CCSSO
Council of Chief State School Officers

State Education Agency Common Core State Standards Implementation Progress and Capacity Rubric

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
A. System alignment and system change				
1. Aspiration	■ Has the state articulated a clear vision for Common Core State Standards (CCSS) implementation that includes the expected results for students? ■ Do key stakeholders know the state's vision for CCSS implementation and what changes are expected? Do they agree with the state's vision? ■ Do key stakeholders know why the state is implementing the CCSS? ■ Is it clear to those at the agency and in the field how the state's various initiatives, including CCSS, fit together and support a common vision? ■ Have SEA leaders considered how this vision relates to statewide goals and district and school level accountability, and particularly how those might be affected by coming assessment transition?	■ The state has not established a vision for CCSS implementation ■ Major disagreement exists among key stakeholders over the potential benefit of the CCSS ■ Key stakeholders, including teachers and the general public, do not understand the state's vision or the changes expected as a result of CCSS ■ The CCSS and other state-led initiatives feel disconnected; it is unclear to those in the field what the priorities are and in what direction the state is moving ■ Little or no thought has been given to the implications of assessment transitions for the vision and goals	■ The state has established a clear vision for CCSS implementation and articulated the moral and economic purpose of the standards, and what they will accomplish for students ■ Teachers, principals, and the general public know why the state is implementing the CCSS and understand its potential impact ■ There is widespread agreement among key stakeholders that the CCSS will benefit students ■ Educators understand how the state's various initiatives, including the CCSS, fit together and add up to a greater statewide vision for student success ■ SEA leaders have a plan for ensuring that the vision, goals, and accountability systems remain ambitious and meaningful through the assessment transition	■ Existence of documents (e.g., on a state website) that outline a consistent vision for the CCSS ■ Feedback from teachers, principals, and the general public about their understanding of the purpose behind CCSS and their support of the new standards ■ Inclusion of provisions for assessment transition in vision documents, ESEA flexibility plans, and/or other descriptions of accountability system

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
2. Clarity of Roles	■ Have state leaders clearly defined and articulated the SEA's role in ensuring that CCSS is implemented in every classroom? ■ Has that role been defined and articulated in terms of support and accountability for regional entities (where applicable), districts, and schools? Are the roles of these organizations clearly defined as well? ■ Does the SEA work with district leaders to coordinate implementation and support for districts? Is support differentiated based on the needs and requests from districts?	■ The SEA role in the implementation of the CCSS is unclear relative to that of the districts and schools ■ Most SEA staff and district and school leaders cannot articulate the state's role in implementation ■ State and district efforts to implement the CCSS are redundant and overlapping ■ The SEA employs a "one-size-fits-all" approach to its interactions with and support for districts; it does not differentiate based on size, resources, or need	■ The SEA has clearly defined its role in CCSS implementation ■ Schools, districts, and/or regional entities understand their role in relation to the SEA and each other ■ The SEA works with districts to ensure their implementation efforts complement and build upon one another ■ The SEA focuses its available support and resources on those districts that need it most	■ Existence of documents (e.g., on a state website) that articulate the state role ■ The alignment of state and local perspectives on the state's role, as evidenced by feedback from both ■ Comparison of state and district strategic plans ■ Existence of regular and visible SEA contacts and districts/regional entities regarding implementation plans
3. Leadership	■ Is there a clear leader for CCSS implementation at the SEA? ■ Are the state chief and his/her leadership team deliberately and regularly engaged in discussions about the CCSS, particularly as it relates to other initiatives in the agency? ■ Are other key state leaders, including the governor, the State Board, and legislators, engaged? Do they feel shared ownership for this work? ■ Are leaders of higher education identified and clearly involved in implementation?	■ While many people are working on CCSS, it is unclear who is really responsible for its successful implementation statewide ■ CCSS implementation exists in isolation within one part of the agency; other leaders rarely engage in conversations about implementation progress ■ Information to the State Board, the governor, and the legislature is only provided when specifically requested ■ Collaboration or discussions with higher education have been non-existent, sporadic, or non-productive	■ There is a clear leader for CCSS implementation who is coordinating and driving this work at the state level, with the support of a strong team ■ The chief and all members of his/her leadership team see CCSS as a priority and regularly engage in conversations about progress and the relationship between CCSS and other initiatives ■ Key state leaders, including the governor, the State Board, and the legislature, see CCSS as a priority and its successful implementation as part of their responsibilities; they often speak out on behalf of the CCSS ■ Higher education leaders are engaged with the SEA and have a plan for dealing with the changes that CCSS will bring about for them	■ Existence of a single responsible leader at the SEA who is acknowledged as such across the system ■ Engagement levels of the state chief and SEA leadership team ■ Engagement levels of the governor, key legislators, and the State Board ■ Inclusion of CCSS implementation in State Board Meeting agendas and updates to the governor and legislature ■ State Board actions regarding CCSS ■ Perception by higher education leaders of how involved they are in the SEA's planning ■ Existence of a statewide Common Core commission or work group that is formed and functioning ■ Designation of a clear leader from the SEA for the CCSS commission or work group

