

CTE and Academic Integration Self-Assessment Rubric

STANDARDS OF PRACTICE	INEFFECTIVE	DEVELOPING	ACCOMPLISHED	EXEMPLARY
	1	2	3	4

Curriculum at the Systems Level

Standardized curriculum templates are developed and/or adopted that articulate a CTE program’s industry, academic, CDOS, CFM, and career readiness standards.	There is no standardized curriculum template evident and/or there are NO connections to associated standards.	Standardized curriculum templates are developed but are NOT used by all and DO NOT FULLY articulate associated standards.	Standardized curriculum templates are developed, are used by all, and EFFECTIVELY articulate MOST but NOT ALL associated standards.	Standardized curriculum templates are developed, are used by all, and CLEARLY articulate ALL associated standards.
Curriculum documents describe what skills, knowledge, behaviors, and competencies are to be learned and explicitly outline learning activities and assessment strategies.	Curriculum documents DO NOT describe what competencies are to be learned and DO NOT outline learning activities and/or assessment strategies.	SOME Curriculum documents describe the skills, knowledge, competencies, and behaviors to be learned, but DO NOT describe learning activities AND/OR assessment strategies.	MOST curriculum documents describe the skills, knowledge, competencies, and behaviors to be learned AND outline learning activities BUT NOT ALL assessment strategies.	ALL curriculum documents describe the skills, knowledge, competencies, and behaviors to be learned and outline learning activities AND ALL assessment strategies.
Curriculum documents include course descriptions, crosswalks, outlines, sequencing maps, unit plans, and assessment strategies.	Curriculum documents DO NOT include anything more than scope and sequence, if developed at all.	Some curriculum documents are used and include course descriptions, outlines, and unit plans, but DO NOT include maps, crosswalks, and assessment strategies.	MOST curriculum documents are used by all and include all components, but some fail to include assessments or crosswalks in all areas.	ALL curriculum documents are used by all and include course descriptions, crosswalks, outlines, sequencing maps, unit plans, and assessment strategies.

System-wide standardized approaches are used to assess the comprehensive use of the developed curriculum and its implementation with fidelity.	There is NO standardized approach to assess whether the developed curriculum is the implemented curriculum.	There is a basic approach to assess the implementation of the developed curriculum, but it is NOT fully documented to determine fidelity of curriculum use.	There is a fully documented and standardized approach to assess if the developed curriculum is implemented BUT it is NOT used in ALL programs.	There is a fully documented system-wide approach to assessing the implementation of the developed curriculum in ALL programs by BOTH academic and CTE teachers.
Curriculum development occurs using external partnerships (e.g., post-secondary, SREB, industry and zone/statewide educators).	There is NO evidence that external partners are used to support the development of curriculum.	There is evidence that external partners are used to support the development of curriculum in SOME but not all program areas.	Documentation exists that external partners are used to support the development of curriculum in MOST but not all program areas.	Documentation exists that external partners are used to support the development of curriculum in ALL program areas without exception.
Differentiation strategies for students with disabilities (SWDs) are identified in the curriculum.	NO differentiation strategies are included in the curriculum documents.	Differentiation strategies MAY exist but are not formally identified in the curriculum.	Differentiation strategies are identified in MOST but not all curriculum documents that support SWDs.	Differentiation strategies for SWDs are identified in ALL curriculum in ALL program areas.
Employability profiles include statements of competency related to academic proficiency in addition to industry, CDOS, and career readiness standards.	Employability profiles ARE NOT developed and/or DO NOT include all components.	Employability profiles are developed for MOST but not all programs and may fail to include one or more of the identified components.	Employability profiles are developed for ALL programs but SOME fail to include academic proficiency statements.	ALL employability profiles include statements of competency related to academic proficiency in addition to industry, CDOS, and career readiness standards.

