

**Content Team Rubric:** This tool is intended for use by leaders to evaluate the quality of their content team implementation and calibrate with leaders within a school or region.

	LEVELS	4 – Exemplary	3 – Proficient	2 – Approaching	1 – Emergent
<b>Implementation</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	Teams meet 2-3 times per week for 45 minutes. All team members attend every time and stay for the entire time.	Teams meet once per week for 45 minutes. All team members attend every time and almost all stay for the entire time.	Teams meet every other week for at least 45 minutes. Almost all team members attend and most stay for the entire time.	Teams meet less than every other week for at least 30 minutes. Attendance is irregular.
	<b>Norms</b>	Team adheres to co-authored norms without prompting/redirecting	Team most often adheres to co-authored norms, occasionally redirecting to the norms.	Team often loses sight of the norms and compromises their effectiveness as they do.	Team ignores their norms.
	<b>Evidence Driven</b>	Team keeps discussion rooted in relevant student assessment data. Members openly share student achievement results, student work, lesson artifacts, and teacher actions that caused student performance.	Teams usually use student assessment data. Members reluctantly share student achievement results, student work, lesson artifacts, and teacher actions that caused student performance.	Teams infrequently refer to in relevant student assessment data, or fail to meaningfully ground conversations in the work, or teacher actions that caused student performance.	Teams do not ground work in relevant student assessment data.
	<b>Action</b>	Members consistently implement new practices in their classrooms based on content team work. Members observe and support each other with feedback.	Members frequently implement new practices in their classrooms.	Members sometimes implement new practices in their classrooms.	Members rarely implement new practices in their classrooms.
	<b>Questioning</b>	Team members constantly ask challenging questions of one another, pushing colleagues to engage in deep critical thinking, and unpack misconceptions. Team's questions successfully drive toward increasing the rigor of their instruction.	Team members usually ask questions of one another, pushing colleagues to engage in deep critical thinking, and unpack misconceptions. Team's questions often engage all members in deep critical thinking.	Team identifies one or two follow-up questions to ask, but doesn't push for depth. Questions are inconsistent in their level of rigor, or focus on clarification rather than challenge.	Team asks low level questions of one another that don't push each other's practice.
	<b>Authentic Discussion</b>	Team discussion is open and authentic. Team members feel safe being vulnerable, and carefully respond to each other's points and concisely and eloquently state their thinking on the topic. All members participate all of the time.	Team discussion is honest. Team members and carefully respond to each other's points and concisely and eloquently state their thinking on the topic. All members participate most of the time.	Discussion is sometimes authentic, but often skirts the core issues at play. Members respond to each other's points and state their thinking on the topic. Most members participate.	Team is rarely able to facilitate open discussions that advance the work. Not all members participate.
	<b>Intellectual Rigor</b>	Team treats each meeting as an opportunity to deepen their craft. Team constantly challenges one another and tests the intellectual ceiling of their work. Team embraces struggle because they knows adult struggle is good for students.	Team's work together is sufficiently rigorous, but may not actively stretch each member's capacity in every meeting.	The rigor bar for the team's work is inconsistent. Team often stays where they are comfortable or addresses superficial problems rather than unpacking the toughest challenges	The team does not engage in rigorous conversation or work.
	<b>Goal-Setting</b>	Team effectively and strategically sets goals together, such that all members know <i>exactly</i> what they are working on and <i>exactly</i> what students need to do to demonstrate mastery and by when.	Team sets goals. Teachers generally know what students must do to demonstrate mastery but inconsistently set deadlines for mastery	Team inconsistently sets goals, or failures to monitor progress against them.	Team does not set goals.
	<b>Progress Monitoring</b>	Team has and uses simple, clear systems for tracking all members' progress. The team regularly celebrates progress and works to solve problems together on a weekly basis.	Team has a clear system for tracking all members' progress. The team celebrates and problem solves at least every other week.	Team has a system for tracking members' progress, but it is rarely used.	Team lacks systems for tracking member's progress.

