or Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement rating.

MSDE will continue to refine the rubric based on evidence-based practices, research reviews, and stakeholder feedback to ensure continuous improvement of the Expert Review Team process.

## COMMUNITY SCHOOLS AND THE EXPERT REVIEW TEAM

The community school model is designed to promote positive, equitable outcomes by providing students, families, and the community with the health, mental health, academic, and extracurricular support needed to thrive. Community schools serve as hubs that bring families, communities, and partners together. Maryland continues to prioritize community schools through the Blueprint for Maryland's Future. This landmark legislation is designed to improve the quality of education for Maryland students and close achievement gaps. Included in this legislation are Concentration of Poverty grants for schools that serve large populations of students experiencing poverty.

The Expert Review Team will review the extent to which the community schools are fulfilling their requirements based on the Concentration of Poverty Grant. The community school measure, Implementation with Fidelity, focuses on providing resources to address barriers that affect marginalized students and providing wraparound services to students and families. The community schools' indicator is organized by requirements for year 1, year 2, and year 3 and beyond schools.

# Domain 1: Curriculum and Instruction - High-quality curriculum, instructional materials, teaching practices, and assessments are implemented to support student learning.

**INDICATOR 1:** Curriculum and Instructional Materials - Curriculum and instructional materials are aligned to standards, incorporate culturally responsive strategies, are supported by research, and include stakeholder input; professional learning is provided to staff.

## Measure: High Quality Instructional Materials

Curriculum and instructional materials are aligned to standards, incorporate culturally responsive strategies, are supported by research, and include stakeholder input.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The school **has not** started the process of aligning curriculum and instructional materials to be rated by Evidence for ESSA or What Works Clearinghouse. | ☐ The school **is in the process** of aligning curriculum and instructional materials to be rated by Evidence for ESSA or What Works Clearinghouse. | ☐ Curriculum and instructional materials are rated as **"Promising" or "Moderate**" by Evidence for ESSA or Tier 2 by What Works Clearinghouse. | ☒ Curriculum and instructional materials are rated as **"Strong"** by Evidence for ESSA or Tier 1 by What Works Clearinghouse. |
| ☐ The school **has not** started the process of aligning curriculum and instructional materials with the Maryland College and Career Standards. | ☐ The school is **in the process** of aligning curriculum and instructional materials with the Maryland College and Career Standards. | ☒ Curriculum and instructional materials are **aligned** with the Maryland College and Career Standards. | ☐ Curriculum and instructional materials, **and assessments** are **aligned** with the Maryland College and Career Standards **and are consistently being assessed to maintain vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum and instruction.** |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The school **has not** started the process of vetting and rating curriculum and instructional materials by EdReports. | ☐ The school is **in the process** of vetting and rating curriculum and instructional materials by EdReports. | ☐ Curriculum and instructional materials are rated as **"Partially Meets"** by EdReports. | ▣ Curriculum and instructional materials are rated as **"Meets Expectations"** by EdReports. |
| ☐ The school is **not in the process** of selecting curriculum and instructional materials that represent different perspectives, authors, and characters; acknowledge the contributions of individual cultures, values, and identities of students. | ☐ The school is **in the process** of selecting curriculum and instructional materials that represent different perspectives, authors, and characters; acknowledge the contributions of individual cultures, values, and identities of students. | ▣ Curriculum and instructional materials **consistently** represent different perspectives, authors, and characters; acknowledge the contributions of individual cultures, values, and identities of students. | ☐ Curriculum and instructional materials **consistently** represent different perspectives, authors, and characters; acknowledge the contributions of individual cultures, values, and identities of students. **Curriculum and instructional materials are designed inclusively to account for differences in students' learning needs, competencies, and levels of readiness.** |
| ☐ The school **has not** started developing a process for eliciting input from teachers, families, and other stakeholders in the adoption and implementation of curriculum and materials. | ☐ The school is **developing a process** for eliciting input from teachers, families, and other stakeholders in the adoption and implementation of curriculum and materials. | ▣ The school **consistently** (every 3-5 years) solicits input from teachers, families, and other stakeholders in the adoption and implementation of curriculum and materials. | ☐ The school **consistently** (every 3-5 years) solicits input from teachers, families, and other stakeholders **while monitoring and adjusting** the adoption and implementation of curriculum and instructional materials **using a variety of inclusive practices.** |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The school's Pre-K (Pre-Kindergarten) program **has not** started the process of aligning comprehensive learning standards that are research-based, age and developmentally appropriate. | ☐ The school's Pre-K (Pre-Kindergarten) program is **in the process** of aligning comprehensive learning standards that are research-based, age and developmentally appropriate. | ☐ The school's Pre-K (Pre-Kindergarten) program **aligns** comprehensive learning standards that are research-based, age and developmentally appropriate. | ☐ The school's Pre-K (Pre-Kindergarten) program **aligns** comprehensive learning standards that are research-based, age and developmentally appropriate, **and are monitored and adjusted for effectiveness.** |

