



THE STATE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT / THE UNIVERSITY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK / ALBANY, NY 12234

Office of Curriculum and Instructional Support
Office of Curriculum, Instruction and Instructional Technology
Room 320 EB
Albany, NY 12234
Tel. (518) 474-5922, Fax (518) 473-4884
www.emsc.nysed.gov/ciai

Rubrics to Guide the Development of Model B Applications Proposed Implementation in September 2008

School: _____ District: _____

Address: _____

City: _____, NY _____ Telephone: (_____) _____ - _____

Principal: _____ E-mail: _____

I. Eligibility- Basic Information

	Unsatisfactory	Pending Approval	Approved
1. School/ District Particulars	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Eligibility	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Executive Summary	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Certification of Staff	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Student Achievement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Information	NO	YES
Evidence of eligibility	The evidence indicates that the building meets none of the requirements for eligibility to prepare a Model B application.	The evidence indicates that the building meets all the requirements for eligibility to prepare a Model B application.

II. Procedural Evidence

Evidence	(Unsatisfactory)	(Pending Approval)	(Approved)
Consultation with affected constituencies at both the district and school level (see page 12)	Involved informal and infrequent contact with selected representatives from one or two key constituencies. Requisite signatures and reporting forms from SDM/SLT team were not submitted.	Involved periodic contact with one or two key constituencies in accordance with a contractually prescribed procedure.	Involved ongoing and continuous contact with key constituencies including the Shared Decision Making/ School Leadership Teams constituted under Section 100.11 of Commissioner's Regulations to work toward mutually shared goals and objectives. Requisite signatures and reporting forms from SDM/SLT team were submitted.
Agreement among key constituent groups (see pages 13-15)	A key constituent group or groups at both the district and school levels have major reservations and unresolved concerns about the Model B application and its potential for success and do not support it as written.	A key constituent group or groups at either the district or school levels has/ have concerns or objections which raise questions about the potential success of the Model B application and which have not been adequately addressed by school officials.	All Key constituent groups at both the district and school levels approved the submission of the Model B application and/or arrived at consensus to support its implementation.
Self study involved key constituencies (see page 16)	Involved only a few selected members of the school's administrative and instructional staff.	Involved a limited number of the school's administrative and instructional personnel and few parent representatives.	Representative's from all constituencies at both the district and school levels included staff from various levels and areas of special needs, e.g. ELL, Special Ed.

Evidence	(Unsatisfactory)	(Pending Approval)	(Approved)
<p>Self study accurately describes strengths and identified areas requiring attention</p> <p>(see page 16)</p>	<p>Description of strengths and areas requiring attention are identified but not based upon objective data/evidence; instead, personal feelings and subjective assessments, unsubstantiated by objective data, are the basis for the description of the strengths and areas requiring attention. There is no apparent alignment with the Regents Policy Statement on Middle-Level Education, the Department’s Essential Elements of Standards-Focused Middle-Level Schools and Programs, or the State’s Learning Standards.</p>	<p>The description of the academic strengths and areas requiring attention is limited to ELA and math performance based on state assessments; the description of the learning environment is based entirely upon personal experiences and subjective determinations. There is some evidence of partial alignment with the Regents Policy Statement on Middle-Level Education, the Department’s Essential Elements of Standards-Focused Middle-Level Schools and Programs, and the State’s Learning Standards</p>	<p>The analysis of the identified academic strengths and areas requiring attention is comprehensive, reflecting the students performance in all the standards areas, both tested and non-tested; the description of the learning environment is based primarily upon objective data and evidence, reinforced by personal experiences. There is evidence of complete alignment with the Regents Policy Statement on Middle-Level Education, the Department’s Essential Elements of Standards-Focused Middle-Level Schools and Programs, and the State’s Learning Standards and the school’s mission and vision.</p>
<p>Prioritized areas requiring attention are based upon identified patterns research, data, and evidence</p> <p>(see page 16)</p>	<p>Prioritized areas requiring attention are based entirely upon subjective criteria, unsupported by research, hard data or other objective evidence.</p>	<p>Prioritized areas requiring attention are based primarily upon past subjective criteria, and informed by limited selective research and evidence (data).</p>	<p>Prioritized areas requiring attention are based entirely upon the most current data, substantiated research and will be used to inform recognized best practices.</p>
<p>Self study included an external review</p> <p>(see page 16)</p>	<p>No external review performed.</p>	<p>Informal, unstructured external review occurred.</p>	<p>A formal external review, e.g., SQR was conducted by school constituency/ representatives and district based staff.</p>

