

# Rubric for Curriculum and Assessment Implementation

Level	State Standards	CURRICULUM			ASSESSMENT	PLANNING
	Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS)	Vertical Alignment Document (VAD), TEKS Clarification Document (TCD), & Enhanced TEKS Clarification Document (Math only)	Year at A Glance (YAG) & TEKS Verification Document (TVD)	Instructional Focus Documents (IFD)	Performance Assessment(s) (PA), Assessment Item Bank, & Formative Spiral Item Bank (Math only)	Resource Selection/Planning
1	Teachers lack awareness of state standards. Teachers trust instructional resources address state standards at the appropriate cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers lack awareness of vertical alignment and are unable to discern gaps in instruction across grade bands, and/or district instructional resources.	Teachers lack awareness of an appropriate sequence of topics that comprise the course of study. Teachers trust that instructional resources are sequenced appropriately.	Teachers lack awareness of the concept of bundling standards into units of instruction. Teachers trust that district resources meet the cognitive and content specificity of the standards.	Teachers lack awareness of diverse and appropriate methods of assessment that allow students to demonstrate what they know. Teachers rely on textbook or resource assessments only.	Teachers lack awareness of diverse instructional delivery methods or resources. The textbook is the primary resource; lecture is the primary means of delivery.
2	Teachers are aware of state standards, but lack a thorough understanding of their structure. Teachers individually determine the meaning of the standards.	Teachers are aware of gaps in learning with incoming or outgoing students but fail to connect achievement gaps with instruction or district resources across grade bands. Teachers function individually from grade level to grade level.	Teachers individually attempt to devise a sequence for a course of study but with minimal regard to factors such as district calendar and assessment dates.	Standards are not consistently bundled within the context of a unit of instruction. Interpretation of the cognitive and content specificity of the standards is left to the individual.	Teachers individually devise assessments based on their instructional delivery but after instruction has taken place and with the intent of only measuring student outcomes.	Teachers are aware of various instructional delivery methods but determination of best practice and selection of resources is left to individual teachers.
3	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure, but there is minimal evidence of teacher collaboration regarding the standards.	Teachers are aware of student achievement gaps. Teachers individually connect student achievement gaps with instruction or district resources across grade bands.	Teachers individually attempt to devise a sequence for a course of study by considering essential factors such as district calendar and assessment dates.	Teachers individually bundle of standards within the context of a unit of instruction and determine the specificity of standards.	Teachers individually devise assessments based on learning outcomes prior to instruction, but with the intent of measuring both student outcomes and instructional effectiveness.	Teachers individually select instructional best practices and varied instructional resources but without regard to demands of the IFD.
4	Teachers are aware of state standards and their structure. Teachers routinely collaborate regarding the standards and can somewhat differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Teachers are aware of student achievement gaps. Teachers collaboratively connect student achievement gaps with instruction or district resources across grade bands.	Teachers routinely collaborate with other teachers in order to devise a sequence for a course of study with regard to factors such as district calendar and assessment dates.	Teachers routinely collaborate with other teachers regarding the bundling of standards and their specificity within the context of a unit of instruction.	Prior to instruction, teachers routinely collaborate and use common student assessments at a particular grade level or course, with the intent of measuring both student outcomes and instructional effectiveness.	Teachers routinely collaborate when selecting resources and planning instructional best practices that meet the cognitive and content demands of the IFD.
5	Through professional dialogue, teachers continually articulate current state standards, their structure, and differentiate between cognitive and content expectations.	Through professional dialogue, teachers continually look for and identify student achievement gaps by reflecting on data, the specificity from the VADs/TCDs, and connect gaps to instruction and district resources across grade bands.	Through professional dialogue using YAG, teachers are able to reconcile the course sequence to the district calendar and ensure that essential standards are mastered at appropriate times.	Through professional dialogue, teachers continually study the bundling and specificity of the TEKS within the context of a unit of instruction by examining the IFD.	Through professional dialogue, teachers devise and use a variety of common assessments including Performance Assessments, unit-aligned assessment items, and other local assessments to not only measure learning but shape instructional practices.	Through professional dialogue, teachers evaluate, calibrate, and construct resources; and plan best practices that meet the specificity on the IFD and the demands of pre-determined common assessments.