## Measure: Supporting the Effective Use of High Quality Instructional Materials

Teachers and leaders participate in on going, job embedded professional learning that is anchored in the specific curriculum and materials used for instruction.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ Teachers **do not** engage in job-embedded professional learning, which uses disaggregated data to adjust the implementation of curricular materials to support all students with a focus on the most underserved students. Examples of job-embedded opportunities include:<br>• action research<br>• case study discussions<br>• coaching/mentoring | ☐ Teachers **inconsistently** engage in job-embedded professional learning, which uses disaggregated data to adjust the implementation of curricular materials to support all students with a focus on the most underserved students. Examples of job-embedded opportunities include:<br>• action research<br>• case study discussions<br>• coaching/mentoring | ▣ Teachers **consistently** engage in job-embedded professional learning, which uses disaggregated data to adjust the implementation of curricular materials to support all students with a focus on the most underserved students. Examples of job-embedded opportunities include:<br>• action research<br>• case study discussions<br>• coaching/mentoring | ☐ Teachers **consistently** engage in job-embedded professional learning, **which uses an analysis of disaggregated data** to adjust the implementation of curricular materials to **improve teacher practice across classrooms and** support all students with a focus on the most underserved students. Examples of job-embedded opportunities include:<br>• action research<br>• case study discussions |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| • critical friends groups<br>• data teams/assessment development<br>• examining student work<br>• implementing individual professional growth/learning plans<br>• lesson study<br>• teacher portfolios<br>• professional learning communities | • critical friends groups<br>• data teams/ assessment development<br>• examining student work<br>• implementing individual professional growth/learning plans<br>• lesson study<br>• teacher portfolios<br>• professional learning communities | • critical friends groups<br>• data teams/ assessment development<br>• examining student work<br>• implementing individual professional growth/learning plans<br>• lesson study<br>• teacher portfolios<br>• professional learning communities | • coaching/mentoring<br>• critical friends groups<br>• data teams/ assessment development<br>• examining student work<br>• implementing individual professional growth/learning plans<br>• lesson study<br>• teacher portfolios<br>• professional learning communities |
| ☐ The schoolwide schedule **has not been** developed that includes dedicated time for teachers to engage with their peers during the school day, as part of the master schedule, to support the implementation of curricular materials. | ☐ The schoolwide schedule is **being developed** to include dedicated time for teachers to engage with their peers during the school day, as part of the master schedule, to support the implementation of curricular materials. | ▣ Teachers **consistently** engage with their peers during the school day, as part of the master schedule, to support the implementation of curricular materials. | ☐ Teachers **consistently** engage with their peers during the school day, as part of the master schedule, to support the implementation of curricular materials **through evidence-based strategies meeting the needs of all students.** |
| ☐ A schoolwide schedule **does not** include dedicated time for teachers and leaders to work in teams to analyze student work and instructional practices to inform adjustments to curricular materials. | ☐ A schoolwide schedule is **being developed** that includes dedicated time for teachers and leaders to work in teams to analyze student work and instructional practices to inform adjustments to curricular materials. | ▣ Teachers and leaders **consistently** have dedicated time to work in teams to analyze student work and instructional practices to inform adjustments to curricular materials. | ☐ Teachers and leaders **consistently** have dedicated time to work in teams to analyze student work, **trends,** and instructional practices to inform adjustments to curricular materials **with vertical alignment across grade bands and content areas.** |

## RATING FOR DOMAIN 1, INDICATOR 1

| Not Applicable | Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| _____ out of 0 | _____ out of _____ | _____ out of _____ | 6 out of 8 | 2 out of 8 |

**INDICATOR 2:** Classroom Instruction - Instruction reflects research-based practices that challenge and support all students.