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
4. Plan and Timeline	■ Is there a clear statewide plan for implementing the CCSS that outlines the state's goals and a coherent set of strategies for achieving them? ■ Does the plan include a detailed, realistic timeline for implementation, including details on how and when standards will be rolled out and key milestones necessary to ensure that schools and districts are operationally ready for new standards and aligned assessments? ■ Is the plan concrete enough to serve as the driver of day-to-day implementation work? ■ Do key stakeholders understand the plan? Were they engaged in the planning process? ■ Is the plan coherent with other major statewide reform initiatives (e.g., new teacher and leader effectiveness systems, data systems, ESEA waiver implementation)? ■ Does the plan include strategies for preparing for and managing the various challenges posed by a coming assessment transition?	■ The SEA does not have a written plan, or it has a plan that is not regularly used to drive the implementation work ■ The plan is not sufficiently detailed and does not spell out the timeline and milestones necessary for rolling out the standards and ensuring readiness for the assessments ■ There is limited or no evidence that key stakeholders were engaged in planning and able to provide input into the plan ■ The plan is isolated from plans for other major statewide reform initiatives ■ Little or no thought has been given in the plan to assessment transition issues	■ SEA leaders have created a plan for implementation of the CCSS and uses that plan to drive the day-to-day work ■ The plan includes a realistic timeline which includes key milestones and deadlines the state, districts, and schools should meet in order to be prepared to implement the assessments in 2014 ■ Key stakeholders understand the CCSS implementation strategy—how it is to be implemented, what will define success, and their role ■ The plan is integrated with (and possibly a part of) other plans for statewide reform initiatives ■ The plan includes or makes reference to state strategies for ensuring operational and instructional readiness for new assessments ■ Work has begun to alter the state's accountability system to accommodate new assessments	■ Existence of a written plan with key characteristics: » Goals » Strategies and their connection to goals » Timeline » Connection points with other key state initiatives ■ Inclusion of milestones for operational readiness for new assessments in plan and/or timeline: » Technology readiness » Test administration and scoring, including procurement » Data systems and reporting » Enabling policies (e.g., adoption of new assessment system) ■ Access to and use of the plan by SEA staff responsible for implementation ■ Knowledge of state plan among stakeholders inside and outside of the SEA ■ Frequency of updates to key stakeholders on completion of milestones and status of plan

