

**District School Board of Pasco County
Problem-Solving Rubric**

PLC/ Grade Level Team:

Date:

() **Self-Assessment** () **Self-Reflection** () **Observation**

STEP 0: Pre-Planning for Problem Solving:

Teams

1. Participants have consensus to use problem-solving to help make decisions and develop an action plan
2. Participants are familiar with problem-solving steps
3. Teams have identified roles and responsibilities (e.g., facilitator, recorder, time keeper...)
4. Adequate time is allocated for dialogue and problem-solving and all key stakeholders are invited and able to attend
5. Teams have agreed upon norms, PLC core values and goals

Data

1. A common data source is agreed upon (administered the same way, at the same time)
2. Teams understand how common data sources selected align to district strategic plan and improvement efforts
3. Data sources directly inform important decisions and address questions the team asks
4. Data is readily available, organized, and is presented in a format that is understood by all participants

Expectations

1. Expectations for performance among the targeted group (school, staff and/or students) are specified and clearly understood by all participants
2. Expectations for PLC participation are clearly understood including implementing the action plan as agreed upon by the team

**District School Board of Pasco County
Problem-Solving Rubric**

PLC/ Grade Level Team:

Date: () Self-Assessment () Self-Reflection () Observation

Components	Needs Development	Effective	Very Effective
I. PROBLEM IDENTIFICATION			
1. Data were used to determine patterns of student performance across the grade-level	Patterns of student performance across the grade level were discussed, but not linked to data.	Patterns of student performance across the grade level were discussed and linked to data collected.	Patterns of student performance across the grade level was linked to data, and used to develop replacement behavior.
2. Desired outcome/performance was identified (e.g., Replacement Behavior)	Desired outcome was discussed, but it is not clearly defined among all participants.	Desired outcome was clearly defined to all participants and included criteria for attaining the desired outcome.	Desired outcome was clearly defined to all participants, linked to standards, and included criteria for attaining the desired outcome.
3. Present level of performance on the desired outcome was clearly identified	No present level of performance on desired outcome was discussed/documented.	Present level of performance on desired outcome was discussed and/or documented, but not clearly defined.	Present level of performance on the desired outcome is clearly defined, was discussed, and documented.
4. Expected level of performance on the desired outcome was clearly identified	No expected level of performance on desired outcome was discussed/documented.	Expected level of performance on desired outcome was discussed and/or documented, but not clearly defined.	Expected level of performance on the desired outcome was clearly defined, discussed, and documented.
5. Peer level of performance on the desired outcome was clearly identified	No peer level of performance on desired outcome was discussed/documented.	Peer level of performance on desired outcome was discussed and/or documented, but not clearly defined.	Peer level of performance on the desired outcome is clearly defined, was discussed, and documented.
6. The gap between expected and current levels was clearly identified and documented.	Not Present	Present	

**District School Board of Pasco County
Problem-Solving Rubric**

PLC/ Grade Level Team:

Date: () **Self-Assessment** () **Self-Reflection** () **Observation**

Components	Needs Development	Effective	Very Effective
III. INTERVENTION PLAN DEVELOPMENT			
1. Plan is linked directly to the verified hypotheses and follows the thinking outlined in the prediction statement	Plan does not link directly to a verified hypothesis	Plan links to the hypothesis but does not address the prediction statement	Plan links to the hypothesis and follow the prediction statement
2. Intervention is very specific and includes all the necessary components for completion	Includes only one of the following: -Who is responsible -What will be done -A start date -The time of day -Location	Includes contains 2 or 3 of the following: -Who is responsible -What will be done -A start date -The time of day -Location	Includes each of the following: -Who is responsible -What will be done -A start date -The time of day -Location
3. Intervention plan contains a support plan	Does not outline supports for the interventionists including human resources, professional development or materials	Outlines supports for the interventionists including human resources, PD, or materials but does not include specifics	Outlines supports including: -Who is responsible -What will be done -Dates and Times
4. Intervention plan contains a way to evaluate Intervention Implementation (fidelity/integrity)	Plan does not specify a way to guarantee and measure implementation	Plan has a way to measure implementation but lacks specific criteria for evaluation	Implementation evaluation component includes the following: -Who collects information -What measures are used -How often -Criteria for success
5. Intervention plan contains a way to evaluate the student outcomes directly linked to the problem identified in step 1	Plan does not indicate a way to measure student or target group's Response to Intervention	A progress monitoring plan is included but lacks key components	The progress monitoring plan includes: (1)Who collects the PM data; (2) When and how often the data collection occurs; (3) Criteria for success

**District School Board of Pasco County
Problem-Solving Rubric**

PLC/ Grade Level Team:

Date: () **Self-Assessment** () **Self-Reflection** () **Observation**

Components	Needs Development	Effective	Very Effective
IV. RESPONSE TO INTERVENTION			
1. Data related to fidelity of implementation was used to evaluate response to instruction/intervention.	No data related to fidelity of implementation was present and/or data was used but it included only attendance information for the student(s).	Data related to fidelity of implementation was used and included student attendance and implementation frequency and duration	Data related to fidelity of implementation was used and included student attendance and engagement, frequency and duration of instruction, and quality of implementation
2. Graphed data on student outcome is used to determine the effectiveness of instruction/intervention.	Graphed data are not used or graphed data does not include critical components (e.g., baseline, goal, aimline, trendline), and/or is not based on regular intervals of data collection.	Graphed data are used, based on regular intervals of data collection, and clearly indicates the student(s) outcome goal.	Graphed data are used, based on regular intervals of data collection, and includes all of the critical graph components.
3. A decision is made for good, questionable, or poor response based on student outcome data and consideration of fidelity of implementation.	Instruction/intervention effectiveness was not determined, a decision was made without considering fidelity of intervention, or the decision was not based on graphed student(s) outcome data.	Instruction/intervention effectiveness was determined based upon one source of graphed student(s) outcome data and included some evidence of fidelity of implementation.	Instruction/intervention effectiveness was determined after assuring fidelity of implementation factors and was based upon multiple sources of student(s) outcome data, including graphed data.
4. Next steps were decided based on student response to instruction and intervention	There was no documented plan for next steps or there was a plan but was not clearly linked to student(s) response.	For a poor/questionable response, plan provided for intervention modification (i.e., increased time, decreased ratio, improved fidelity, intervention replacement) For a positive response, plan provided for continuation, fading of support, and/or goal adjustment.	For a poor/questionable response, plan provided for intervention modification and continued progress monitoring with revisiting. For a positive response, plan provided for continuation, fading of support, and/or goal adjustment with continued progress monitoring with revisiting.

**District School Board of Pasco County
Problem-Solving Rubric**

PLC/ Grade Level Team:

Date: Self-Assessment Self-Reflection Observation

SUMMARY AND NEXT STEPS:

SUMMARY	Next Steps:			
Step 0				
SUMMARY	Needs Development	Effective	Very Effective	Next Steps:
Step 1				
Step 2				
Step 3				
Step 4				