### Measure: Differentiation

Teachers address the needs of diverse learners through modifying content, process, and/or products.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of differentiation of content, process, or product. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of differentiation of content, process, or product. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ▣ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of differentiation of content, process, or product. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of differentiation of content, process, or product. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. |

## Questioning

A variety of questions are used to challenge students and promote higher order thinking.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of students engaged in effective questioning practices. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of students engaged in effective questioning practices. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* | ▣ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of students engaged in effective questioning practices. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of students engaged in effective questioning practices. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* |

## Measure: Explicit Instruction

An instructional method designed with the student objective in mind demonstrated through planning, learning, and assessment.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of effective practices for explicit instruction. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of effective practices for explicit instruction. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* | ▣ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of effective practices for explicit instruction. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of effective practices for explicit instruction. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ Focus groups with students demonstrate that students have **no knowledge** of what they are learning and why they are learning it. | ☐ Focus groups with students demonstrate that students have **minimal knowledge** of what they are learning and why they are learning it. | ▣ Focus groups with students demonstrate that students have **general knowledge** of what they are learning and why they are learning it. | ☐ Focus groups with students demonstrate that students have **in-depth knowledge** of what they are learning and why they are learning it. |

## Measure: Reading Instruction at the Elementary Level

Students in the elementary grades receive reading instruction grounded in the science of reading. **Elementary grades only.*

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed implement evidence-based reading instructional practices focused on phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>• decoding skills (phonemic awareness, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, etc.). an emphasis is placed on decoding skills in grades Pre-K to 3<br>• comprehension skills (morphological awareness, vocabulary, etc.)<br>• fluency strategies (model fluent reading, repeated reading, etc.)<br>• an emphasis is placed on student writing in grades 3-5. | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed implement evidence-based reading instructional practices focused on phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>• decoding skills (phonemic awareness, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, etc.). an emphasis is placed on decoding skills in grades Pre-K to 3<br>• comprehension skills (morphological awareness, vocabulary, etc.)<br>• fluency strategies (model fluent reading, repeated reading, etc.)<br>• an emphasis is placed on student writing in grades 3-5. | ☐ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed implement evidence-based reading instructional practices focused on phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>• decoding skills (phonemic awareness, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, etc.). an emphasis is placed on decoding skills in grades PreK- to 3<br>• comprehension skills (morphological awareness, vocabulary, etc.)<br>• fluency strategies (model fluent reading, repeated reading, etc.)<br>• an emphasis is placed on student writing in grades 3-5. | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed implement evidence-based reading instructional practices focused on phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>• decoding skills (phonemic awareness, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, etc.). an emphasis is placed on decoding skills in grades Pre-K to 3<br>• comprehension skills (morphological awareness, vocabulary, etc.)<br>• fluency strategies (model fluent reading, repeated reading, etc.)<br>• an emphasis is placed on student writing in grades 3-5. |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The school **does not** utilize a screening process to identify students at risk for reading difficulties, revise instruction based on progress monitoring, and communicates the process to parents and guardians. | ☐ The school **inconsistently** utilizes a screening process to identify students at risk for reading difficulties, revise instruction based on progress monitoring, and communicates the process to parents and guardians. | ☐ The school **consistently** utilizes a screening process to identify students at risk for reading difficulties, revise instruction based on progress monitoring, and communicates the process to parents and guardians. | ☐ The school **consistently** utilizes a screening process to identify students at risk for reading difficulties, revises instruction based on progress monitoring, **evidence-based practices and providing timely and effective information to families about their students' progress ensuring information helps them understand how to support their student**. |
| ☐ Evidence-based supplemental reading instruction **does not** occur through differentiated small group instruction based on data and student needs. | ☐ Evidence-based supplemental reading instruction **inconsistently** occurs through differentiated small group instruction based on data and student needs. | ☐ Evidence-based supplemental reading instruction **consistently** occurs through differentiated small group instruction based on data and student needs. | ☐ Evidence-based supplemental reading instruction **consistently** occurs through differentiated small group instruction based on data and **is modified based on individual student needs.** |
| ☐ Training and professional development **is not** provided directly to principals and teachers in implementing the Science of Reading. | ☐ Training and professional development is **inconsistently** provided directly to all principals and teachers in implementing the Science of Reading. | ☐ Training and professional development is **consistently** provided directly to all principals and teachers in implementing the Science of Reading. | ☐ Training and professional development is **consistently** provided directly to all principals and teachers in implementing the Science of Reading **with follow-up trainings throughout the school year**. |
| ☐ The school has **not developed a plan** to provide and track interventions to students, utilizing a high-quality screening process, who are not reading on grade level by the end of grade 3 as well as evaluating the effectiveness of the reading intervention(s). | ☐ The school is **developing a plan** to provide and track interventions to students, utilizing a high-quality screening process, who are not reading on grade level by the end of grade 3 as well as evaluating the effectiveness of the reading intervention(s). | ☐ The school is **consistently** providing and tracking interventions to students, utilizing a high-quality screening process, who are not reading on grade level by the end of grade 3 as well as evaluating the effectiveness of the reading intervention(s). | ☐ The school is **consistently** providing and tracking interventions to students, utilizing a high-quality screening process, who are not reading on grade level by the end of grade 3 as well as evaluating the effectiveness of the reading intervention(s) **and monitor and ensure fidelity of implementation.** |

