Framework for Facilitating a Professional Learning Community
Table of Contents

Cabarrus County Schools Vision, Mission, and Purpose.................................................. 3
CCS Curriculum and Instruction Vision, Mission, and Purpose..................................... 4
History and Purpose of Professional Learning Communities......................................... 5
General expectations for PLCs in Cabarrus County Schools........................................ 8
PLC Flow Model........................................................................................................... 9
Sample Course-Long Curriculum/PLC Pattern ............................................................... 10
Connections between UbD and PLCs.......................................................................... 11
Guide to the Annual Work of PLCs............................................................................. 12
  Step 1: Stage 1 Conversation: Standards and Curriculum ....................................... 12
  Step 2: Stage 2 Conversation: Acceptable Evidence ................................................. 13
  Step 3: Stage 3 Conversation: The Learning Plan ...................................................... 14
  Step 4: Deliver Instruction ....................................................................................... 15
  Step 5: Give Common Formative Assessment ........................................................... 15
  Step 6: Analysis Conversation: Remediation and Enrichment ................................. 15
  Step 7: Enrichment/Interventions ............................................................................ 16
  Step 8: Reflection Conversation .............................................................................. 16
  Step 9: Documentation of the Work ........................................................................ 16
Appendix....................................................................................................................... 17
  Know/Do Graphic Organizer .................................................................................... 18
  Rubric for Quality Common Formative Assessments .............................................. 19
  PLC Data Analysis Form (by unit) ............................................................................ 20
  Individual Teacher Data Analysis Form .................................................................. 21
  Professional Learning Community Performance Rubric ......................................... 22
  Resources for PLCs................................................................................................. 25
References...................................................................................................................... 26
Our Vision:
- To produce globally competitive lifelong learners through rigorous and relevant curriculum taught by highly prepared visionary leaders who recognize the importance of engaging a diverse body of learners.
- To provide 21st Century resources through responsible and efficient use of funding.
- To ensure success for all students in safe, inviting, and healthy learning communities by building upon a foundation of stakeholder support and caring/respectful relationships.

Our Mission:
We will value, teach, and empower each student in a culture of educational excellence.

Our Beliefs:
We believe in…
- educating the whole child.
- personalized educational approaches for each child.
- caring and respectful relationships.
- safe, motivating, and inviting learning environments.
- integrity and honesty.
- parent and community partnerships.
- fiscal responsibility and efficient operations.
- data-driven decisions.
- achieving success and educational excellence.
Our Vision:
Every Teacher Highly Effective…
Every Student Cognitively Engaged…

Our Mission:
The Curriculum and Instruction leadership team will empower and equip educators to effectively engage and challenge all students by providing effective professional development, coaching support, and modeling.

Our Beliefs:
We believe in…

- educating the whole child.
- personalized educational approaches for each child.
- caring and respectful relationships.
- safe, motivating, and inviting learning environments.
- integrity and honesty.
- parent and community partnerships.
- fiscal responsibility and efficient operations.
- data-driven decisions.
- achieving success and educational excellence.

In 2010, Cabarrus County Schools developed a visionary plan to continue the development of a cutting edge, 21st century school system. The process began with the implementation of Professional Learning Communities in every school. In 2012, CCS focused their work on writing a guaranteed, viable, and coherent curriculum based on the Common Core State Standards and the North Carolina Essential Standards. Beginning in 2014, CCS embraced the concept of personalization in education; the goal is to provide each student with a personalized education using various digital methods. These three initiatives are an ongoing process for CCS and are at the heart of our mission and vision statements. The Framework for Facilitating the Professional Learning Community (PLC) is a reference for teachers and leaders as they implement PLCs. Each step of the PLC process is explained and discussed in detail on the following pages.
Common Language of Instruction: Reflecting on Teaching (PLC)

Through the adoption of Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Cabarrus County Schools now has a structure that allows teachers to collaborate and reflect upon current teaching practices and student growth in order to plan instruction. This framework is based upon the work of Richard DuFour, et al. (A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work, 2010). CCS made the PLC the basic framework for instructional planning and reflection in 2010. The following section on the history and purpose of PLCs is taken from Learning by Doing by DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, and Many (2006).

History and Purpose of Professional Learning Communities

Professional Learning Community (PLC)
A Professional Learning Community is defined as an ongoing, systematic process in which educators work together interdependently to analyze and impact their professional practice in order to achieve better results for their students, their team, and their school. Professional learning communities operate under the assumption that the key to improved learning for students is continuous job-embedded learning for educators (Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, & Many, 2006, p. 98, 217).

What Are Professional Learning Communities?

Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, and Many (2006) state the following:

It has been interesting to observe the growing popularity of the term professional learning community. In fact, the term has become so commonplace and has been used so ambiguously to describe virtually any loose coupling of individuals who share a common interest in education that it is in danger of losing all meaning. This lack of precision is an obstacle to implementing PLC concepts because, as Mike Schmoker observes, "clarity precedes competence." Thus, we begin with an attempt to clarify our meaning of the term. To those familiar with our past work, this step may seem redundant, but we are convinced that redundancy can be a powerful tool in effective communication, and we prefer redundancy to ambiguity. (p. 2)

A Focus on Learning

The very essence of a learning community is a focus on and a commitment to the learning of each student. When a school or district functions as a PLC, educators within the organization embrace high levels of learning for all students as both the reason the organization exists and the fundamental responsibility of those who work within it. In order to achieve this purpose, the members of a PLC create and are guided by a clear and compelling vision of what the organization must become in order to help all students learn. They make collective commitments clarifying what each member will do to create such an organization, and they use results-oriented goals to mark their progress. Members work together to clarify exactly what each student must learn, monitor each student's learning on a timely basis, provide systematic interventions that ensure students receive additional time and support for learning when they struggle, and extend and enrich learning when students have already mastered the intended outcomes.

A corollary assumption is that if the organization is to become more effective in helping all students learn, the adults in the organization must also be continually learning. Therefore, structures are created to ensure staff members engage in job-embedded learning as part of their routine work practices.

There is no ambiguity or hedging regarding this commitment to learning. Whereas many schools operate as if their primary purpose is to ensure that children are taught, PLCs are dedicated to the idea that their organization exists to ensure that all students learn essential knowledge, skills, and dispositions. All the other characteristics of a PLC flow directly from this epic shift in assumptions about the purpose of the school. (p. 3)
A Collaborative Culture With a Focus on Learning for All

A PLC is composed of collaborative teams whose members work interdependently to achieve common goals linked to the purpose of learning for all. The team is the engine that drives the PLC effort and the fundamental building block of the organization. It is difficult to overstate the importance of collaborative teams in the improvement process. It is equally important, however, to emphasize that collaboration does not lead to improved results unless people are focused on the right issues. Collaboration is a means to an end, not the end itself. In many schools, staff members are willing to collaborate on a variety of topics as long as the focus of the conversation stops at their classroom door. In a PLC, collaboration represents a systematic process in which teachers work together interdependently in order to impact their classroom practice in ways that will lead to better results for their students, for their team, and for their school. (p. 3)

Therefore their collaboration centers on certain critical questions:

1. What knowledge, skills, and disposition must each student acquire as a result of this course, grade level, and/or unit of instruction?
2. What evidence will we gather to monitor student learning on a timely basis?
3. How will we provide students with additional time and support in a timely, directive, and systematic way when they experience difficulty in their learning?
4. How will we enrich the learning of students who are already proficient?
5. How can we use our SMART goals and evidence of student learning to inform and improve our practice?

Dufour, Dufour, Eaker, and Many (2006) also state the following:

**Collective Inquiry Into Best Practice and Current Reality**

The teams in a PLC engage in collective inquiry into both best practices in teaching and best practices in learning. They also inquire about their current reality including their present practices and the levels of achievement of their students. They attempt to arrive at consensus on vital questions by building shared knowledge rather than pooling opinions. They have an acute sense of curiosity and openness to new possibilities.

Collective inquiry enables team members to develop new skills and capabilities that in turn lead to new experiences and awareness. Gradually, this heightened awareness transforms into fundamental shifts in attitudes, beliefs, and habits that, over time, transform the culture of the school.

Working together to build shared knowledge on the best way to achieve goals and meet the needs of clients is exactly what professionals in any field are expected to do, whether it is curing the patient, winning the lawsuit, or helping all students learn. Members of a professional learning community are expected to work and learn together.

**Action Orientation: Learning by Doing**

Members of PLCs are action oriented: They move quickly to turn aspirations into actions and visions into reality. They understand that the most powerful learning always occurs in a context of taking action, and they value engagement and experience as the most effective teachers. In fact, the very reason that teachers work together in teams and engage in collective inquiry is to serve as catalysts for action.