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
5. Budget and Resources	■ Has the SEA considered the resources necessary for successful implementation and included those in annual budgets? ■ Is the SEA supporting districts and schools in doing the same?	■ State has no additional resources planned for implementation activities or has not even considered reallocating current resources ■ SEA budget does not reflect any prioritization of the implementation of CCSS ■ No changes to how districts and schools plan and use various funding streams have been considered to help with implementation	■ State leaders have been thoughtful and deliberate in mapping the resources necessary for successful CCSS implementation ■ They have worked to create a budget that ensures access to those resources through the allocation of new funds, reallocation of existing ones, or both ■ SEA leaders have also supported districts in considering resources and budgets and have provided guidance on the use and budgeting of resources	■ Budget documents: 　» Inclusion of additional resources or a shifting of resources to prioritize CCSS implementation 　» Alignment with CCSS implementation plans (if they exist) ■ Extent to which information regarding budget and resources is shared with districts and schools
6. Technology and Information Systems	■ Are districts and schools prepared technologically to administer online assessments? ■ Have SEA leaders identified potential gaps in technology readiness? Is there a plan for working with district leaders to address those gaps? ■ Does the SEA provide its districts and schools with access to quality information to support decision making? ■ Are data and information systems seen as integrated into the day-to-day work of the SEA? Is the Chief Information Officer (CIO) a part of the SEA leadership team?	■ Districts do not have the technology capacity (e.g., broadband, devices) to administer online assessments ■ Technology needs of schools have not been discussed at the state level; SEA leaders do not have a clear idea of how ready schools are ■ SEA staff and those in the field do not have access to the data they need to make decisions on a daily basis, or data is difficult to access or understand ■ The quality of data collected, stored, and used is questionable and/or data are often inaccurate ■ Data and information systems are viewed as a separate function within the agency; both the people and the systems they oversee are siloed ■ There is no CIO at the SEA or this person does not participate as part of the SEA leadership	■ Most districts and schools have the technology and broadband capacity they need to administer online assessments ■ SEA leaders have worked closely with districts to identify those gaps in technology readiness that do exist and have plans to address those gaps ■ The necessary data are easy to access and easy to understand for those in the field and at the SEA; people both at the SEA and in the field use the data to make decisions around funding, supports, and programs ■ The SEA has confidence in the quality of the data that are collected, stored, and used ■ Data and information systems – and the people responsible for them – are fully integrated into leadership structures and functions in the agency ■ The CIO is a part of the senior leadership team and works with the Chief and Deputies to ensure that systems are implemented in support of the agency's goals	■ Existence of data on gaps in technology readiness at the school and district level ■ Existence of a state technology plan to work with districts to address gaps ■ Existence of and ease of access to regular data collection and analytical reports from this feedback ■ The data system can provide indicators for both teacher evaluation and Common Core implementation ■ An articulated data governance plan including well-defined roles and responsibilities, data dictionary, and collection timelines ■ A data privacy and security policy that is publically available and regularly reviewed ■ Presence of Chief Information Officer (CIO) on the SEA leadership team

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
7. Monitoring and Problem Solving	■ Do SEA leaders and those in the field have access to data they need to drive their work, including leading indicators on the progress of CCSS implementation and regular feedback from teachers, school leaders, and district leaders? ■ Have SEA leaders established a system for regularly monitoring the progress of implementation (including leading and lagging indicators, feedback from the field, and milestones and activities from the plan) and problem-solving when work is off-track? ■ Are problems brought to the attention of the appropriate decision-makers and acted upon in a timely manner? ■ Do leaders understand whether the activities undertaken at the state level (such as providing professional development, instructional materials) are having their intended impact in the field?	■ SEA leaders have little or no access to information regarding implementation in the field; they have no way of knowing whether most teachers, school leaders, and district leaders understand the changes associated with CCSS and whether they are prepared to implement those changes ■ SEA leaders meet only rarely and sporadically to discuss the progress of implementation of the CCSS ■ The conversations that do occur are not structured to facilitate real problem-solving that is focused on outcomes ■ These conversations often take place in the context of a crisis and may not include the right people ■ SEA leaders do not have a clear picture of whether or not the activities they are undertaking are having their intended impact in the field	■ The SEA regularly collects, analyzes, and uses data on the progress of implementation in the field ■ Feedback from the field includes opinions and comments on the progress of implementation, but also data on teacher and principal satisfaction, knowledge, and practices ■ SEA leaders, including the chief and those directly responsible for CCSS implementation, regularly meet to review implementation progress against the state's plan (if there is one) ■ Discussions of progress are focused on outcome data (including leading and lagging indicators, feedback from the field, and milestones) ■ Conversations provide a consistent opportunity to arrive at a shared view of progress, to surface challenges, to problem-solve together, to hold responsible leaders accountable for implementation, and to make mid-course corrections	■ Existence of survey tools, focus groups, or other methods for collecting feedback from the field on quality of implementation ■ Existence of and ease of access to regular data collection and analytical reports from this feedback ■ Occurrence of regular progress-monitoring discussions ■ Agendas, materials, and results of data analyses from progress-monitoring discussions ■ Feedback from state leaders on the quality of conversations and extent to which they helped the state move forward with implementation

