



## Performance Task Rubric: Accelerating Student Outcomes Across Nevada

### Task Overview:

Design a 3-year statewide initiative targeting one area of underperformance (e.g., early literacy, college/career readiness, achievement gaps). Proposal must address:

- Data-driven problem analysis
- Evidence-based strategies
- Implementation timeline with roles
- Key metrics for monitoring and accountability
- Integration of Personalized, Competency-Based Education (PCBE), where appropriate
- Differentiation for diverse student populations
- District/community-level variance
- Budget summary

<b>Assessed Area</b>	<b>4 – Exemplary</b>	<b>3 – Proficient</b>	<b>2 – Developing</b>	<b>1 – Basic</b>
<b>Data-Driven Leadership</b>	Data analysis is robust, relevant, and directly informs all aspects of the proposal	Data is used appropriately to define the problem and guide decisions	Data is present but superficial or not well-aligned to the chosen focus area	Data is missing, misinterpreted, or unrelated to the initiative
<b>Instructional Improvement Strategies</b>	Interventions are highly targeted, evidence-based, and tailored to Nevada’s context	Interventions are mostly evidence-based and appropriate for the focus area	Strategies are general, weakly supported, or inconsistently aligned with the problem	Strategies are generic, untested, or not instructional in nature
<b>Systemic Thinking &amp; Capacity for Scale</b>	Clear statewide vision with realistic plans for implementation across diverse districts; timelines and roles are specific and actionable	Plans reflect state-level perspective and feasible coordination across systems; timelines and roles are generally clear	Limited systemic view; strategies lack clarity on scalability or state-district coordination	No clear plan for scaling; lacks attention to district variance or implementation feasibility
<b>Monitoring, Metrics &amp; Accountability</b>	Clear, measurable indicators of success aligned to goals; roles for monitoring and accountability are specific and realistic	Includes metrics and roles for monitoring, with some clarity and alignment to the plan	Vague or limited metrics; unclear accountability structures	Missing or inappropriate metrics; no structures for monitoring or accountability
<b>Understanding of PCBE</b>	PCBE is thoughtfully and appropriately integrated where relevant; aligned with instructional design and initiative goals	PCBE is acknowledged and reasonably included in parts of the initiative	PCBE is mentioned but with limited understanding or unclear application	PCBE is missing or misaligned with the initiative
<b>Equity &amp; Responsiveness to Diverse Populations</b>	Clearly addresses the needs of underserved populations; strategies are	Acknowledges student diversity with reasonable strategies to support different populations	General or minimal mention of student diversity; limited differentiation	No attention to diversity, inclusion, or specific student group needs

<b>Assessed Area</b>	<b>4 – Exemplary</b>	<b>3 – Proficient</b>	<b>2 – Developing</b>	<b>1 – Basic</b>
	inclusive, targeted, and equity-centered			
<b>District/Community Responsiveness</b>	Thoughtfully differentiates approaches based on community/district context; recognizes local autonomy and capacity	Notes district variation and offers some flexibility in implementation	Assumes uniform district needs; limited attention to context	No distinction made between districts; “one-size-fits-all” approach
<b>Budget Summary</b>	Budget is realistic, aligned to initiative goals, and reflects priorities; includes assumptions or funding sources	Budget is generally appropriate and aligned to the proposed activities	Budget is incomplete, overly general, or disconnected from initiative components	No budget or unreasonable/unexplained figures