III. Required Information

Information	(Unsatisfactory)	(Pending Approval)	(Approved)
Regulatory relief (see pages 17-21)	No information presented on what regulatory relief is being requested or the regulatory relief being requested is not permissible under Model B.	The regulatory requirements in Section 100.4 for which regulatory relief is being requested are implicit and need further clarification.	All of the regulatory requirements in Section 100.4 for which regulatory relief is being requested are explicit and clearly specified.
Programmatic and scheduling particulars for providing instruction related to achieving the 28 Learning Standards.	All 28 Learning Standards will be integrated throughout the curriculum. (no evidence of rubrics, checklists)	The Learning Standards in those areas where there are State assessments will be taught through discrete or interdisciplinary courses; Some of the Learning Standards in the non-tested areas will be taught through discrete or interdisciplinary courses with the majority being integrated throughout the curriculum.	The 28 Learning Standards will be taught through discrete and/or interdisciplinary courses. Integrated to prepare students for assessments in both tested (state) and non-tested areas (Identifying/ using Middle Level checklists) Required sample student schedules are provided.
Addressing the Learning Standards in those areas where regulatory relief is being requested	The application includes no plan for specifically addressing the Learning Standards in those areas where regulatory relief is being requested so as to ensure students achievement of proficiency.	The application includes a limited number of discrete activities that will suffice to address the standards in those areas where regulatory relief is being requested so as to ensure students achievement of proficiency.	The application includes a detailed, comprehensive plan, thoughtfully developed and thoroughly grounded in research and best practice, for addressing the Learning Standards in those areas where regulatory relief is being requested so as to ensure students achievement of proficiency. (Regents Policy Statement and Essential Elements)
Interventions and changes	The interventions and changes in the Model B proposal do not reflect or address the prioritized areas generated by the self study. Identified	The interventions and changes in the Model B proposal reflect only a limited number of identified areas generated by the self study	The interventions and changes reflect the identified areas generated by the self-study and are the basis for the Model B proposal and are fully and completely addressed in the proposal

Information	(Unsatisfactory)	(Pending Approval)	(Approved)
Safeguards	The interventions and changes do not include safeguards to ensure that all students are proficient in the State’s 28 Learning Standards.	The interventions and changes include few safeguards to ensure that all students will be proficient in the State’s 28 Learning Standards.	The Model B proposal includes extensive safeguards to ensure that all students will be proficient in the State’s 28 Learning Standards
Alignment with district and school improvement plans (see page 22)	The interventions and changes are not aligned with district and school improvement plans.	There is minimal alignment between the district and school improvement plan. Further clarification will be needed	The interventions and changes are fully aligned with the district and school improvement plans.
Essential Elements of Standards Focused on Middle Level Schools and Programs	There is nothing to indicate that the Essential Elements were either examined or considered in the development of the plan.	Evidence indicates that Essential Elements were summarily examined, all or in part, but that they were not integral to the development of the plan. Further clarification will be needed.	Evidence indicates that the Essential Elements were thoroughly examined and that they were integral to the development of the plan.
Staff qualifications (see page 19)	The responsibility for teaching the Learning Standards for which regulatory relief is being requested will rest generally with staff who are neither certified (duly licensed by New York State) nor qualified (have both the content knowledge and the pedagogical skills) to teach the Learning Standards; more than 10 percent of the staff teaching in the other Learning Standards areas (those where regulatory relief is not being requested) are both uncertified and unqualified.	The responsibility for teaching the Learning Standards for which regulatory relief is being requested will rest primarily with staff who are certified (duly licensed by New York State) and qualified (have both the content knowledge and the pedagogical skills) to teach the Learning Standards; More than 90 percent, but less than 100 percent, of staff teaching in other areas (those where regulatory relief is not being requested) are either certified or qualified.	The responsibility for teaching the 28 Learning Standards, including those for which regulatory relief is being requested, will rest with staff who are both certified (duly licensed by New York State) and qualified (have both the content knowledge and the pedagogical skills) to teach the Learning Standards.
Measurable indicators/evidence	The application includes no measurable indicators of school change and improvement aligned	The application includes several measurable indicators of school change and	The application includes a comprehensive set of research-based measurable indicators of school change and improvement fully aligned with the Regents Policy, the Department’s Essential Elements, and the