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
B. Educator Supports				
8. Instructional Materials	■ Do educators have access to CCSS-aligned instructional materials? ■ Are they using those materials to align their instructional and assessment practices with CCSS?	■ State and district leaders are aware of some CCSS-aligned instructional materials, but cannot say with much certainty that the right set of resources exists ■ Some educators may be intentionally using CCSS-aligned instructional materials, but it is a small number or state leaders do not know who they are ■ Educators who desire CCSS-aligned and/or state-endorsed materials are not able to easily access them	■ Educators have access to comprehensive CCSS-aligned materials, including curricular modules, guidance on developing CCSS-aligned lesson plans, and guidance on aligning assessments to CCSS ■ The majority of educators are aware of these materials and are using them in their classrooms ■ Nearly all educators have sufficient resources to successfully teach the CCSS and are using them in their classrooms	■ Existence of CCSS-aligned instructional materials, as validated by a trusted source (e.g., districts or schools that are leaders in this field, state "seal of approval," state-developed or -provided, third party with expertise) ■ Existence of a rigorous process to continually evaluate the alignment of new materials ■ Range of CCSS-aligned instructional materials: curricular modules, guidance on developing and/or aligning curricular modules with CCSS ■ Educator access to materials posted online ■ Educator practice that makes use of these materials, as self-reported or reported by educator leaders
9. Professional Learning for Teachers	■ Are teachers engaged in high-quality professional development (PD) that is designed to rapidly and significantly improve their ability to teach the CCSS? ■ Is this professional learning designed to incorporate the use of high-quality instructional materials as defined above? ■ Is this professional learning changing classroom practices?	■ SEA leaders are aware of some CCSS-aligned PD offerings and may have some evidence that educators are benefiting from these offerings, but have little idea of how widespread these offerings are ■ While there may be some bright spots, the average educator experiences disjointed PD training that may or may not be aligned to CCSS ■ Training tends not to be connected to other training opportunities or to day-to-day coaching and feedback ■ Districts and schools have not planned for adequate time for teachers to truly absorb the CCSS	■ SEA leaders can identify a range of CCSS-aligned PD programs that cover every grade band and relevant subject (including literacy and numeracy in non-ELA and math disciplines) comprehensively and coherently ■ PD programs are well integrated with CCSS-aligned instructional materials that are available ■ Programs are anchored in a job-embedded component that links professional learning to day-to-day feedback and coaching that educators receive ■ State policies and guidance to schools and districts support teachers having time during the school day for professional learning ■ The SEA ensures that the vast majority of educators are enrolled in these programs and are changing their instructional practices accordingly as appropriate to the timeline	■ Existence of high-quality CCSS-aligned professional learning programs, as validated by a trusted source (e.g., districts or schools that are leaders in this field, state "seal of approval," state-developed or -provided, professional learning communities of practitioners, third party with expertise) ■ Enrollment data for these programs vs. total size of field as compared to other programs ■ Participant feedback on these programs ■ Evidence of changed educator practice as a result of these programs, as self-reported or reported by educator leaders