Members of PLCs recognize that learning by doing develops a deeper and more profound knowledge and greater commitment than learning by reading, listening, planning, or thinking. Traditional schools have developed a variety of strategies to resist taking meaningful actions, preferring the comfort of the familiar. Professional learning communities recognize that until members of the organization "do" differently, there is no reason to anticipate different results. They avoid paralysis by analysis and overcome inertia with action.
A Commitment to Continuous Improvement

Inherent to a PLC are a persistent disquiet with the status quo and a constant search for a better way to achieve goals and accomplish the purpose of the organization. Systematic processes engage each member of the organization in an ongoing cycle of:

- Gathering evidence of current levels of student learning
- Developing strategies and ideas to build on strengths and address weaknesses in that learning
- Implementing those strategies and ideas
- Analyzing the impact of the changes to discover what was effective and what was not
- Applying new knowledge in the next cycle of continuous improvement

The goal is not simply to learn a new strategy, but instead to create conditions for perpetual learning, an environment in which innovation and experimentation are viewed not as tasks to be accomplished or projects to be completed but as ways of conducting day-to-day business—forever. Furthermore, participation in this process is not reserved for those designated as leaders; rather, it is a responsibility of every member of the organization.

Results Orientation

Finally, members of a PLC realize that all of their efforts in these areas, a focus on learning, collaborative teams, collective inquiry, action orientation, and continuous improvement must be assessed on the basis of results rather than intentions. Unless initiatives are subjected to ongoing assessment on the basis of tangible results, they represent random groping in the dark rather than purposeful improvement. As Peter Senge and colleagues conclude, “The rationale for any strategy for building a learning organization revolves around the premise that such organizations will produce dramatically improved results.”

This focus on results leads each team to develop and pursue measurable improvement goals that are aligned to school and district goals for learning. It also drives teams to create a series of common formative assessments that are administered to students multiple times throughout the year to gather ongoing evidence of student learning. Team members review the results from these assessments in an effort to identify and address program concerns (areas of learning where many students are experiencing difficulty). They also examine the results to discover strengths and weaknesses in their individual teaching in order to learn from one another. Most importantly, the assessments are used to identify students who need additional time and support for learning. Frequent common formative assessments represent one of the most powerful tools in the PLC arsenal. (p. 4-5)
General Expectations for PLCs in Cabarrus County Schools

The following are the expectations for PLCs in CCS:

- PLCs will meet once a week to discuss and reflect on current practices and to analyze student data.
- Each PLC will identify a PLC facilitator, responsible for creating weekly agendas, facilitating discussions and submitting the proper forms to the administrative team.
- Each PLC will provide feedback on the curriculum documents following the completion of every unit using the Google Apps document located in the PLC Toolbox.
- PLCs will be evaluated twice a year (October and May) by their administrative team; this will be done using the PLC Performance Rubric and will be entered into Teachscape.
- Each PLC will create quality Common Formative Assessments (CFAs) and submit two annually to their school administration for feedback; this will be done using the Rubric for Quality Common Assessments located in this document and in the PLC Toolbox.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District Expectations</th>
<th>PLC Decisions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The purpose of PLCs is to ensure that all students are learning at high levels and that teachers focus their discussions around standards, curriculum, assessment, and best instructional practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Big Ideas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Accept learning as the fundamental purpose of our school and be willing to examine all practices in light of their impact on learning.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultivate a collaborative culture.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Assess effectiveness on the basis of results.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Standards and Curriculum</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All PLC conversations must center on the standards and the curriculum. Curriculum documents should be on the table at all times.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning Principles</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As PLCs and individual teachers make decisions about instructional design, the learning principles will guide these discussions and decisions.</td>
<td>The teams may add to the learning principles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scheduling/Collaboration Time</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers will have time each week to meet with his or her PLC.</td>
<td>The school and/or PLC may determine the days and times for collaboration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLCs will meet weekly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Norms</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The PLC will set two sets of norms: courtesy and collaborative. The courtesy norms will focus on the team members’ interactions with one another. The collaborative norms will focus on teaching and learning.</td>
<td>The team will create and review their norms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data and Evidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each PLC will use data to analyze and make decisions about instruction.</td>
<td>The method for data analysis may be set by the PLC.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
At the start of each school year and prior to step 1, a conversation around norms, beliefs, and principles that will guide the work of the PLC should occur. This is not formally listed on the PLC Flow Model to the left.

*Reflection should happen throughout the unit. This does not only happen in Step 8.*
Sample Course-Long Curriculum/PLC Pattern for a Six-Unit Course

The work of PLCs is **fluid**; therefore, the timing of the process will vary from PLC to PLC and from unit to unit. To that end, please note:

