

Shared Decision-Making Rubric

<i>Shared Decision-Making</i>	<i>Advanced</i>	<i>Middle</i>	<i>First Step</i>	<i>Undeveloped</i>
<i>Communication pathways</i>	Each staff member is connected to program, policy, and procedural decisions by a key communicator ideally with not more than 7 people in the group. Each group is formatted similarly with similar organizational purpose.	Staff members are aligned with key communicators but size and purpose of communication groups may vary dramatically.	Staff assesses what communication pathways would make the most sense as applied to their school. Goal would be to design pathways that limited total group size and created groups of similar purpose with an identified key communicator leading the group.	Key communicators are not identified nor is the staff organized in a manner that facilitates staff involvement through direct participation in building-wide decisions.
<i>Timelines for decisions</i>	Decisions to be made are given through key communicators to staff members in their groups. An estimated timeline for making the decision is provided at the outset of the discussion about the decision to be made.	Staff is informed by key communicators of decisions to be made and in process. Timelines are not specific or well defined but are stated in a general sense, e.g. "by third quarter".	Staff needs to discuss decisions that have been made in the past; the length of time such a decision should take and develop timelines and guidelines for different types of decisions.	Staff does not have a sense of the time required to make various and different kinds of decisions. Staff may feel that decisions are top down and announced despite discussion that may take place regarding the decision.
<i>Decision-making authority</i>	Decisions are clearly delineated in terms of who has the final authority to make what type of decision. Decision types are clearly labeled into categories such as principal, shared with staff, shared with staff and parents, etc.	There is some confusion over who has final authority on any given decision. Decisions may not be labeled by categories although, there may be general understanding about who usually decides what kinds of things.	Staff need to review types of decisions that are made at school and develop a clear glossary of terms and categories for decision making based on legal and contractual rights and responsibilities.	Staff does not have a clear picture of types of decisions made at the school and who might have legitimate authority to make decisions. There may be a sense that the staff gives input but it is not listened to or integrated into decisions which are made.
<i>Parent and community involvement in decisions</i>	Decision making procedures are clear, authentic, and have legitimate participation and authority by all parties concerned. There is clear alignment in the decision making process between governance rules for all decision making groups. The individual groups have a systematic collaborative process that brings all parties together to reach specific goals.	Parents are invited to participate in school governance around issues such as curriculum, goal setting, and budget process. Participation by parents is advisory only.	Staff review types of decisions where authentic parent involvement would help the school and in which they could legally participate. Once defined staff work with parents to assess the types of decisions they might want to be involved with.	Parents have no role at all in any school decisions or initiatives other than to provide cookies and coffee at meetings.

Shared Decision-Making Rubric

<i>Student decision-making authority</i>	Student government exists and a designated student representative brings student concerns to the leadership team on a regularly scheduled basis, for example, once a month.	Student government exists, and clearly represents all students. A member of the school staff has been appointed to work with student representatives. The staff member decides what if any student issues should be relayed to the leadership team and brings them to the group.	Student government exists and has a staff advisor. It may or may not represent all students. The main function of student government is to do traditionally approved activities e.g. fundraisers, sponsoring dances, and so forth. A staff advisor works with the students.	Student government exists in name only. There are limited predetermined activities, the vast majority of students have no voice in the actions of the officers, and student concerns are generally not relayed to any authority for resolution.
<i>Minority viewpoint representation</i>	There is an established process to gain and give voice to a minority viewpoint through an at large elected staff representative that may "call the question" before the entire staff.	There is a process to get each staff member's opinion and minority viewpoints are noted. An effort is made to have decisions be as inclusive of the minority viewpoint as possible.	Minority viewpoints are heard but no effort is made to be inclusive in the final decision.	The staff makes decision through a majority vote process winner take all.
<i>Method of decision making</i>	A clear matrix of decision-making authority is in evidence. The leadership team represents a defined constituency. Decisions are made through consensus.	Decision-making authority is generally understood but not well defined. The leadership team may not have a well-defined constituency and most decisions are made through consensus.	There is not a generally held understanding of decision-making authority. The leadership team does not represent a specific constituency and while consensus is attempted decisions are often made by majority vote.	There is no understanding of who has the authority to make what decisions. There is no leadership team. All staff through a majority vote makes decisions.
<i>Evaluation method on implemented decisions</i>	Each decision includes an action timeline, who is responsible, and a leadership team review of the implemented decision. Decisions made are implemented for a one year minimum period and may not be changed until after the annual review.	Decisions are reviewed collectively on a yearly basis by the leadership team. A determination as to the success of the decisions made over the course of the year is shared with all staff. Recommendations are made for the next year.	Some decisions are reviewed and others are not. There are no particular criteria associated with what decisions are evaluated.	Decisions are not evaluated as to their impact and effectiveness. Staff who have worked in such a school for an extended period of time often complain that they continually are reinventing the same wheel.
<i>Evaluation review of decision making model</i>	There is an annual review of the decision-making model itself as to its effectiveness in serving the best interest of students, staff, and parents.	A review may occur when there is a particularly contentious issue where the decision-making model has not been as successful as in other situations.	There is no review but a decision-making model does exist that is somewhat functional.	There is no decision making model.