## Measure: Literacy at the Secondary Level

Students in the secondary grades receive literacy instruction aligned with current research based strategies. **Secondary grades only.*

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed implement research-based literacy instructional practices focused on vocabulary, comprehension, writing instruction, and speaking and listening. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>• comprehension of grade level texts (metacognition, meta comprehension, annotation, literary analysis)<br>• diverse grade level texts (reading independently)<br>• vocabulary and content knowledge<br>• building background knowledge<br>• sentence structure (syntax and grammar)<br>• an emphasis is placed on student writing in grades 6-12<br>• Socratic methods | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed implement research-based literacy instructional practices focused on vocabulary, comprehension, writing instruction, and speaking and listening. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>• comprehension of grade level texts (metacognition, meta comprehension, annotation, literary analysis)<br>• diverse grade level texts (reading independently)<br>• vocabulary and content knowledge<br>• building background knowledge<br>• sentence structure (syntax and grammar)<br>• an emphasis is placed on student writing in grades 6-12.<br>• Socratic methods | ▣ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed implement research-based literacy instructional practices focused on vocabulary, comprehension, writing instruction, and speaking and listening. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>• comprehension of grade level texts (metacognition, meta comprehension, annotation, literary analysis)<br>• diverse grade level texts (reading independently)<br>• vocabulary and content knowledge<br>• building background knowledge<br>• sentence structure (syntax and grammar)<br>• an emphasis is placed on student writing in grades 6-12<br>• Socratic methods | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed implement research-based literacy instructional practices focused on vocabulary, comprehension, writing instruction, and speaking and listening. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>• comprehension of grade level texts (metacognition, meta comprehension, annotation, literary analysis)<br>• diverse grade level texts (reading independently)<br>• vocabulary and content knowledge<br>• building background knowledge<br>• sentence structure (syntax and grammar)<br>• an emphasis is placed on student writing in grades 6-12<br>• Socratic methods<br>• debate and argumentative writing |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| • debate and argumentative writing<br>• decoding skills (phonemic awareness, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, etc.)<br>• fluency strategies (model fluent reading, repeated reading, etc.) | • debate and argumentative writing<br>• decoding skills (phonemic awareness, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, etc.)<br>• fluency strategies (model fluent reading, repeated reading, etc.) | • debate and argumentative writing<br>• decoding skills (phonemic awareness, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, etc.)<br>• fluency strategies (model fluent reading, repeated reading, etc.) | • decoding skills (phonemic awareness, phoneme-grapheme correspondence, etc.).<br>• fluency strategies (model fluent reading, repeated reading, etc.) |
| ☐ The school **does not** utilize a high-quality screening process to identify students at risk for reading difficulties, revises instruction based on progress monitoring, and communicates the process to parents and guardians. | ☐ The school **inconsistently** utilizes a high-quality screening process to identify students at risk for reading difficulties, revises instruction based on progress monitoring, and communicates the process to parents and guardians. | ☒ The school **consistently** utilizes a high-quality screening process to identify students at risk for reading difficulties, revises instruction based on progress monitoring, and communicates the process to parents and guardians. | ☐ The school **consistently** utilizes a high-quality screening process to identify students at risk for reading difficulties, revises instruction based on progress monitoring **and evidence-based practices**, **and provides timely and effective information to families about their students' progress, ensuring information helps them understand how to support their students.** |
| ☐ Training and ongoing professional development **is not** provided directly to all principals and teachers in implementing research-based literacy strategies. | ☐ Training and ongoing professional development is **inconsistently** provided directly to all principals and teachers in implementing research-based literacy strategies. | ☒ Training and ongoing professional development is **consistently** provided directly to all principals and teachers in implementing research-based literacy strategies. | ☐ Training and ongoing professional development is **consistently** provided directly to all principals and teachers in implementing research-based literacy strategies **with follow-up trainings throughout the school year**. |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The school **has not** developed a plan to provide and track interventions to students who are not reading on grade level as well as evaluating the effectiveness of the reading intervention(s). | ☐ The school is **in the process** of developing a plan to provide and track interventions to students who are not reading on grade level as well as evaluating the effectiveness of the reading intervention(s). | ☒ Multiple strategies, approaches, and research-based practices are **consistently** utilized to provide and track interventions to students who are not reading on grade level as well as evaluating the effectiveness of the reading intervention(s). | ☐ Multiple strategies, approaches, and research-based practices are **consistently** utilized to provide and track interventions to students who are not reading on grade level **and the effectiveness of the reading intervention(s) is evaluated and modified.** |