1. The number of steps does not necessarily equate to the amount of discussion time. We expect much of the time will be spent implementing (and reflecting on) the learning plan.
2. Specific steps may not align perfectly and multiple steps may be discussed in the same meeting. For example, steps 1 and 2 may be discussed in one conversation (but don’t have to be). Further, teams will be delivering instruction and unpacking the curriculum at the same time. The PLC must set these agendas based on their needs.
3. PLCs will reflect throughout the unit. This work does not only have to happen at the end of the process.
4. Intervention and enrichment should happen after each data analysis to make sure all students’ needs are met.
## Connections between Understanding by Design and Professional Learning Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step #</th>
<th>UbD</th>
<th>PLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Stage 1: Desired Results</td>
<td>1. What will students know, understand, and be able to do?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Stage 2: Determining Acceptable Evidence</td>
<td>2. How will we know they are learning it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - 9</td>
<td>Stage 3: The Learning Plan</td>
<td>3. What teaching and learning experiences we will provide?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Includes Enrich, Remediate, and Reflect)</td>
<td>4. What will we do when students already know it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5. What will we do if they don’t learn it?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6. What teaching and learning experiences were effective? How do we know?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Guide for the annual work of the PLC

The following pages outline the steps from the PLC flow in detail.

I. Yearly conversation around norms, beliefs, and principles

Time Frame
This conversation should occur during the workdays before the school year begins.

Items Needed
- The learning principles
- Norms from previous years, if applicable
- Considerations for creating norms

Focus question for this discussion
- What are the norms, beliefs, and principles that will guide our work as a professional learning community?

Facilitative Questions/Statements to Guide Discussion
1. What are the common beliefs we hold regarding our collaborative work?
2. Do we have any sticking points regarding our differing beliefs? If so, how might we overcome these barriers?
3. What are the courtesy norms we should hold?
4. What are the collaborative norms we should hold?
5. What learning principles will guide our discussions of teaching and learning this year?
6. What are our meeting times?
7. Who will fill the needed roles this year? What do these roles entail? (At this point, make sure that each PLC determines who will serve as the PLC facilitator.)

Evidence for this portion of the PLC flow
- Meeting agenda and/or minutes
- A statement of norms

II. Step 1: Stage 1 - Standards and Curriculum

Time Frame
This conversation should occur approximately 14 days before the unit is scheduled to begin. The conversation will probably last 30 minutes.

Items Needed
- A copy of the standards aligned to this unit. These are attached to the curriculum map.
- The stage 1 document for this unit
- Learning principles
- Unpacking documents

Items NOT Needed
- Examples of activities for students
- Lesson plans
- Student work

Focus question for this discussion
- Based on the enduring understandings, essential questions, and standards, what should students know, understand, and be able to do over the course of this unit?
Facilitative Questions/Statements to Guide Discussion

1. What is our focus for this discussion? (PLC members should understand this discussion must center on the desired outcomes. They should be discussing what students will know, understand, and be able to do at the end of the unit. They will not discuss what students will be doing during the unit. That discussion will happen later.)
2. Let’s do a close read of the standards for this unit.
3. What exactly do the standards call for?
4. Let’s do a close read of the enduring understandings and essential questions from the stage 1 document.
5. What do these statements call for?
6. Let’s look at the acquisition portion of the stage 1 document.
7. What content, concepts, and skills will students master?
8. Let’s complete the Know-Do Graphic Organizer (See Appendix, page 18).

Evidence for this portion of the PLC framework
- Meeting agenda and/or minutes
- The PLC should have discussed the Enduring Understandings, Essential Questions, Knows and Dos for the unit. They may have used the graphic organizer, if they choose. The key evidence is the conversation about the standards and curriculum, not the process of completing the graphic organizer.

III. Step 2: Stage 2 – Acceptable Evidence

Time Frame
This conversation should occur approximately 10 to 14 days before the unit is scheduled to begin.

Items Needed
- The standards aligned to this unit
- The Stage 1 and Stage 2 components of this unit
- The “Know, Understand, and Be able to do” graphic organizer created in the first conversation, if applicable
- Learning principles

Items NOT Needed
- Examples of activities for students
- Lesson plans
- Student work
- Commercially prepared tests and/or test banks

Focus Question for this Discussion
- What are the various ways students could prove proficiency in regard to the standards, understandings, and/or knowledge and skills?

Facilitative Questions/Statements to Guide Discussion

1. Based on our earlier conversation, what is it we expect students to know, understand, and be able to do?
2. What are ways students might demonstrate this knowledge, understanding, and skills?
3. What formative evidence are we going to be looking for in our classrooms on a daily basis? What will students be doing? What can we listen for? What will we observe? Where do we need additional evidence?
4. Will the evidence match the standards students are supposed to meet?
5. Do we need a rubric to measure student progress and achievement?
6. Let’s look at the exemplar common assessment (if available) from the Unit Map. How does this assessment meet the standards, understandings, knowledge, and skills?
7. Is this the common assessment we want to use? Why or why not?
8. If we need to create our own common assessment, what should it include?
9. Does our common assessment match the standards and enduring understandings?
10. If we wrote our own, let’s evaluate our common assessment using the CFA rubric. What do we need to change?

