

108 SCHOOL BUILDING LEADER (SBL) RUBRIC #4—PART TWO, ASSIGNMENT 1: VIDEO OBSERVATION AND ANALYSIS

	4	3	2	1
Performance Characteristic	The "4" response reflects a thorough command of the relevant knowledge and skills.	The "3" response reflects a general command of the relevant knowledge and skills.	The "2" response reflects a limited command of the relevant knowledge and skills.	The "1" response reflects little or no command of the relevant knowledge and skills.
<p>COMPLETENESS The degree to which the response addresses all parts of the assignment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Substantial evidence is cited for all 4 components. • All 4 components are assigned a performance level. • One strength is identified and fully supported. • One area for improvement is identified and fully supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some evidence is cited for all 4 components. • All 4 components are assigned a performance level. • One strength is identified and generally supported. • One area for improvement is identified and generally supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is cited for all of the components but may be minimal for 1 or more components. • Only 2–3 components are assigned a performance level. • One strength <u>and</u> one weakness are identified but only weakly supported, OR • Only one strength <u>or</u> one weakness is identified and adequately supported. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence is minimal and may be missing for 1 or more components. • Only 1 or no component is assigned a performance level. • Either a strength or a weakness is identified but is largely unsupported.

Performance Characteristic	4	3	2	1
	The "4" response reflects a thorough command of the relevant knowledge and skills.	The "3" response reflects a general command of the relevant knowledge and skills.	The "2" response reflects a limited command of the relevant knowledge and skills.	The "1" response reflects little or no command of the relevant knowledge and skills.
<p>ACCURACY The degree to which the response demonstrates the relevant knowledge and skills accurately and effectively</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence cited for each component is significant and fully accurate and is correctly associated with the relevant component. The performance levels assigned to all components are appropriate. The strength identified is significant, correctly associated with the relevant component, and fully justified by the evidence presented. The area for improvement identified is significant, correctly associated with the relevant component, and fully justified by the evidence presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence cited for each component is largely significant and accurate and is usually correctly associated with the relevant component. The performance levels assigned to 3 components are appropriate. The strength identified is plausible, correctly associated with the relevant component, and largely justified by the evidence presented. The area for improvement identified is plausible, correctly associated with the relevant component, and largely justified by the evidence presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence cited for each component is sometimes superficial and only partially accurate and is sometimes incorrectly associated with the relevant component. The performance levels assigned to 2 components are inappropriate. The strength identified is minor, incorrectly associated with the relevant component, or only partly justified by the evidence presented. The area for improvement identified is minor, incorrectly associated with the relevant component, or only partly justified by the evidence presented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence cited for most components is superficial, inaccurate, or missing altogether, and is incorrectly associated with the relevant component. The performance levels assigned to 3 or 4 components are inappropriate. The strength identified is erroneous, incorrectly associated with the relevant component, or not justified by the evidence presented. The area for improvement identified is erroneous, incorrectly associated with the relevant component, or not justified by the evidence presented.

	4	3	2	1
Performance Characteristic	The "4" response reflects a thorough command of the relevant knowledge and skills.	The "3" response reflects a general command of the relevant knowledge and skills.	The "2" response reflects a limited command of the relevant knowledge and skills.	The "1" response reflects little or no command of the relevant knowledge and skills.
DEPTH OF SUPPORT AND UNDERSTANDING The degree to which the response provides appropriate examples and details that demonstrate sound reasoning and reflects a strong understanding of the relevant knowledge and skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The observations cited are relevant, significant, and clearly described. • The quality and quantity of evidence are sufficient. • Conclusions drawn from the evidence (i.e., performance level and identification as strength or area for improvement) are valid. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The observations cited are largely relevant, significant, and clearly described. • The quality and quantity of evidence are largely sufficient, but minor deficiencies may occur. • Conclusions drawn from the evidence (i.e., performance level and identification as strength or area for improvement) are generally valid. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The observations cited are only partially relevant, sometimes insignificant, and sometimes only vaguely described. • The quality and quantity of evidence are only occasionally sufficient. • Conclusions drawn from the evidence (i.e., performance level and identification as strength or area for improvement) have limited validity. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The observations cited are largely irrelevant, insignificant, and described vaguely or not at all. • The quality and quantity of evidence are largely insufficient. • Conclusions drawn from the evidence (i.e., performance level and identification as strength or area for improvement) are largely invalid.
UNSCORABLE	The response is unscorable because it is unrelated to the assigned topic or off-task, unreadable, written in a language other than English or contains an insufficient amount of original work to score.			
BLANK	No response.			