



INSTITUTE for EVIDENCE-BASED CHANGE
Informing Decisions - Improving Practice - Increasing Student Success

Using the Common Core State Standards to Align High School Exit Expectations and Postsecondary Entrance Expectations: A Rubric for Engaging Postsecondary Education

The Institute for Evidence-Based Change (IEBC) is committed to improving students' successful transitions across the educational segments. As one of our core activities, we bring together intersegmental groups of educators to align curricula and develop innovations that remove barriers to student success. Based on our experience facilitating hundreds of such collaborations across the country, we developed the attached rubric to improve outcomes for states and local education agencies engaged in aligning the Common Core State Standards (CCSS) to postsecondary education expectations.

The Need for a Rubric

With the CCSS in various stages of implementation across the United States, there has been increased understanding of the need to involve postsecondary education in the discussion. This is a positive turn, in our view, for a number of reasons. Educators from both segments have a stake in the successful implementation of CCSS and their alignment to postsecondary education. As the nation addresses increasing completion, the preparation of students to be successful in postsecondary education is paramount.

Despite the standards movement at the state level, remediation of students entering college has not decreased in the last decade. History has shown that aligning high school curricula to standards does not ensure high school exit skills are aligned to college entrance expectations; and there are implications at the postsecondary level for remedial or development education that arise from CCSS implementation. The cost of unprepared students in postsecondary is a fiscal drain on families, education institutions, and states; as well as an emotional drain on students who believed they were prepared for college. Unfortunately, a high school diploma does not necessarily mean a student is college-ready.

A primary goal of the CCSS is to bring students to college- and career-ready status. So it stands to reason that postsecondary institutions, which are receiving these students, must be involved in the discussion of the alignment of exit skills and entrance expectations. Yet, there is wide variation among states in the extent to which postsecondary education is involved in the CCSS discussion. Furthermore, there are issues of both process and content:

- Whom to involve and when
- How to capitalize on the expertise of all segments
- What steps are best taken, and in what order, when analyzing and aligning CCSS and curricula across segments

There also are considerable issues related to the different language and processes of education used across the segments, constraints on what happens in the classroom, expectations for students, and resources.

The Solution: IEBC's Rubric for the Intersegmental Conversation

Our experience in multiple states has demonstrated that intersegmental collaborations must be thoughtfully planned, intentionally established, and rigorously implemented. Without the investment of time and attention to process and content of the discussions, the products of this work are likely to be inadequate, inconsistent, and difficult, if not impossible, to implement. IEBC created this rubric to ensure these efforts successfully produce useful and useable outcomes. The rubric provides a framework for assessing how well intersegmental discussions about the CCSS are following best practices and addressing necessary content.

The rubric is meant to be used as an assessment tool and a guide to good practice in the process of aligning CCSS to postsecondary expectations. It supports thoughtful and candid assessment, so education leaders can judge the likelihood their process will lead to success. The rubric also is designed to guide the content of the work as educators engage in these courageous conversations.

**Using the Common Core State Standards to Align High School Exit
 Expectations and Postsecondary Entrance Expectations
 Rubric for Engaging Postsecondary Education**

Collaboration Process Goal: All segments collaborate *on an equal basis* toward a seamless educational experience for students, P-20.

a. *Support by leadership:* Leadership supportive at all levels.

Leadership support of collaborative efforts exists at one level only (e.g., state or local)	Partial support across levels of leadership in the state	Most segments are supporting collaborative efforts	All state, county, regional leadership fully support collaborative efforts
1	2	3	4

b. *Participation:* Educators at all levels in all segments participate.

One level involvement only (e.g., State leadership or Local faculty)	Some but not all segments represented and participating	Most but not all segments represented and participating	State, county, regional leadership and faculty participating across the state
1	2	3	4

c. *Frequency of meeting:* Frequent, ongoing meetings on a regularly scheduled basis.

No meetings of collaborative partners	One to two meetings per year, not regularly scheduled	Regularly scheduled but limited number of meetings	Frequent, ongoing meetings on a regularly scheduled basis
1	2	3	4

- d. *Consistency of group participation*: Consistent participation by same group members over time.

Different membership at each meeting	Some consistency of membership but enough inconsistency to require new introductions and reviews at each meeting or work session	Generally good attendance but not consistent across all meetings	Consistent attendance by group members at all meetings
1	2	3	4

- e. *Building trust*: All members are considered peers, working together openly and honestly to produce the best outcomes for students.

Critical or judgmental atmosphere inhibits member participation	Individual agendas pervade discussions	Most groups members are working openly and honestly	All members feel safe to voice their thoughts and give input
1	2	3	4

- f. *Decision making*: The group works together, compromising when necessary, to reach a decision that can be accepted by all, even if the outcome is not ideal for all.