11. What performance task(s) will students do?

Evidence for this portion of the PLC Framework
- Meeting agenda and/or minutes
- The PLC should have created one common assessment for use at the end of the unit.

IV. Step 3: Stage 3 – The Learning Plan

Time Frame
This discussion should occur 5 to 10 days before the unit is scheduled to begin.

Items Needed
- The standards aligned to this unit
- The complete unit plan
- The learning principles
- The common assessment(s)
- The common instructional framework
- Appropriate resources, texts, etc.

Focus Question for this Discussion
- What engaging, rigorous learning experiences will allow students to meet the standards for this unit?

Facilitative Questions/Statements to Guide Discussion
1. What should students know, understand, and be able to do at the end of this unit?
2. What are we asking students to do on the common assessment?
3. Let’s work through the Design Questions for student engagement.
   a. Will students find the content/concepts intrinsically valuable or are they disinterested?
   b. What types of compelling products, performances, or exhibitions might students create?
   c. What are the various sources (including the teacher) where students can access the required information?
   d. How will I make clear the standards by which students’ work will be judged?
   e. How will I provide students with feedback along the way?
   f. What will I do if students’ work is not proficient?
   g. Where can I incorporate opportunities for students to collaborate?
   h. How can I provide opportunities for students’ work to be valued by others?
   i. What are the opportunities for students to have choice in
      i. How they access information?
      ii. With whom they work?
      iii. How they are formatively assessed?
      iv. The products they create?
   j. Based on the technology standards, what strategies and technology can I incorporate in this unit?
   k. What are the opportunities for students to have authentic experiences?
4. For Middle School ELA classes:
   a. What model texts are appropriate for this work?
   b. What mini-lessons do we need to design?
   c. Where should we incorporate seminar?
   d. What anchor charts do we need to develop?
   e. Where might students struggle?
5. How do we align work students are willing to do with what they must learn?
6. Have we incorporated quality, research-based instructional practices?
7. Where will student work fall on Revised Bloom’s Taxonomy? Webb’s Depth of Knowledge? How might we make the work more rigorous?
8. How will we enable all students (ESL, EC, AIG) to access the curriculum? Consider Culturally Responsive Pedagogy, SIOP, etc.)

At this point, the PLC can take one of two steps:
1. They may decide to create the learning plan together.
2. After reflecting on the conversation, teachers may decide to plan instruction individually to meet the needs of their students.

V. **Step 4: Deliver Instruction**
No PLC action required for this step.

VI. **Step 5: Give Common Formative Assessment**
No PLC action required for this step.

VII. **Step 6: Analysis Conversation - Remediation and Enrichment**

**Time Frame**
This conversation should occur after the teachers in the PLC have administered and scored the common assessment.

**Items Needed**
- A copy of the standards and curriculum documents
- A copy of the common assessment
- Student work
- Data analysis form (see Appendix, page 20)

**Facilitative Questions for this discussion**

*Focus on the standards…*
1. Based on the standards, what did we expect students to know and do in this unit?
2. What were the enduring understandings and essential questions for this unit? How does the common assessment measure those components?
3. Which strategies did we use to teach to the standards in this unit? (This answer will probably vary from teacher to teacher.)
4. Which test questions or tasks align to which standards?
5. Which standards did students meet? Which standards did students not meet?
6. What were the individual teachers’ strengths and weaknesses?
7. Were there particular instructional strategies implemented that were more effective than others? If so, what were those strategies?

*Focus on the students…*
8. Which students were not proficient on specific standards? Which standards?
9. What were student misconceptions? Which students had similar misconceptions? How might we group students and reteach to address these misconceptions?
10. What is the remediation plan for students who did not meet specific standards?
11. What should we do to provide enrichment to those students who met the standards? If this assessment was given as a pre-assessment, what will the learning plan be for those students who have already mastered the standard?

**Tasks to be completed in this discussion**
1. Analyze student work and aggregated as well as disaggregated data. Teams may use the form on the following page or create one that works best for them.
2. Develop an enrichment/remediation plan.

**Evidence for this portion of the PLC Framework**
- Meeting agenda and/or minutes
• The PLC should have analyzed data and planned for remediation and/or enrichment.

VIII. Step 7: Enrichment/Interventions
At this point, the teachers in the PLC will implement the enrichment and interventions that were discussed at the previous PLC meeting. No PLC action required for this step.

IX. Step 8: Reflection Conversation

Time Frame
This conversation should occur near the end of the unit.