	LEVELS	4 – Exemplary	3 – Proficient	2 – Approaching	1 – Emergent
Practice #1: Looking at Student Work	Studies Student Work	Team relentlessly and methodically uses student work and informal data to plan for targeted and effective instruction.	Team consistently uses student work and informal data to plan for targeted and effective instruction.	Team regularly looks at student work and informal data, but may not use effectively to plan for instruction.	Team rarely looks at student work and informal data.
	Criteria for Success	The team identifies and names clear criteria for success for all student assignments, and produces and exemplar to ground their shared understanding.	The team identifies and names clear criteria for success for student assignments.	The team names criteria for success, but Cfs are often vague or guidelines rather than measures of success.	The team rarely if ever names criteria for success.
	Diagnosis	Team is able to come up with a clear, actionable diagnosis of student needs. Based upon this diagnosis, team is able to identify key next steps for moving all students to mastery.	Team arrives at a clear diagnosis of student needs, but sometimes struggles to prioritize next steps.	Team attempts to diagnose student needs but sometimes does not know what to look for	Team lacks systems for diagnosing student needs and does not know what to look for.
	Feedback	Team has robust systems for always giving students transferable feedback on their work after the content team meeting	Team has systems for giving students feedback on their work, but feedback could be more consistent given to students	Team gives students infrequent feedback on their work, and/or these systems are cumbersome or inconsistent.	Team is very inconsistent about giving students feedback.
Practice 2: Lesson Study (Internalization and Tuning)	Content Knowledge	Team has studied deeply and has a thorough understanding of the curriculum and breaks the content down in ways that lead to student mastery.	Team often studies the curriculum, but occasionally fails to anticipate student misconceptions.	Team generally understands the curriculum but may lack clarity about the content.	Team struggles to understand the curriculum and/or may go into meetings with misconceptions about the content.
	Lesson Purpose	Team deeply understands the purpose of lessons, how it connects to the rest of the unit, and knows the moves that they must make in order transfer this understanding to students to be successful.	Team understands the purpose of this individual lesson, how it connects to most of the unit, and how to transfer this understanding to students.	Team superficially understands the purpose of lessons or doesn't understand how it connects to rest of unit or how to transfer understanding to students.	Team does not understand the purpose of lessons.
	Alignment	During lesson study, teams work diligently to ensure that lessons are aligned and the assessments give accurate information about levels of student mastery.	During lesson study, teams work to ensure that lessons are aligned and the assessments give accurate information about levels of student mastery.	During lesson study, team sometimes focuses on lesson alignment.	Team fails to focus on lesson alignment during lesson study.
	Anticipation	Team anticipates students' misconceptions and confusions and develops multiple strategies to overcome them.	Team anticipates misconceptions that students might have and addresses them in the moment.	Team struggles to come up with strategies to overcome student misconceptions.	Team fails to consider misconceptions that students might have about the material.
	Sets College-Ready Bar	Team understands unit and year-end goals as well as the Common Core; each team member has a clear understanding not only for the current grade level, but also for the grade level above and below.	Team understands year-end goals, and the College ready standards. Each team member understands what students are expected to know and be able to do by year's end.	Team has gaps in their understanding of year-end goals, and the College ready standards. Team members are unclear about what students are expected to know and be able to do by year's end.	Team lacks an understanding of year-end goals, and the College ready standards. Team lacks an understanding of what students are expected to know and be able to do by year's end.
Practice 3: Teachbacks	Prep & Use	The team has deeply studied and prepared to teach lessons for teachbacks. Teachers immediately transfer learnings into their implementation.	The team has studied and prepared to teach lessons for teachbacks.	The team walks in unprepared for teachbacks but executes them anyway.	The team fails to prepare or implement teachbacks.
	Repeated Practice	The team works diligently on an identified area of the lesson, practicing repeatedly until teachers master its delivery.	The team spends time practicing the lesson. Practice time occasionally lacks focus.	The team goes through the motions of practicing the lesson and/or gets lost in conversations about the lesson rather than practicing.	The team fails to use teachbacks.