Curriculum at the Teacher Level

STANDARDS OF PRACTICE	INEFFECTIVE 1	DEVELOPING 2	ACCOMPLISHED 3	EXEMPLARY 4
Standardized curriculum templates are used to frame co-planning efforts and guide day-to-day planning for instruction.	Curriculum is NOT based on the standardized template and does not effectively guide planning efforts.	The curriculum IS developed using the standardized template but DOES NOT effectively guide co-planning and/or daily plans.	The curriculum is WELL DEVELOPED using the standardized template and IS used to plan daily lessons but NOT co-planning efforts.	The curriculum is WELL DEVELOPED using the standardized templates and is used for planning lessons AND co-planning efforts with academic teachers.
Co-planning time is productive and purposeful and drives instructional strategies.	Co-planning time is NOT scheduled or used to support the planning of instructional strategies.	Co-planning time is RANDOM, not fully productive or purposeful, and NOT used to drive instructional strategies.	Co-planning time is MOSTLY scheduled, productive, and purposeful and IS USED to drive instructional strategies.	Co-planning time is explicitly scheduled, HIGHLY productive and purposeful, and USED to develop new instructional strategies.
Integrated learning activities are co-planned and align with the industry-based knowledge and skills identified in the curriculum.	There is NO evidence that co-planning takes place or, if it does, it may not align with industry standards.	Integrated learning activities are generally NOT co-planned but SOMETIMES align with the industry-based knowledge and skills identified in the curriculum.	Integrated learning activities are NOT ALWAYS co-planned and MOSTLY align with the industry-based standards in the curriculum.	Integrated learning activities ARE co-planned, documented, and FULLY aligned with the industry-based knowledge and skills identified in the curriculum.
Assessment strategies are co-planned to routinely evaluate the acquisition of academic knowledge, skills, and proficiency.	There is LITTLE or NO co-planning or use of assessment strategies to determine academic proficiency.	Assessment strategies are OCCASIONALLY co-planned, randomly documented, and NOT ALWAYS USED to evaluate academic knowledge and skills.	Assessment strategies are GENERALLY co-planned, documented, and USED to evaluate academic knowledge, skills, and proficiency.	Assessment strategies are ALWAYS co-planned and explicitly documented to evaluate academic knowledge, skills, and proficiency.

Implementation at the Systems Level

STANDARDS OF PRACTICE	INEFFECTIVE 1	DEVELOPING 2	ACCOMPLISHED 3	EXEMPLARY 4
<p>The number of academic integration teachers is adequate to ensure commencement level standards are met equally well in all programs, by all students.</p>	<p>The number of certified academic teachers is NOT adequate to support the number of CTE students enrolled in all programs.</p>	<p>There are just enough certified academic teachers for the student enrollment, but they are NOT effectively used to support all programs equally well.</p>	<p>There is an adequate number of certified academic teachers to EFFECTIVELY support commencement level standards in all programs equally well</p>	<p>Academic teachers are assigned to support each career cluster individually to ENSURE that commencement level standards are met by ALL students in ALL programs.</p>
<p>The formal teacher evaluation process includes assessment of the implementation of the integrated curriculum developed.</p>	<p>There is NO formal or informal assessment of the implementation of the developed curriculum.</p>	<p>There is an INFORMAL assessment of the implementation of the developed curriculum.</p>	<p>There is a FORMAL assessment of the implementation of the developed curriculum.</p>	<p>FORMAL and INFORMAL assessments of the effectiveness of the implementation of the curriculum are used.</p>
<p>The organization establishes and utilizes outcome measures to determine integration effectiveness at the course/program level.</p>	<p>NO PROCESS is established or utilized to measure integration effectiveness.</p>	<p>A LOOSELY established process to measure integration effectiveness exists, but outcome measures have NOT been developed.</p>	<p>A process is established to determine integration effectiveness, outcome measures are developed and applied to MOST programs, and data is shared internally.</p>	<p>A formally documented process is established, developed outcome measures apply to ALL programs, and data is shared internally and externally.</p>
<p>Ongoing professional learning on integrating academics and CTE at local, regional, and state levels keeps staff current in best practices.</p>	<p>There is an ABSENCE of professional learning experiences on integrating academics and CTE.</p>	<p>Staff have participated in INITIAL professional learning on integrating academics and CTE, but none recently.</p>	<p>Staff participate in professional learning on integrating academics and CTE on an ONGOING basis.</p>	<p>Staff continually participate in and LEAD professional learning on integrating academics and CTE at all levels.</p>

Instructional support staff are in place to assist SWDs meet expectations of established curriculum.	NO additional staff have been identified to support learning strategies for SWDs.	Additional staff have been identified to support SWDs but generally are used as resource room support ONLY.	Additional special education staff assist SWDs by providing instructional support through BOTH push-in and pull-out approaches.	Special education teachers support SWDs in all program areas through COLLABORATIVE efforts with CTE teachers.
A process is in place to routinely evaluate the implementation of the system-wide curriculum to ensure all curricular elements are included during the co-planning process	NO PROCESS is established and/or used to determine if all curricular elements are included in co-planning	An evaluation process IS ESTABLISHED, used by some and may NOT be used to determine if ALL curricular elements are included during the co-planning process	There is an established evaluation process that is MOSTLY used to determine if ALL curricular elements are included during the co-planning process	The established evaluation process is ROUTINELY used to determine if ALL curricular elements are included during the co-planning process