Items Needed
• Curriculum documents
• Learning plans
• Assessment results
• Remediation/Enrichment plans

Facilitative Questions for this discussion
1. What did we learn from our practice in this unit?
2. What instructional strategies and processes were most effective with specific groups of students?
3. What are we taking from this unit into our next unit to improve our instructional practices?

Evidence for this portion of the PLC Framework
• Meeting agenda and/or minutes

X. Step 9: Documentation of the Work of the Professional Learning Community

At the conclusion of a PLC cycle, the team should have the following documentation:

At the school level:
1. Meeting agendas and/or minutes for the PLC meetings
2. A common assessment or performance task (These may come from the unit plans.)

At the district level:
1. The PLC completed the feedback on the unit via the Google form (Click here to access the elementary, middle, or high form).
2. Completion of the PLC rubric twice per year (October and May).

Individual schools and/or PLCs may choose to archive the school level documentation in a number of formats. These may include, but are not limited to:
1. A PLC Notebook
2. A Google Document
3. A Microsoft Office document
4. A LiveBinder

It is the expectation that school and district administrators will be able to access this documentation upon request to monitor the PLC’s work and help facilitate questioning regarding instructional practices. This documentation, however, will be housed at the school site, not at the district office.
Appendix

The appendix contains the following documents:

- Know/Do Skills Graphic Organizer
- Rubric for Quality Common Formative Assessments
- PLC Data Analysis Form (by unit)
- Individual Teacher Data Analysis Form
- Professional Learning Community Performance Rubric
- Resources for PLCs
**Know-Do Graphic Organizer**

Based on our reading of the standards and curriculum documents, at the end of the unit, our students will…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Know… (nouns)</th>
<th>Be able to do… (verbs)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Factual Knowledge</em></td>
<td><em>Skills</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Concepts*

*Vocabulary*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CRITERIA</th>
<th>Not Present</th>
<th>Below Standard</th>
<th>At Standard</th>
<th>Above Standard</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Enduring Understandings and unit SMART Goals specified</td>
<td>No Enduring Understandings or SMART goals specified</td>
<td>Enduring Understandings specified but an inadequate SMART goal.</td>
<td>Enduring Understandings specified and SMART goal specified.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>CFA aligns with Enduring Understandings</td>
<td>No alignment with Enduring Understandings discernible</td>
<td>Somewhat aligned with Enduring Understandings</td>
<td>CFA is aligned with Enduring Understandings</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** If you are using a test as the CFA, complete 3a and 4a. If you are using a performance assessment, complete 3b and 4b. You do not need to complete both.

| 3a. | **Proficiency levels established prior to CFA (test)**                   | No proficiency levels established                                           | Proficiency levels established but not shared with students                 | Proficiency levels explicitly shared with students after test               | Proficiency levels explicitly shared with students prior to CFA            | Students participate in creating proficiency levels prior to CFA            |
| 4a. | Engagement of students in the establishment of criteria for evaluation  | No criteria for evaluation established                                      | Teachers create reasonable and understandable criteria for evaluation       | Teachers create reasonable and understandable criteria for evaluation with student input | With teacher assistance, students create reasonable and understandable criteria for evaluation | Students create reasonable and understandable criteria for evaluation |
| 3b. | **Proficiency levels established prior to CFA (Performance/Authentic Assess.)** | No proficiency levels established                                           | Proficiency levels established but not shared with students                 | Proficiency levels explicitly shared with students after performance or product | Proficiency levels explicitly shared with students in a rubric prior to CFA | Students participate in creating proficiency levels prior to CFA            |
| 4b. | Rubric created for performance assessment CFAs                         | No rubric created                                                           | Rubric created prior to CFA but not shared with students                   | Rubric created prior to CFA and shared with students after CFA             | Rubric created and shared with students prior to CFA                      | Students create reasonable and understandable criteria for evaluation |

Please evaluate all of the following criteria:

| 5   | RBT                                                                           | The CFA has no identifiable connections to RBT                              | The CFA only measures the Remembering level of RBT                         | The CFA includes measures of the Remembering, Understanding, and Applying levels of RBT | The CFA includes measures of the Remembering, Understanding, Applying, and Analyzing levels of RBT | The CFA includes measures of the Remembering, Understanding, Applying, Analyzing, and Evaluating levels of RBT |
| 6   | Provides useful information for “next instructional steps”                  | Provides no information about student understanding, knowledge and skill     | Provides little information about student understanding, knowledge and skill | Provides much valuable information about student understanding, knowledge and skill | Provides much valuable information for student reflection of their metacognitive skills | Students actively reflect on their understanding, knowledge, skills using data from CFA |
| 7   | Rationale for type of CFA                                                    | No rationale                                                               | Rationale for CFA not aligned with Enduring Understandings and Essential Questions | CFA selected is most suitable method for assessing Enduring Understandings and Essential Questions | N/A            | N/A       |
PLC Data Analysis Form

