|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strand #1: Foundation for Learning Community Culture** | | | | | |
|  | **Deep Implementation** | **Proficient Implementation** | **Partial Implementation** | **Minimal or No Implementation** | |
| 1. **Mission** | The school community (staff, students, parents, patrons) demonstrate in words, actions and/or documents the school's mission. The school regularly revisits and aligns all relevant decisions to the mission. | Staff members are able to demonstrate knowledge of the school’s mission statement that reflects a focus on learning and a belief all students can learn. Staff members can articulate how the mission guides decisions and actions in the school. | The school has developed a mission statement that reflects a focus on learning and a belief all students can learn. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Vision** | The school community regularly revisits the vision, including planning and documenting progress towards achieving the vision. | Staff members have collectively developed and demonstrate in words and actions a compelling vision for the future of the school. | The school has collectively clarified a compelling future for the school by developing a unifying vision. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Values / Commitments** | Collective commitments are annually revisited by staff. Assessment strategies are used to provide feedback on implementing collective commitments. | Staff members have developed and demonstrate in words and actions the values of the school through set of collective commitments. The school has aligned all decisions to collective commitments. | The school has identified and clarified values by developing a written set of collective commitments. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **SMART Goals** | The school routinely and annually revises SMART goals, systematically sustained over time. | The school has established a common understanding of a results oriented learning community by creating, implementing, and monitoring building and collaborative team level SMART Goals and Action Plans that align with the mission, vision and commitments. The school uses a data team process to develop SMART goals | The school has established a common understanding of a results oriented learning community by creating and implementing building level SMART Goals and Action Plans that align with the expectations of the school. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **School Culture** | The healthy culture extends to the community, as evidenced by academic, extracurricular and co-curricular involvement in activities. Assessment strategies are used to assess the culture. | The school has established a common purpose of learning for all, a collaborative culture, and a focus on results. | The school has created common knowledge of a PLC culture and analyzed the existing culture in order to facilitate change. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| **Notes/Evidence:** | | | | | |
| **Strand #2: How Effective Building-Level Leadership Teams Work** | | | | | |
|  | **Deep Implementation** | **Proficient Implementation** | **Partial Implementation** | **Minimal Implementation** | |
| 1. **Shared Leadership** | All staff are leading and sharing all roles, and the school has created a long term plan for training and positioning staff for leadership roles. | The leadership team facilitates and employspractices of shared leadership with delineation of roles, processes and responsibilities (district leaders, principal leaders, teacher leaders). | The leadership team facilitates practices of shared leadership inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Meeting Conditions** | The focus of regular meetings are proactive and responsive to specific building and student needs. | The leadership team meets regularly and effectively to provide direction for implementation. | The meeting conditions are inconsistent, or implemented in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Communication** | The leadership team collects and analyzes feedback data to improve school practices, and are transparent in sharing their processes and decisions. | The leadership team effectively communicates using norms, roles, and protocols (i.e., agenda, minutes, decision-making tools, inquiry processes, conflict resolution strategies). | The leadership team uses norms and protocols inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Progress Monitoring** | The leadership team consistently monitors the progress of collaborative team/school goals, evaluates and provides feedback and organizes appropriate professional development. | The leadership team reviews and provides progress monitoring of collaborative team goals and school goals. | The leadership team reviews and progress monitors team /school goals inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Feedback to Teams** | The leadership team has developed a systematic process for reviewing meeting records/artifacts, and provides descriptive feedback to collaborative teams. | The leadership team regularly reviews and acknowledges collaborative team meeting records and provides feedback to the teams to ensure fidelity of PLC implementation. | The leadership team reviews and acknowledges collaborative team meeting records and gives feedback to the teams to ensure fidelity of PLC implementation inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Support** | The leadership team identifies the support needed for collaborative teams based upon regular feedback/review and progress monitoring. | The leadership team provides the necessary supports for effective collaboration and communication processes (i.e., time, high-quality professional development, team structures, etc.). | The leadership team inconsistently provides support for collaboration and communication processes (i.e., time, high-quality professional development, team structures, etc.), or does so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| **Notes/Evidence:** | | | | | |