Implementation at the Teacher Level

STANDARDS OF PRACTICE	INEFFECTIVE 1	DEVELOPING 2	ACCOMPLISHED 3	EXEMPLARY 4
The primary model used to support academic integration is a consistent push-in/co-teaching model, which ensures quality instruction based on the expertise of the academic and CTE teachers.	The model for academic integration support does NOT ensure the quality of instruction due to lack of expertise or capacity.	Integration support relies heavily on RANDOMLY co-planned or co-taught lessons that are NOT connected to the industry standards within the CTE curriculum.	Integration support is provided through a co-planning and co-teaching approach that is MOSTLY scheduled and directly connected to the industry standards being taught.	Academic integration support is achieved through a CONSISTENTLY implemented and scheduled push-in/co-teaching model that ensures quality of instruction is based on teacher expertise.
The co-planning process identifies and defines the co-teaching roles to ensure equitable and active involvement by both academic and CTE teachers	The co-planning process FAILS to define the roles of both academic and CTE teachers to ensure active involvement.	The co-planning process identifies the co-teaching roles but does NOT define them well enough to ensure equitable and/or active involvement by both academic and CTE teachers.	The co-planning process IDENTIFIES and DEFINES the co-teaching roles to ensure equitable and active involvement by both academic and CTE teachers.	The co-planning process is used to IMPROVE co-teaching and ensure the equitable and active involvement by both academic and CTE teachers.

Visual representations are evident in the learning environment that show a commitment to the integration process.	Visual representations that show the importance of academic content in the CTE program area are FEW or ABSENT entirely in the learning environment.	Visual representations are present in the learning environment but DO NOT effectively demonstrate the importance of academic knowledge in CTE.	Visual representations in the learning environment CLEARLY demonstrate the importance of academic knowledge in CTE.	Visual representations in the learning environment demonstrate the COMMITMENT to academic knowledge in CTE.
Student evaluation measures are established for implementation of co-planned activities to show the connection of technical and academic skills and knowledge.	Student evaluation measures are NOT established that show the connection between technical and academic skills and knowledge.	Student evaluation measures are developed but DO NOT ALWAYS show the connection between technical and academic skills and knowledge.	Student evaluation measures are developed and IMPLEMENTED that show the connection between technical and academic skills and knowledge.	Student evaluation measures are developed through the CO-PLANNING process that show the connection between technical and academic skills and knowledge.
Students perceive both academic and CTE teachers as equally important in the integrated learning environment.	Students DO NOT perceive both academic and CTE teachers as equally important in the integrated learning environment.	Students typically perceive CTE teachers as MORE important in the integrated learning environment.	Students generally perceive both academic and CTE teachers as EQUALLY important in the integrated learning environment.	Students in ALL programs perceive both academic and CTE teachers as equally important in the integrated learning environment.
Both CTE and academic integration teachers are involved in, and responsible for, co-assessment strategies designed to measure student performance.	CTE teachers are SOLELY responsible for assessment strategies.	Both CTE and academic integration teachers are involved in assessment, but strategies are NOT typically co-planned.	Both CTE and academic integration teachers are involved in CO-ASSESSMENT of students in relation to integrated academics.	Both CTE and academic integration teachers are involved in co-planning and co-assessment strategies in ALL programs.

Effectiveness at the Systems Level

STANDARDS OF PRACTICE	INEFFECTIVE 1	DEVELOPING 2	ACCOMPLISHED 3	EXEMPLARY 4
Metrics are defined and developed that measure overall academic integration effectiveness at the organizational level.	NO metrics are defined that measure overall organizational effectiveness for academic integration.	Metrics are developed to measure effectiveness but are NOT fully institutionalized and used consistently across all program areas.	Metrics have been defined that measure effectiveness of the academic integration process and are used in ALL programs.	Metrics have been defined that measure effectiveness of the academic integration process and are used to GUIDE program improvement.
External partners/stakeholders are enlisted to provide input on strategies to measure program effectiveness.	External stakeholders are NOT engaged in supplying input on measuring the effectiveness of integration efforts.	A loose process is in place to obtain input from external partners but NOT related to strategies for measuring program effectiveness.	A process is established to engage external partners to obtain input on strategies for measuring program effectiveness in ALL areas.	An explicitly documented system to solicit input from external partners is utilized by ALL program areas and guides efforts to improve academic integration.
A system-wide approach exists that measures program effectiveness using qualitative and quantitative evidence with emphasis on quantitative evidence.	NO system-wide approach is used to measure program effectiveness using qualitative or quantitative measures.	A system-wide approach is USED INCONSISTENTLY to measure program effectiveness using qualitative measures but NOT quantitative measures.	A system-wide approach is MOSTLY USED to measure program effectiveness through qualitative measures and some quantitative measures.	System-wide approaches CONSISTENTLY measure program effectiveness through BOTH qualitative and quantitative measures.
Program effectiveness data is established and used with faculty and staff to drive goals and improvement targets.	Program effectiveness data is NOT USED with faculty and staff if it is collected at all.	Program effectiveness data IS USED with faculty and staff to provide information but FAILS to drive improvement.	Program effectiveness data IS USED to provide information to faculty and staff that INFORMS program improvement initiatives.	Program effectiveness data IS USED to provide information to faculty and staff that DRIVES program improvement initiatives.