Unit #: ____________
PLC: __________________________
Date: __________________________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1</th>
<th>Standard 2</th>
<th>Standard 3</th>
<th>Standard 4</th>
<th>Standard 5</th>
<th>Standard 6</th>
<th>Standard 7</th>
<th>Standard 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T 1</td>
<td>T 2</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>T 4</td>
<td>T 1</td>
<td>T 2</td>
<td>T 3</td>
<td>T 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |

| YELLOW     |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| T 1        | T 2        | T 3        | T 4        | T 1        | T 2        | T 3        | T 4        |
|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |

|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |

| WELL       |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
| T 1        | T 2        | T 3        | T 4        | T 1        | T 2        | T 3        | T 4        |
|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |

For PLCs: Based on your analysis of the common assessment, write the number of students who fall into each category for each standard for each teacher (T).

Reflective Questions:
1. Which standards did students meet?
2. Which standards did students not meet?
   a. Did we expect students to be proficient at this point in the year?
3. Which students were not proficient on specific standards?
4. Which instructional strategies were most effective for specific standards?
5. For which standards do we need to provide remediation?
6. What are we doing for students that are above standard?
Individual Teacher Data Analysis Form (OPTIONAL)

Unit _______

*Individual teachers may use this form to disaggregate their student data from the common assessment.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard 1</th>
<th>Standard 2</th>
<th>Standard 3</th>
<th>Standard 4</th>
<th>Standard 5</th>
<th>Standard 6</th>
<th>Standard 7</th>
<th>Standard 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABOVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AT         |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |

| BELOW      |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |

| WELL BELOW |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |
|            |            |            |            |            |            |            |            |

Based on the data from the common assessment, please put STUDENT NAMES in the appropriate cells.

Reflective Questions:
1. On which standards were students not proficient? Which students?
2. In which areas do specific students need remediation? What remediation do they need?
3. What am I doing for students that are above-standard?
# Professional Learning Community Performance Rubric
(Revised 08-06-14)