| **Strand #3: Administrative Leadership (Duties, responsibilities, and expectations of an administrative leader in the PLC process)** | | | | | |
|  | **Deep Implementation** | **Proficient Implementation** | **Partial Implementation** | | **Minimal or No Implementation** |
| 1. **Modeling** | The administrator consistently models the value of PLCs by:   * actively participating in all PLC trainings; * networking with other building and district leaders; * monitoring and participating in collaborative meetings; * building relationships and trust. | The administrator models values of Professional Learning Communities. | The administrator models the value of Professional Learning Communities inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation |
| 1. **Change** | The administrator proactively plans for effecting change by:   * actively assessing the cultural shifts associated with change * consciously planning for addressing conflict and/or problems before they actually occur. | The administrator leads the change process and addresses conflict when needed. | The administrator leads the change process but inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation |
| 1. **Communication** | The administrator effectively communicates to all stakeholders demonstrating sustainability and transparency. | The administrator communicates with stakeholders using appropriate communication methods. | The administrator communicates but inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation |
| 1. **Shared Leadership** | The administrator demonstrates deep implementation by establishing a systematic and sustainable process for sharing leadership, providing opportunities for leadership training to expand leadership capacity. | The administrator builds the capacity for shared leadership and practices by:   * actively participating in leadership team meetings * applying both loose/tight leadership styles * providing resources, structures, and protected time for collaboration. | The administrator builds the capacity for shared leadership and practices inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation |
| **Notes/Evidence:** | | | | | |
| **Strand #4: How Effective Teams Work** | | | | | |
|  | **Deep Implementation** | **Proficient Implementation** | **Partial Implementation** | | **Minimal or No Implementation** |
| 1. **Meeting Conditions** | All teams meet regularly or more than 45 minutes per week and collaboration systematically includes both horizontal and vertical collaboration. | Most teams meet at least weekly during contract time for a minimum of 45 minutes with appropriate resources and tools (e.g. markers, displays, student data, instructional strategies, etc.). | The meeting conditions for teams are inconsistent, or implemented in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Collaborative Meetings** | All teams are effective in using protocols for collaborative meetings, AND use a systematic recording and communication mechanism to maintain an accurate record of conversations and work done. | Most teams effectively use norms, roles and protocols (i.e., agendas, minutes, decision-making tools, inquiry processes, conflict resolution strategies, etc.). | Teams inconsistently use norms, roles and protocols (i.e., agendas, minutes, decision-making tools, inquiry processes, conflict resolution strategies, etc.), or do so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Corollary Questions** | The four corollary questions are regularly and systematically reflected in meeting agendas, conversations and dialogue. | All teams know and use the four corollary questions to guide their work. | Teams inconsistently know and/or use the four corollary questions to guide their work, or do so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Team Monitoring** | All teams regularly use a monitoring tool such as the Critical Issues for Team Consideration" to systemically monitor teaming practices, and *intentionally* submit to leadership teams for review and feedback. | Most teams use a monitoring tool such as the “Critical Issues for Team Consideration” to systematically monitor teaming practices. | Teams inconsistently use monitoring tools to guide the work of collaborative teams, or do so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Evidence** | All teams generate and collect accurate and appropriate evidence of their work, and a systemic process is in place for sharing evidence of student work publically in an appropriate manner. | Most teams generate and collect accurate and appropriate evidence of their work. | Teams inconsistently generate and/or collect accurate evidence of their work, or do so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Focus on Results from Data** | All teams focus on results using strategies and structures to facilitate data-driven decisions by:   * Collecting/Charting Data * Analyzing to Prioritize * Setting SMART Goals * Selecting Strategies * Determining Results Indicators * Monitoring and Evaluating Results. | Most teams focus on results using strategies and structures to facilitate data-driven decisions by:   * Collecting/Charting Data * Analyzing to Prioritize * Setting SMART Goals * Selecting Strategies * Determining Results Indicators * Monitoring and Evaluating Results. | Teams inconsistently focus on results using strategies and structures to facilitate data-driven decisions, or do so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Trust / Participation** | Teams intentionally monitor and address shifts in trust and participation. | Staff members demonstrate high levels of trust and engaged participation in collaborative meetings. | Staff members inconsistently participate in collaborative meetings, or do so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| **Notes/Evidence:** | | | | | |
| **Strand #5: What Students Need to Know and Do** | | | | | | |
|  | **Deep Implementation** | **Proficient Implementation** | **Partial Implementation** | | **Minimal or No Implementation** | |