Information	(Unsatisfactory)	(Pending Approval)	(Approved)
(see page 20)	with the Regents Policy, the Department’s Essential Elements, and the State’s Learning Standards that can be used to evaluate the success of the school improvement plan and the approved Model B application.	improvement that align, in part, with the Regents Policy, the Department’s Essential Elements, and the State’s Learning Standards. The indicators cannot be used to evaluate fully the success of the school improvement plan and the approved Model B application.	State’s Learning Standards that can be used to evaluate the success of the school improvement plan and the approved Model B application including evidence related to student achievement in tested and non-tested areas and to the integrity with which the application is being implemented.
Professional development (see page 21)	The application does not reference professional development or the professional development is not in compliance with Section 100.2 of Commissioner’s Regulations (show links)	The application includes a series of staff development activities that focus on literacy and numeracy but are not closely and clearly tied to the priorities of the School Improvement Plan and require further clarification..	The application includes an organized, comprehensive staff development plan that is focused on literacy and numeracy, and clearly aligned with the school improvement plan
District office support (see page 22)	The application does not indicate any commitment from the District Office to support the development of the applications and implementation of Model B schools.	The District Office commits to give Model B schools additional, but modest support above and beyond that provided to other schools in the district.(needs further clarification)	The District Office commits to giving Model B schools significant additional support (resources, personnel, special attention) above and beyond that provided other schools in the district.

IV. Assurances

Assurances			
District submission (see page 23)	There is a signed assurance or clear, unequivocal evidence that the Model B application came from the district, with the full understanding of the President of the Board of Education and the Superintendent of Schools (or in the case of New York City, the Chancellor, the appropriate Regional Superintendents and principals).	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

Assurances			
Compliance with the six non-negotiable Educational Conditions (see page 23)	There is a signed assurance from the President of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools (Chancellor) and the principals of each of the Model B schools (or in the case of New York City, the Chancellor, the appropriate Regional Superintendents and principals) that the middle-level schools included in the Model B applications are in compliance with the six non-negotiable educational conditions.	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Collection of a common set of data (see page 24)	There is a signed assurance from the President of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools and the principals of each of the Model B schools (or in the case of New York City, the Chancellor, the appropriate Regional Superintendents and principals) that the middle-level schools included in the Model B applications agree to collect a common set of data using SED approved research-based, survey instruments that include objective, measurable indicators of structural, organizational, curricular and/or instructional change as well as behavioral, attitudinal, and environmental changes and are aligned to the Regents Policy Statement on Middle-Level Education and the Department’s Essential Elements of Standards-Focused Middle-Level Schools and Programs.	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
Annual public evaluation (see page 25)	There is a signed assurance from the President of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools and the principals of each of the Model B schools (or in the case of New York City, the Chancellor, the appropriate Regional Superintendents and principals) that the middle-level schools included in the Model B applications agree to conduct an annual, public evaluation of the implementation of the Model B application that includes a report on the implementation of the Model B proposal contained in the approved application, measurable indicators/evidence of school change and improvement as proposed in the application, school Performance Index, State-developed checklists of knowledge and skills or alternative assessments in those areas where there are no State assessments, and compliance with the six non-negotiable Educational Conditions.	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

Assurances			
<p>Submission of status report to the State Education Department (see page 26)</p>	<p>There is a signed assurance from the President of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools and the principals of each of the Model B schools (in the case of New York City, the Chancellor, the appropriate Regional Superintendents and principals) that the district and the middle-level school(s) will submit an annual status report to the State Education Department on the implementation of the Model B application in such form and according to such timelines as may be prescribed by the commissioner.</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Implementation of the Model B application (see page 27)</p>	<p>There is a signed assurance from the President of the Board of Education, the Superintendent of Schools and the principals of each of the Model B schools (or in the case of New York City, the Chancellor, the appropriate Regional Superintendents and principals) that the middle-level schools included in the Model B applications agree to implement the Model B application as proposed.</p>	<p>YES <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>NO <input type="checkbox"/></p>