## Measure: Mathematics Elementary Instruction Prekindergarten Grade 5

Students receive MCCR standards based instruction aligned with current research based strategies.

Elementary Content Domains: Counting & Cardinality (PreK K), Operations & Algebraic Thinking, Number & Operations in Base Ten, Number & Operations Fractions (3 5), Measurement & Data, Reasoning with Mathematics (3 5), Modeling with Mathematics (3 5)

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed implement evidence based mathematical instructional practices aligned to standards-based content, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>▪ clear instructional outcomes and intentional positive mathematical mindset building (progress monitoring, perseverance, supporting productive struggle)<br>▪ use of mathematical representations (teacher modeling and student use of mathematical tools)<br>▪ scaffolding of content from | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed implement evidence based mathematical instructional practices aligned to standards-based content, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>▪ clear instructional outcomes and intentional positive mathematical mindset building (progress monitoring, perseverance, supporting productive struggle)<br>▪ use of mathematical representations (teacher modeling and student use of mathematical tools)<br>▪ scaffolding of content from fluency to conceptual | ☐ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed implement evidence based mathematical instructional practices aligned to standards-based content, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>▪ clear instructional outcomes and intentional positive mathematical mindset building (progress monitoring, perseverance, supporting productive struggle)<br>▪ use of mathematical representations (teacher modeling and student use of mathematical tools)<br>▪ scaffolding of content from fluency to conceptual | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed implement evidence based mathematical instructional practices aligned to standards-based content, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>▪ clear instructional outcomes and intentional positive mathematical mindset building (progress monitoring, perseverance, supporting productive struggle)<br>▪ use of mathematical representations (teacher modeling and student use of mathematical tools)<br>▪ scaffolding of instruction as needed, that may address procedural fluency, conceptual understanding, or application. |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| fluency to conceptual understanding with application (grade level content, intentional and consistent check for understanding opportunities with feedback)<br>▪ an emphasis on student thinking (sharing developing thinking, justifying responses | understanding with application (grade level content, intentional and consistent check for understanding opportunities with feedback)<br>▪ an emphasis on student thinking (sharing developing thinking, justifying responses) | understanding with application (grade level content, intentional and consistent check for understanding opportunities with feedback)<br>▪ an emphasis on student thinking (sharing developing thinking, justifying responses) | (grade level content, intentional and consistent check for understanding opportunities with feedback)<br>▪ an emphasis on student thinking (sharing developing thinking, justifying responses) |

## Measure: Mathematics Secondary Instruction Grade 6 High School Content Courses

Students receive MCCR standards based instruction aligned with current research based strategies.

