

# Sunshine ISD Asynchronous Plan Open Response

## Rubric Scoring and Rationale

### [Non-Example]

*This non-example is:*

- An example of **ONE** plan that would require an LEA to revise and resubmit
- An example of some key errors LEAs will want to avoid when creating their plan

*This example is **NOT***

- The only or “worst” way to develop a plan that requires revisions. Plans are evaluated based on the rubric. There are several ways that plans would need revisions before being approved.
- An endorsement or non-endorsement of any particular set of materials or products. See exemplars for examples of how a wide variety of products can be used or adapted to meet the requirements of the rubric.

#### Non-Example Key Errors for Instructional Schedule:

Points Category	Rubric Alignment	Key Errors Included in Non-Example
1.1 Instructional schedule outlines expected time for students to interact with academic content.	<p><b>1 point —</b> Expectations for daily interaction with academic content is clear <b>And</b> times are defined for student interaction with academic content <b>But</b> it is not clear how all student groups and grade levels will have the opportunity to engage in approx. a full day of academic content everyday</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Schedule description does include expectations for daily interactions with academic content, and there is a definition of approximate times for student interaction with content, but</li> <li>• It is not clear that students will have the opportunity to engage in approx. a full day of academic instruction, with several grade levels not close to the minimal daily instruction requirements.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ PK-2 only has 80 min of instructional activities defined per day compared to the minimal guidance of 180 minutes.</li> <li>○ 3-5 has only 120 minutes of planned instructional activities compared to the minimal guidance of 180 minutes</li> <li>○ 6-8 has only 220 minutes of planned instructional activities compared to the minimal guidance of 240 minutes</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
1.2 Instructional schedule outlines expected time for students to interact with teacher(s) and receive instructional support	<p><b>1 point —</b> Expectations and pre-planned times for teacher/student interactions are clear in instructional schedule <b>But</b> expectations and pre-planned times for teacher/student interactions is inadequate (e.g. less than 30 minutes per day) or does not consider differentiation (e.g. is not</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less than 30 minutes of pre-planned teacher/student interaction per day</li> <li>• Not adjusted to include differentiation               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Doesn't include GT, SPED support</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Parents are required to be a main instructional support</li> </ul>

	differentiated for students with additional learning needs)	
--	---	--

**Instructional Schedule Total: 2 out of 4 possible points = Needs Revision**

**Non-Example Key Errors for Materials Design:**

Points Category	Rubric Alignment	Key Errors Included in Non-Example
2.1 District has adopted a full, TEKS-aligned curriculum that can be executed in an asynchronous remote learning environment.	<b>0 points —</b> TEKS-aligned instructional materials and assessments are not named <b>Or</b> it is unclear how instructional materials and assessment have been designed/adapted for asynchronous instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• While the plan states that textbooks have been adopted, no specific TEKS-aligned instructional materials or assessments are named</li> <li>• No materials or assessments that have been specifically designed for asynchronous instruction are named</li> <li>• It is not clear how existing materials will be adapted for asynchronous instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No clear district guidance to teachers for how to adapt materials</li> <li>○ Collaborative activities and hands-on activities are still meant for in-person or synchronous remote learning</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
2.2 Instructional materials include specifically designed resources to support students with disabilities and English Learners in an asynchronous environment	<b>1 point —</b> Instructional materials include resources designed to support students with disabilities and ELs <b>But</b> it is unclear that there is a plan for all students with disabilities and ELs to receive the needed support through the use of the instructional materials	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan states that adopted instructional materials include resources designed to support students with disabilities and ELs, but</li> <li>• The plan does not include support for all students through materials <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ No specified SPED support</li> <li>○ Language support for ELs not specified</li> <li>○ Supports are largely made for face-to-face instruction and are not specific</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Materials Design Total: 1 out of 4 possible points = Needs Revision**

**Non-Example Key Errors for Student Progress:**

Points Category	Rubric Alignment	Key Errors Included in Non-Example
3.1 Daily student engagement is defined, trackable, and includes expectations for daily student engagement that is consistent with progress that would occur in an on-campus environment	<b>0 points —</b> Expectations for daily student engagement is not defined <b>Or</b> there is not a clear system for tracking daily student engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only requirement is for students to log in; this is inconsistent with progress that would occur in an on-campus environment</li> <li>• The system for how teachers will track and report student engagement is not defined</li> <li>• There is not a clear plan for students who do not regularly engage in</li> </ul>

		content
3.2 There is a system for tracking student academic progress to inform instruction and providing regular feedback to students on their progress	<p><b>1 point —</b> There is a clear system for tracking student academic progress <b>And</b> there is a clear system for providing feedback to students on progress <b>But</b> it is not clear that all students will receive regular (at least weekly) feedback on progress</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Teachers tracking student academic progress using bi-weekly quizzes/formative assessments</li> <li>Teachers provide feedback via grades</li> <li>Teachers provide monthly comments/1:1 check-in sessions</li> <li>Student feedback is not frequent enough (not weekly)</li> </ul>

**Student Progress Total: 1 out of 4 possible points = Needs Revision**

**Non-Example Key Errors for Implementation:**

Points Category	Rubric Alignment	Key Errors Included in Non-Example
4.1 Professional development for educators is planned and specific to supporting asynchronous instruction	<p><b>1 point —</b> There is a pre-planned calendar for educators with specific supports for implementing asynchronous instruction <b>And</b> the professional development calendar includes both initial and ongoing, job embedded development opportunities <b>But</b> it is not clear how the professional learning will develop content knowledge to help educators internalize the asynchronous curriculum and analyze and respond to data with the use of the instructional materials</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The professional development calendar is largely the same as the calendar used in 2019-2020 and does not reflect adjustments for asynchronous remote instruction</li> <li>Does not include key professional learning on asynchronous curriculum</li> </ul>
4.2 There is explicit communication and support for families in order to support asynchronous work at home	<p><b>0 points —</b> There is not a plan for explicit communication of expectations and support for families specific to asynchronous instruction <b>Or</b> the plan does not have reasonable expectations for families (e.g. expects families to be primary deliverer of instruction)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Response includes a generic plan for communication of expectations and support for families</li> <li>Plan does not specify communicating expectations for asynchronous instruction</li> <li>Plan does not have reasonable expectations for families <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires daily instruction from parents</li> <li>Requires printing and scanning on a weekly basis from all parents</li> </ul> </li> <li>Plan does not include additional supports, training, and/or resources for families who may need additional support</li> </ul>

**Implementation Total: 1 out of 4 possible points = Needs Revision**