| 1. **Essential Learning Terminology** | Teams communicate essential terminology to students who can demonstrate an understanding and use of the terminology. | Teams have identified and agreed upon essential learning terminology (standards, indicators, essential, nice to know, etc.) | Teams have neither consistently identified nor agreed upon essential learning terminology (standards, indicators, essential, nice to know, etc.), or have done so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Identified Standards** | All teams have adopted ELO's using appropriate criteria (endurance; leverage; readiness) or state recommendations. | Most teams have adopted ELO's using appropriate criteria (endurance; leverage; readiness) or state recommendations. | Teams have inconsistently identified essential learning outcomes utilizing common selection criterion, or have done so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Unwrapped Standards** | All teams have unwrapped and deconstructed essential learning outcomes including tasks such as:   * identifying skills and content * aligning horizontally and vertically * written in student-friendly language * determining Depth of Knowledge * Identifying the Big Ideas and Essential Questions * Identifying prior learning. | Most teams have unwrapped and deconstructed essential learning outcomes including tasks such as:   * identifying skills and content * aligning horizontally and vertically * written in student-friendly language * determining Depth of Knowledge * Identifying the Big Ideas and Essential Questions * Identifying prior learning. | Teams have inconsistently unwrapped and deconstructed essential learning outcomes, or have done so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Instructional Timeline (map)** | Teams regularly adjust instructional timelines based on data, and students are able to articulate to others their own learning progressions in each subject area. | Teams have implemented instructional timelines and identified instructional resources for instructing and assessing essential learning outcomes. | Teams have inconsistently developed instructional timelines and/or identified instructional resources for instructing and assessing essential learning outcomes, or have done so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Review & Revise Standards** | Systematic protocols are in place for teams to review, reflect and revise components of the ELO process. | Teams review, reflect and revise components of the ELO process. | Teams review, reflect and revise components of the ELO process in a limited way or extent. | | Little or no evidence of partial implementation. | |
| **Notes/Evidence:** | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strand #6: Assessment for**/**of Learning** | | | | | | | |
|  | **Deep Implementation** | | **Proficient Implementation** | | **Partial Implementation** | **Minimal or No Implementation** | |
| 1. **Purpose and Type** | All teams understand the function and purpose of assessment and have developed the appropriate assessment tools (classroom formatives, common formatives, common summatives). | | Most teams understand the function and purpose of assessment and have developed the appropriate assessment tools (classroom formatives, common formatives, common summatives). | | Teams have inconsistently identified the purpose and appropriate types of assessments, or have done so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Methods** | All teams have collaboratively determined appropriate assessment methods aligned to the standards:   * selected response * extended written response * performance assessment * personal communication * appropriate scoring guides * auditing and revising as needed. | | Most teams have collaboratively determined appropriate assessment methods aligned to the standards:   * selected response * extended written response * performance assessment * personal communication * appropriate scoring guides). | | Teams have inconsistently determined appropriate assessment methods, or have done so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Feedback** | All teams have developed and applied strategies and techniques for providing timely specific descriptive feedback. | | Most teams have developed and applied strategies and techniques for providing timely specific descriptive feedback. | | Teams have inconsistently developed and applied strategies/techniques for providing descriptive feedback, or have done so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Student Involvement** | All teams have developed and applied strategies for involving students in the assessment process in a systematic manner. | | Most teams have developed and applied strategies for involving students in the assessment process:   * Clear and understandable learning targets * Student self-monitoring * Student data notebooks * Goal-setting * Student-led conferences, etc. | | Teams have inconsistently developed and applied strategies for involving students in the assessment process, or have done so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Scoring** | All teams regularly and systematically utilize answer keys and/or scoring guides to collectively score student work. | | Most teams utilize answer keys and/or scoring guides to collectively score student work. | | Teams inconsistently utilize scoring guides to collectively score student work, or do so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Data** | Systematic and systemic protocols are utilized by teams to analyze student assessment (effect) data and adult behavior (cause) data with fidelity. Data is regularly used to audit assessments for validity and reliability. | | Most teams analyze student assessment (effect) data and adult behavior (cause) data to inform instructional decisions and make adjustments. Data is also used to audit assessments for validity and reliability. | | Teams inconsistently analyze student assessment data to inform instructional decisions and make adjustments, or do so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| 1. **Grading Practices** | Systematic , school-wide decisions regarding research-based grading practices have been made and implemented with fidelity. | | Most teams have examined current grading practices and the impact on student learning and have made collective decisions regarding appropriate grading practices. | | Teams have inconsistently examined current grading practices and the impact on student learning, or have done so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation. | |