Secondary Content Domains: Ratios & Proportional Relationships (6 8), Expressions & Equation (6 8), The Number System (6 8), Statistics & Probability (6 Algebra), Functions (Algebra), Number & Quantity (Algebra), Modeling with Mathematics, Reasoning with Mathematics

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed implement evidence based mathematical instructional practices aligned to standards-based content, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>▪ clear instructional outcomes and intentional positive mathematical mindset building (progress monitoring, perseverance, supporting productive struggle)<br>▪ use of mathematical representations (teacher modeling and student use of mathematical tools)<br>▪ scaffolding of content from fluency to conceptual understanding with | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed implement evidence based mathematical instructional practices aligned to standards-based content, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>▪ clear instructional outcomes and intentional positive mathematical mindset building (progress monitoring, perseverance, supporting productive struggle)<br>▪ use of mathematical representations (teacher modeling and student use of mathematical tools)<br>▪ scaffolding of content from fluency to conceptual understanding with | ☐ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed implement evidence based mathematical instructional practices aligned to standards-based content, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>▪ clear instructional outcomes and intentional positive mathematical mindset building (progress monitoring, perseverance, supporting productive struggle)<br>▪ use of mathematical representations (teacher modeling and student use of mathematical tools)<br>▪ scaffolding of content from fluency to conceptual understanding with | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed implement evidence based mathematical instructional practices aligned to standards-based content, problem solving, and mathematical reasoning. Examples include but are not limited to instruction on:<br>▪ clear instructional outcomes and intentional positive mathematical mindset building (progress monitoring, perseverance, supporting productive struggle)<br>▪ use of mathematical representations (teacher modeling and student use of mathematical tools)<br>▪ scaffolding of instruction as needed, that may address procedural fluency, conceptual understanding, or application. (grade level content, |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| application (grade level content, intentional and consistent check for understanding opportunities with feedback)<br>▪ an emphasis on student thinking (sharing developing thinking, justifying responses) | application (grade level content, intentional and consistent check for understanding opportunities with feedback)<br>▪ an emphasis on student thinking (sharing developing thinking, justifying responses) | application (grade level content, intentional and consistent check for understanding opportunities with feedback)<br>▪ an emphasis on student thinking (sharing developing thinking, justifying responses) | intentional and consistent check for understanding opportunities with feedback)<br>▪ an emphasis on student thinking (sharing developing thinking, justifying responses) |

## Measure: Collaborative Learning

Students work together in small groups to cooperatively solve problems, develop answers to questions, or complete assignments.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of students engaging in effective collaborative learning practices. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of students engaging in effective collaborative learning practices. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* | ▣ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of students engaging in effective collaborative learning practices. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of students engaging in effective collaborative learning practices. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet.* |

## Feedback

Students receive timely, specific, and structured feedback to further their learning.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more effective practices in providing and using feedback. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more effective practices in providing and using feedback. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ▣ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of effective practices in providing and using feedback. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more effective practices in providing and using feedback. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. |

## Measure: Learning Environment

Students experience a positive and supportive learning environment that fosters academic growth and the development of social and emotional competencies (self awareness, self management, social awareness, relationship skills, and responsible decision making).

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of positive and supportive learning environments. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of positive and supportive learning environments. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ▣ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of positive and supportive learning environments. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of positive and supportive learning environments. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. |

## Student Driven Learning

Instruction is a shared experience among the teacher and students.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ **Few** (less than 25%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of students leading learning. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ☐ **Some** (25%-59%) of classrooms observed demonstrate two or more examples of students leading learning. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ▣ **Majority** (60%-84%) of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of students leading learning. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. | ☐ **At least 85%** of classrooms observed demonstrated two or more examples of students leading learning. Evidence will be collected from the *Classroom Capture Sheet*. |

### RATING FOR DOMAIN 1, INDICATOR 1

| Not Applicable | Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| _____ out of _____ | _____ out of _____ | _____ out of _____ | 13 _____ out of 13 _____ | _____ out of _____ |

**INDICATOR 3:** Assessments - The school uses formative and summative assessments that are aligned to standards and provide educators with timely data to inform modification to instructional practices.