### Norms, Values, and Logistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Shared Values:</strong> How must we behave to have a high functioning PLC?</td>
<td>Team members have not yet created team norms.</td>
<td>Norms were created (or revised) but have not been referenced again</td>
<td>Norms are referenced throughout the year but not adhered to</td>
<td>Norms are frequently referenced and adhered to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trust Building:</strong> How do we build trust and collective responsibility?</td>
<td>Teachers work in isolation.</td>
<td>Teachers work in teams that do not address team conflict and one or two people dominate. Team members cannot be counted on for completion of tasks.</td>
<td>Team members are reluctant to raise concerns and questions about difficult issues for fear of being misunderstood, of betrayal, or of retribution from administrators or colleagues. Some team members do not demonstrate responsibility for tasks and/or do not complete tasks on time.</td>
<td>Teachers express differing points of view, respect each other's opinions, and work comfortably toward consensus. Team members share responsibility for tasks and can be counted on to complete tasks on time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Protection from Initial Failure:</strong> What practices allow students to improve their skills/work and demonstrate proficiency?</td>
<td>Each CFA counts for a static grade.</td>
<td>After intervention students have an opportunity to retest/revise and 2nd grade is averaged with first grade.</td>
<td>After intervention students have an opportunity to retest/revise and receive the higher of the two grades.</td>
<td>After multiple interventions, students have multiple opportunities to retest/revise and receive the highest of the two grades.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLC Team Protection from Initial Failure:</strong> What practices allow teachers to demonstrate a highly functioning PLC?</td>
<td>Administrators only collect the required paper work for PLCs</td>
<td>Administrators rarely participate in PLC meetings and offer little support.</td>
<td>Administrators regularly attend PLC meetings and provide coaching and support, and celebrate PLC progress.</td>
<td>Administrators regularly attend PLC meetings, provide coaching and support, and celebrate highly functioning teams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Setting Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit SMART Goals:</strong> What student achievement data have we analyzed and what are our priorities for this unit?</td>
<td>No effort has been made to set PLC goals related to student learning.</td>
<td>Team members have analyzed student achievement data points but goals are written so broadly that they are impossible to measure.</td>
<td>Team members have worked together to analyze student achievement data points and have created measurable but weak SMART goals.</td>
<td>Team members have worked together to analyze student achievement data points and have created challenging SMART stretch goals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stage 1 Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Enduring Understandings, Knowledge, &amp; Skill (UbD Stage 1):</strong> What do we want students to learn?</td>
<td>Teachers have not identified the Enduring Understandings, Knowledge, &amp; Skills for the unit.</td>
<td>Teachers do not agree on the Enduring Understandings, Knowledge, &amp; Skills for the unit.</td>
<td>Teachers agree on the Enduring Understandings, Knowledge, &amp; Skills, but they are not aligned with the unit.</td>
<td>Teachers agree on the Enduring Understandings, Knowledge, &amp; Skills for the unit that form the basis of a coherent, viable, and guaranteed curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 2 Discussion and Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unit Common Formative Assessments (Paper/Pencil or Performance Tasks) (UbD Stage 2):</strong> How do we know if they learned it?</td>
<td>No effort has been made to create CFAs.</td>
<td><em>Low quality CFAs are created and are minimally related to the Enduring Understandings, Knowledge, &amp; Skills for the unit.</em></td>
<td><em>Moderate quality CFAs are created relative to the Enduring Understandings, Knowledge, &amp; Skills for the unit and are infrequent.</em></td>
<td><em>High quality CFAs relative to the Enduring Understandings, Knowledge, &amp; Skills for the unit are frequently used to guide instruction.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proficiency Standards:</strong> How will we know if students are proficient?</td>
<td>No proficiency standards have been set prior to administration of a CFA.</td>
<td>Proficiency standards have been set prior to administration of a CFA but have not been shared with the students.</td>
<td>Proficiency standards have been set and have been shared with the students prior to administration of a CFA.</td>
<td>Teachers on the team and their students collaborate on the creation of performance standards prior to administration of a CFA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stage 3 Discussion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intentional Planning (UbD Stage 3):</strong> What learning experiences and teaching promote understanding, interest, and excellence?</td>
<td>Teachers do not collaboratively plan teaching and learning experiences.</td>
<td>PLCs collaboratively design work without regard to differentiation and/or student engagement or work that does not cause understanding.</td>
<td>PLCs collaboratively design work that is clear, coherent, and engaging and that will likely cause understanding.</td>
<td>PLCs collaboratively design differentiated work that will engage all students and equip them to demonstrate the targeted enduring understandings and answer the essential questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Analysis (Enrichment and Remediation)</td>
<td>Pre-Initiation Stage – 1 pt.</td>
<td>Initiation Stage – 2 pts.</td>
<td>Developing Stage – 3 pts.</td>
<td>Sustaining Stage – 4 pts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data Analysis:</strong> Which students got it, what objectives did they get/not get? Which teachers were effective/not effective with which objectives?</td>
<td>Teachers do not identify students for interventions.</td>
<td>Team members identify students in their own classes for interventions/enrichment.</td>
<td>Team members collaboratively identify individual students for interventions/enrichment and determine which teachers were most effective with which objectives.</td>
<td>Team members collaboratively identify individual students and subgroups for interventions/enrichment based on an item analysis and determine which teachers were most effective with which objectives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interventions (UbD Stage 3):</strong> What do we do when they don’t get it?</td>
<td>No effort is made to reteach and/or retest.</td>
<td>Teachers provide reteaching and interventions in isolation in their own classrooms and then retest/revise.</td>
<td>Teachers regroup students for reteaching and interventions based on student need and then retest/revise.</td>
<td>Teachers regroup students for reteaching and interventions based on student needs and teacher strengths and then they retest/revise.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Enrichment (UbD Stage 3):</strong> What do we do when students demonstrate proficiency, before or after it was taught?</td>
<td>All students do the same work.</td>
<td>Students are allowed to read or play games if they finish early.</td>
<td>Students delve deeper into the work of their current unit.</td>
<td>Students attend organized enrichment activities based on their interests and/or engage in accelerated work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Error Analysis:</strong> What mistakes did students make? Was it a good question? Where did the students go wrong in their thinking?</td>
<td>Teachers do not analyze student errors.</td>
<td>Teachers identify student errors but do not examine the reasons for the errors.</td>
<td>Individual teachers examine their own students' work for errors and reasons for those errors. Teachers adjust their instruction based on the information they learn from student errors.</td>
<td>Team members analyze each other's student work collaboratively and delve deeply into the reasons for student errors. Teachers adjust their instruction based on the information they learn from student errors.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Column total points for all three pages: _______ pts. _______ pts. _______ pts. _______ pts.

Total Points _______ \(\div 4\) = _______ (Average)
Resources

Cabarrus County Schools Leveled Pages:
- Elementary
- Middle
- High
- CTE

Cabarrus County Schools Curriculum Documents

North Carolina Standard Course of Study:
- Common Core State Standards
- North Carolina Essential Standards

All Things PLC