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
10. Educator Preparation and Licensure	■ Have SEA leaders engaged institutions of higher education and educator preparation programs to ensure they are preparing educators to teach and assess the CCSS? ■ Have state leaders altered or considered how they should alter state teacher licensing requirements to reflect the expectations of the CCSS?	■ Changes to educator preparation and licensure are not part of an overall implementation strategy ■ Leaders of educator preparation programs are not engaged in discussions around what it will take to prepare new teachers to teach the CCSS ■ There has been little change to licensing policies and requirements, or changes are behind schedule	■ State CCSS implementation plan has clear timeline with schedule for new educator preparation and licensure policies to take effect ■ Higher education leaders have aligned their educator preparation programs to help new teachers to graduate with CCSS competencies and meet new licensure requirements ■ Licensure requirements and policies have been adjusted and rewritten to align with new expectations for educators	■ Evidence of regular contact and cooperation between state licensure staff and stakeholders in postsecondary educator preparation programs ■ Alignment of content and requirements in educator preparation programs to CCSS expectations and new licensure policies ■ Existence of new state policies that align licensure requirements with CCSS expectations
11. Professional Learning for Principals	■ Are principals receiving high-quality professional development that will equip them to understand the content and pedagogical shifts necessary to implement the CCSS in their buildings? ■ Does this professional learning help principals to tell the difference between CCSS and previous standards in the classroom? Are principals prepared to observe, support, and evaluate teachers according to the expectations of the new standards? ■ Is this professional learning changing the way that principals exercise instructional leadership in their buildings?	■ SEA leaders are aware of some CCSS-aligned PD offerings for principals but have little idea of how widespread these offerings are ■ Principals know the changes are coming but have not been a major part of the implementation process or received focused training on the specific implications of the changes for their role ■ Principals tend to run their schools' educator evaluation systems in isolation from other CCSS resources, including aligned instructional materials and aligned professional learning opportunities, because the resources themselves are offered to them in isolation ■ Principals have to rely mostly on properly trained content teachers for instructional leadership	■ SEA leaders can identify a range of CCSS-aligned professional learning programs for principals that equip them to incorporate CCSS expectations into their instructional leadership ■ SEA leaders are working closely with districts and other partners to ensure that principals at all grade levels have engaged in one or more of these programs ■ The vast majority of principals can speak confidently about the CCSS and are ready to observe and support teachers on the new standards ■ The vast majority of principals and educator leaders are fully capable of integrating teacher evaluation systems with CCSS-aligned instructional materials and professional learning programs to create a comprehensive developmental experience for teachers ■ Principals are widely viewed as the instructional leaders of their schools and teachers feel comfortable that their principals are prepared to support them in implementing the standards	■ Existence of high-quality CCSS-aligned professional learning programs for principals, as validated by a trusted source (e.g., districts or schools that are leaders in this field, state "seal of approval," state-developed or provided, professional learning communities of practitioners, third party with expertise) ■ Enrollment data for these programs vs. total size of field as compared to other programs ■ Participant feedback on these programs ■ Evidence of changed principal practice as a result of these programs, as self-reported or reported by teachers and district leaders ■ Evidence that educator enrollment in PD and use of instructional materials is being driven by feedback from the evaluation system