Grading system parameters are established for co-teaching strategies to ensure performance standards for students are universally implemented by teaching staff.	NO grading system is in place that guides co-assessment of co-teaching strategies.	Grading system parameters HAVE BEEN established for co-teaching strategies but are NOT universally implemented in all program areas.	Grading system parameters HAVE BEEN established for co-teaching strategies and are CONSISTENTLY implemented in all programs.	Grading system parameters established for co-teaching strategies have led to IMPROVEMENT in the co-planning and co-teaching process system-wide.
---	--	--	--	--

Effectiveness at the Teacher Level

STANDARDS OF PRACTICE	INEFFECTIVE 1	DEVELOPING 2	ACCOMPLISHED 3	EXEMPLARY 4
Formative and summative assessments are co-developed and align with identified system metrics	There is NO evidence that assessments are co-developed or are matched to system metrics.	Assessments have been co-developed in SOME programs but are NOT consistent with identified system metrics in all cases.	Assessments have been co-developed in ALL programs and MOSTLY align with identified system metrics.	Assessments have been co-developed in ALL programs that STRONGLY align and support identified system metrics.
Collaborative evaluation strategies for measuring student academic learning outcomes are evident for integrated activities.	There is NO collaboration between teachers for measuring student academic outcomes.	INCONSISTENT collaboration for the assessment of integrated academic outcomes is evident in most units or lesson plans.	There is a CONSISTENT commitment to collaboration for student assessment of academic proficiency in integrated learning activities.	Collaborative evaluation strategies for measuring student outcomes is CONSISTENTLY evident and demonstrably IMPROVES integrated academic learning activities.
Project-based learning (PBL) assessment strategies include the use of rubrics that are developed and implemented collaboratively.	NO rubrics are developed through collaborative efforts between academic and CTE teachers.	PBL assessment strategies frequently DO NOT include the use of rubrics developed through collaborative efforts.	PBL assessment strategies include the collaborative DEVELOPMENT of rubrics used separately by academic and CTE teachers.	PBL assessment strategies include the collaborative development and USE of rubrics by BOTH academic and CTE teachers.

<p>Co-assessment strategies include measuring additional outcomes, such as career readiness, CDOS, and CFM elements.</p>	<p>Additional outcomes such as career readiness, CDOS, and CFM elements are NOT typically assessed,</p>	<p>CDOS, career readiness, and CFM elements MAY BE measured but NOT through collaborative efforts.</p>	<p>CDOS, career readiness, and CFM elements ARE measured through collaborative efforts between CTE and academic teachers.</p>	<p>ALL co-assessment strategies include measuring additional outcomes, such as career readiness, CDOS, and CFM elements and are consistent with grading parameters.</p>
<p>Assessment strategies explicitly measure specific academic skills, knowledge, and content.</p>	<p>There are NO assessment strategies that measure specific academic skills.</p>	<p>Assessment strategies INCONSISTENTLY measure academic skills and/or knowledge documented in the formal curriculum.</p>	<p>Assessment strategies GENERALLY measure academic skills, knowledge, and content documented in the formal curriculum.</p>	<p>Assessment strategies EXPLICITLY measure specific academic skills, knowledge, and content documented in the formal curriculum.</p>
<p>Academic integration teachers participate in the evaluation of associated technical and academic skills, knowledge, and content within an assessment strategy.</p>	<p>Academic integration teachers DO NOT participate in the evaluation of technical and academic skills/knowledge.</p>	<p>Academic integration teachers participate in the evaluation of academic content ONLY.</p>	<p>Academic integration teachers MOSTLY participate in the evaluation of associated technical and academic content.</p>	<p>Academic integration teachers ALWAYS participate in the evaluation of associated technical and academic skills, knowledge, and content.</p>