Decisions handed down or made on the basis of hierarchical position	Decisions by majority without minority input	Full consensus not achieved on all decisions by the group	Decisions reached by full consensus for best interest of all parties and with students at the forefront
1	2	3	4

g. *Intra-group communication*: An accepted system of communication is adopted so that productive exchanges can take place between meetings.

No system for communicating group activities to group members is developed	Limited or inconsistent communication of some aspects of the work takes place between meetings	Group activities are fully documented but not distributed to all group members	Group activities consistently documented and distributed to all group members
1	2	3	4

h. *Dissemination of group findings*: A system of transparency enables interested parties to access the current work of the group.

No system exists; knowledge of all group work and activities remains within the group	Limited communication to some stakeholders	All group activities disseminated to some stakeholders - or - limited information on group activities disseminated to all stakeholders	Group activities, findings, suggestions, etc. consistently disseminated to <i>all</i> stakeholders
1	2	3	4

i. *A feedback loop is integrated*: A system for stakeholders exists to give the workgroup timely and relevant feedback exists.

No system exists to get information from stakeholders back to the work group	Inconsistent feedback system prevents workgroup from consistent feedback or time for review	Stakeholder feedback available but not received in a timely manner to allow workgroups to review or not all stakeholders providing feedback	Stakeholder feedback about workgroup activities, findings, suggestions, is received and reviewed in a timely manner
1	2	3	4

- j. *Workgroup recommendations are implemented:* The workgroup is seen as the experts on alignment and their recommendations are accepted, supported, and funded for implementation.

Recommendations not considered	Workgroup recommendations considered but not fully supported	Workgroup recommendations supported but not funded for implementation	Recommendations by workgroup are adopted and funded in a timely manner
1	2	3	4

Collaboration Content Goal: Common core standards are implemented consistently across the state

- a. *Standards deconstructed:* Standards are deconstructed to ensure their common meaning and level of rigor for all levels of education.

Standards are not deconstructed and there is no consistency in meaning or application	Minor attempts at standardization of meaning and levels of rigor	Standards for only some courses or disciplines, are deconstructed for consistency of meaning and rigor	Standards are deconstructed to discern common meaning and level of rigor
1	2	3	4

- b. *Student learning outcomes articulated:* Student learning outcomes (SLOs) are articulated for all levels of education.

SLOs are not specifically articulated	Rudimentary SLOs are developed for some levels only	Well-developed SLOs exist at some levels only	At each grade level and segment, well developed SLOs are articulated by discipline
1	2	3	4

c. *Expectations mapped*: For each discipline, all competencies for each grade level and postsecondary education are mapped.

No mapping has occurred	Mapping has begun but is incomplete	Mapping exists in single segments	Competencies from all segments are mapped
1	2	3	4

d. *Expectations alignment*: Exit skills are aligned to entrance expectations across each grade level and to postsecondary education.

No alignment efforts have taken place	Exit and entrance expectations are incompletely articulated and curricula have not been adjusted	Exit and entrance expectations are articulated but curricula have not been adjusted	Curricula adjusted where necessary according to deconstructions and mapping
1	2	3	4

e. *Implementation and the role of leadership*: A viable plan for implementation of CCSS and alignment with postsecondary education is developed and supported by leadership

No plan, or unrealistic plan, is developed	Plans are incomplete	Plans are developed but unsupported across levels	Implementation plan is thoughtful, viable and supported by leadership
1	2	3	4

f. *Faculty professional development*: Faculty is given time and resources to engage in and implement the CCSS in a consistent fashion.

No faculty development efforts	Uncoordinated faculty development efforts	Professional development plans not coordinated with funding or faculty time	Professional development time and funding provided to implement aligned expectations
1	2	3	4

Terms and Phrases Defined

Expectations alignment: Ensuring that the exit skills in one grade level or segment of education are aligned to the entrance expectations of the next.

Expectations mapping: Articulating when and what is taught and the assessment measures used to demonstrate achievement of expected student learning outcomes.

For examples of alignment and mapping, please see:

- <http://www.iebcnow.org/NewsAndPublications/Publications/MathGuide.aspx>
- <http://www.iebcnow.org/NewsAndPublications/Publications/EnglishGuide.aspx>

Intersegmental: Across the education segments of primary, secondary, community colleges and university levels (K-16).

Standards Deconstructed: Examining each component of a standard and articulating its meaning, e.g., what does it mean to “solve” a problem.

For examples of standards deconstruction, please see:

- <http://calpass.org/Documents/AlgebraIDeconstructionV20.pdf>
- <http://calpass.org/Documents/AlgebraIIdeconstructionV20.pdf>
- <http://calpass.org/Documents/GeometryDeconstructionV10.pdf>
- <http://calpass.org/Documents/PreCalculusDeconstructionV10.pdf>

Student Learning Outcome: what a student is expected to know, understand and be able to do as demonstrated by some form of an assessment.