## Measure: Alignment and Timing

Assessments are aligned to curriculum standards and deliver a range of data (daily, weekly, monthly, and quarterly) to sustain collaborative inquiry and continuously improve instruction.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The school is **not in the process** of developing a plan to align assessments to Maryland College and Career Standards and are embedded into the curriculum to produce a range of data to improve instruction. | ☐ The school is **in the process** of developing a plan to align assessments to Maryland College and Career Standards and embedded into the curriculum to produce a range of data to improve instruction. | ☐ Assessments are **aligned** to Maryland College and Career Standards and are embedded into the curriculum to produce a range of data to improve instruction. | ▣ Assessments are **aligned** to Maryland College and Career Standards and are embedded into the curriculum to produce a range of data to improve instruction **that is monitored regularly and is consistently being assessed to maintain vertical and horizontal alignment of curriculum and instruction.** |
| ☐ The school is **not in the process** of using informal and formal assessments to measure student progress towards meeting outcomes and standards. | ☐ The school is **in the process** of using informal and formal assessments to measure student progress towards meeting outcomes and standards. | ☐ Informal and formal assessments are **consistently** used to measure student progress toward meeting outcomes and standards. | ▣ Informal and formal assessments are **consistently** used to measure student progress**, and growth toward exceeding** outcomes, standards, and schoolwide goals and benchmarks. |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The school is **not in the process** of developing a plan to align assessments to the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) and based on the four interrelated domains of learning (Math, English, Social Foundations, Physical Well-Being and Motor Development). | ☐ The school is **in the process** of developing a plan to align assessments to the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) and based on the four interrelated domains of learning (Math, English, Social Foundations, Physical Well-Being and Motor Development). | ☐ Assessments are **aligned** to the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) and based on the four interrelated domains of learning (Math, English, Social Foundations, Physical Well-Being and Motor Development). | ☐ Assessments are **aligned** to the Kindergarten Readiness Assessment (KRA) and based on the four interrelated domains of learning (Math, English, Social Foundations, Physical Well-Being and Motor Development) **with consistent monitoring and tracking of students' progress.** |

## Measure: Purpose

**Ass**essments are used to adjust the organization of students in the classroom, pace of instruction, or content being taught.

☐ Not applicable

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ The school **does not** use assessment data to regroup students in order to provide targeted instruction. | ☐ The school **inconsistently** uses assessment data to regroup students in order to provide targeted instruction. | ▣ The school **consistently** uses assessment data to regroup students in order to provide targeted instruction. | ☐ The school **consistently** uses assessment data to regroup students in order to provide, **monitor, and adjust** targeted instruction. |

| Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|
| ☐ Teachers **do not** use informal and/or formal checks for understanding to monitor student progress and modify the pace of instruction or content. | ☐ Teachers **inconsistently** use informal and/or formal checks for understanding to monitor student progress and modify the pace of instruction or content. | ▣ Teachers **consistently** use informal and/or formal checks for understanding to monitor student progress and modify the pace of instruction or content. | ☐ Teachers **consistently** use informal and/or formal checks for understanding to monitor student progress and modify the pace of instruction or content **based on individualized student needs.** |
| ☐ Teachers **do not** use assessments to collaborate, monitor student learning, and track performance goals. | ☐ Teachers **inconsistently** use assessments to collaborate, monitor student learning, and track performance goals. | ▣ Teachers **consistently** use assessments to collaborate, monitor student learning, and track performance goals. | ☐ Teachers **consistently** use assessments to collaborate, monitor student learning, track goals, **and communicate performance to students and families**. |

## RATING FOR DOMAIN 1, INDICATOR 3

| Not Applicable | Not Evident | Developing | Accomplishing | Accomplishing with Continuous Improvement |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| _____ out of _____ | _____ out of _____ | _____ out of _____ | 3 _____ out of 5 _____ | 2 _____ out of 5 _____ |