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
C. Student Supports				

12. Identification of and Supports for Special Populations	Note: Use this row of the rubric to separately evaluate the supports provided to key populations of students in the state including: ■ Students with disabilities (SWD) ■ English Language Learners (ELL) ■ Any other racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups that need additional attention in the state			
	■ Do educators and leaders at every level know which of their students are most likely to need the most support to meet the expectations of the CCSS? ■ Will the SEA provide the necessary support to educators to meet the needs of these students? ■ Is there a clear and widely shared aspiration that students in the special population will meet the expectations of the CCSS at levels commensurate with their peers? ■ In implementation planning, have SEA leaders prioritized the training of teachers of the special population to align their classroom practice with CCSS expectations? ■ In implementation planning, have SEA leaders emphasized support to schools and districts that have the greatest concentrations of students of the special population?	■ Educators throughout the state do not have a shared understanding of which students are most likely to struggle to meet CCSS expectations; individual educators may access this information on their own initiative, but there is no coordinated view ■ The aspiration to close achievement gaps for the special population is not widely shared ■ The SEA does little or nothing to align resources to proven or promising practices to support students in the special population to meet CCSS expectations ■ Some educators and school leaders may be using these practices, but SEA leaders have a poor understanding of how widespread they are ■ The state does not differentiate districts and schools according to their concentrations of students in the special population	■ The vast majority of educators and leaders in schools, districts, regions, and the SEA have a very clear sense of where their high-priority students are and the scale of the challenge ■ The vast majority of educators and leaders share a common aspiration to close achievement gaps for students in the special population ■ SEA ensures that available resources give the vast majority of educators and school leaders access to proven or promising practices that are likely to improve the capacity of students in the special population to meet CCSS expectations ■ Educators and school leaders have the necessary capacity to integrate these practices into their instruction and are using them to tier instruction and close achievement gaps ■ The SEA has a plan for targeting the highest-need districts and schools with the necessary resources and support to help students in the special population meet CCSS expectations	■ Accessibility of data at the school, district, regional, and state level that allow leaders to pinpoint achievement gaps across a wide range of CCSS-aligned measures ■ Review of policies governing the use of Federal (Title I, XX, etc.), state, and local resources for targeted student supports ■ Coordination and collaboration between those responsible for CCSS and those responsible for programs for the special population ■ Coordination of trainings on RTI and CCSS ■ Existence of proven or promising practices that are likely to help students in the special population meet CCSS expectations, as validated by a trusted source (e.g., districts or schools that are leaders in this field, state "seal of approval," state-developed or provided, third party with expertise) ■ Integration of these practices into professional learning offerings for educators and school leaders

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
D. Communication and Engagement				

13. Engagement with Education Stakeholders	■ Do state leaders regularly communicate with education stakeholders about the state's CCSS implementation effort and associated priorities?
	
	■ How effective are communications in helping education stakeholders understand objectives of the CCSS plan and the actions needed?
	
	■ Are communications two-way? Do state leaders gather and respond to feedback from the field about the CCSS and its implementation?
	
	■ Do district and school leaders feel responsible for successful roll-out of CCSS? Are they utilized as messengers?
	
	■ Do higher education leaders feel a stake in successful roll-out of CCSS?
	
	■ Are media and technology being leveraged to communicate the message to education stakeholders?
		■ Communications within and from the state education agency to education stakeholders are poorly planned, inconsistent, and often conflicting
		
		■ Communication only flows outward; little or no feedback from the field is gathered
		
		■ Districts share information on an ad-hoc basis, and largely rely on the SEA to communicate to school leaders and principals
		
		■ Communication between SEA leaders and higher education leaders is ad hoc and irregular; most faculty will be unprepared for changes brought about by CCSS
		
		■ Media and technology are used in limited capacity (email only) to keep educators abreast of progress
			■ SEA has an internal and external communications plan for education stakeholders with specific focus on CCSS implementation
			
			■ Communication is clear and consistent and important information flows to the parties most affected
			
			■ Communication is two-way; feedback is collected and integrated into implementation plan
			
			■ District leaders have embraced their role in implementation and serve as conduits of information who generate grassroots enthusiasm for the CCSS
			
			■ Higher education leaders are collaborating with the SEA, each other, and the K-12 community in a visible way to ensure successful transition to the CCSS
			
			■ State has a comprehensive online presence with frequently updated information, tools, and materials
				■ Existence of a communications plan with the proper characteristics:
				  » Key messages
				  » Identification and analysis of education stakeholders
				  » Plan for engagement that includes multiple vehicles of communication
				
				■ Feedback from education stakeholders on their understanding of and support for the CCSS and extent to which this feedback is incorporated into state implementation plan
				
				■ Existence of a functioning Common Core Commission that helps coordinate communication across state-level systems
				
				■ Extent to which CCSS Commission or workgroup plays an active role in communications
				
				■ Records of higher education system or campus board actions related to CCSS

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for

14. Engagement with the Broader Community	■ Do state leaders recognize the importance of gaining support for CCSS amongst the general public?
	
	■ Have state leaders identified and partnered with a group of influential and diverse stakeholders that understand the CCSS, and do state leaders defend and support these stakeholders as part of the public conversation?
	
	■ Do state leaders leverage media and technology to communicate the right messages to the public?
		■ Communications within and from the state education agency to the broader community are poorly planned, inconsistent, and often conflicting
		
		■ State leaders are only focused on a limited range of stakeholders, mostly district and school leaders
		
		■ Communications efforts may exist, but are not targeted to different stakeholder groups
		
		■ Information about the CCSS seems to be different depending on where you live in the state
		
		■ There is a loud and distracting debate with anti-CCSS forces
			■ SEA has an internal and external communications plan for the broader public with specific focus on CCSS implementation
			
			■ SEA has a comprehensive media campaign (CCSS website, regular newsletters, etc.) that provides frequently updated information to the public
			
			■ A wide range of stakeholders outside the education community can articulate the importance of the CCSS and what it means for them; the SEA leverages members of its CCSS Commission or workgroup and educators as messengers to the public about the CCSS
			
			■ Dissent to the CCSS is quiet and does not garner legitimate attention; state and district leaders can articulate answers and provide information to those who question or have reservations about CCSS
				■ Existence of a communications plan (can be part of the same plan as above) with the proper characteristics:
				  » Objectives
				  » Key messages
				  » Identification and analysis of key stakeholders in the broader community
				  » Plan for engagement that includes multiple vehicles of communication
				
				■ Extent to which CCSS Commission or workgroup plays an active role in communications
				
				■ Quantity and tone of media coverage of CCSS implementation (e.g., via search of Google News)
				
				■ Quantity and tone of social media chatter about CCSS implementation
				
				■ Feedback from the general public about their understanding of and support for the CCSS

Category	Questions to Consider	Weak (1)	Strong (4)	Evidence to look for
15. Building Momentum through Productive Relationships	■ Do SEA leaders cultivate the relationships that are central to success, both with key stakeholders and within their own organization? ■ Do SEA leaders work actively to sustain these relationships? ■ Is conflict managed proactively? ■ Is continued attention, support, and excitement for the CCSS maintained from SEA leaders and staff and key stakeholders despite [throughout?] the challenges of implementation?	■ Some critical people who want to be involved with CCSS implementation are being ignored by the SEA ■ Relationships between SEA staff and others involved in the implementation process (or between various teams within the SEA) are strained, unproductive, or frustrating ■ The SEA's role in CCSS implementation carries a negative image for leaders in the field ■ Conflict about the CCSS is unexpected and contentious, significantly undermining implementation ■ There is little excitement or attention around the CCSS since adoption; talk about the CCSS is minimal or focuses on implementation challenges	■ Members of the SEA have reached out and created opportunities for collaboration with key stakeholders ■ Members of the SEA maintain effective relationships with all people that they interact with, establishing win-win agreements for cooperation and staying true to the core values of the aspiration ■ There is a strong and positive brand associated with CCSS implementation and the SEA's leadership of it ■ Conflict is managed with a fact-based discussion that acknowledges the emotional arguments of others but does not compromise on core principles of the CCSS implementation effort ■ SEA leaders, those in the field, and the general public remain excited about the potential of CCSS and continue to recognize its benefits despite implementation challenges along the way	■ Feedback from SEA staff about quality of working relationships inside the agency and quality of working relationships with key stakeholders outside the agency ■ Feedback from key stakeholders about the quality and productivity of their working relationships with SEA staff ■ Feedback from educators in general about the image and perception of the SEA and its role in CCSS implementation ■ Existence and engagement of CCSS Commission or workgroup ■ Feeling of excitement from educators and others around the state about the potential of the CCSS