| **Strand #7: Systematic Process for Intervention/Student Success** | | | | | | | |
|  | | **Deep Implementation** | **Proficient Implementation** | | **Partial Implementation** | | **Minimal or No Implementation** |
| 1. **Collective Responsibility** | | Success for all students is deeply embedded in the school culture and is sustained over time, with adaptions and modifications for individual students. | Staff members accept and communicate responsibility for the success of all students. | | Staff members inconsistently accept responsibility for the success of all students, or do so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Data Communication** | | There is a school-wide communication system for data, which is visible and accessible to all stakeholders, and involves other district buildings, both vertically and (when needed) horizontally. | Teams have a communication system for data (academic, behavior, attendance, entrance and exit criteria for tiers, etc.). | | Teams have an inconsistent or limited communication system for data. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Tier 1** | | Both cause and effect data are monitored and adjusted to increase fidelity of implementation across all aspects of Tier 1. Longitudinal data indicates tiered instruction is increasingly effective over time. | The school implements the essential components of Tier 1 intervention:   * universal screening 2 to 3 times per year * continuous and ongoing progress monitoring * evidence-based instructional strategies * provide additional time and support. | | The school inconsistently implements essential components of Tier 1 interventions (see proficient), or does so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Tier 2** | | Both cause and effect data are monitored and adjusted to increase fidelity of implementation across all aspects of Tier 2. Longitudinal data indicates tiered instruction is increasingly effective over time. | The school implements the essential components of a Tier 2 intervention plan:   * identification of intentional non-learners and failed learners * targeted, timely and directive instruction and assessment * data-driven decisions based upon multiple sources * more frequent progress monitoring. | | The school inconsistently implements essential components of a Tier 2 intervention plan (see proficient), or does so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Tier 3** | | Both cause and effect data are monitored and adjusted to increase fidelity of implementation across all aspects of Tier 3. Longitudinal data indicates tiered instruction is increasingly effective over time. | The school implements the essential components of a Tier 3 intervention plan:   * multiple sources of data to identify root causes of failed learning * specific, more intensive support delivered by trained professionals * targeted assessments for timely progress monitoring. | | The school inconsistently implements essential components of a Tier 3 intervention plan (see proficient), or does so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **Protocols for Enrichment** | | Data from enrichment work is collected and monitored, and indicates increasing rigor and/or achievement over time. | The school implements systemic protocols and structures for students who have learned what is essential (Corollary Question #4), which includes a balance of enrichment and incentives. | | The school inconsistently implements protocols for students who have learned what is essential, or does so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| 1. **School-Wide Implementation** | | A school-wide systematic process for intervention to support all learners has been developed and implemented across multiple academic areas and is monitored and adjusted over time. | A school-wide systematic process for intervention to support all learners has been developed and implemented. | | The school has inconsistently developed or implemented school-wide interventions to support learners, or has done so in a limited fashion. | | Little or no evidence of implementation. |
| **Strand #8: Continuous Improvement** | | | | | | | |
|  | | **Deep Implementation** | | **Proficient Implementation** | **Partial Implementation** | **Minimal or No Implementation** | |
| 1. **Induction** | | The district implements systematic and organized training for all new staff in the foundations of PLC and collaborative teamwork. | | Teams implement a structured induction process for new team members (all school personnel). | Teams inconsistently provide an induction process for new team members, or do so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation | |
| 1. **Action Research** | | There is evidence of multiple cycles of action research which result in changes to practice and is shared with multiple stakeholders. | | Teams engage in action research (e.g. Data Teams Cycle, PDSA Cycle) on an ongoing basis. | Teams inconsistently engage in action research, or do so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation | |
| 1. **Data Analysis** | | There is a building-wide, systemic process for data analysis and utilization. | | Teams disaggregate data, utilize it to change instruction, and share it effectively with multiple stakeholders, often through appropriate visual displays. | Teams inconsistently collect, analyze and monitor data for increased student achievement, or do so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation | |
| 1. **Celebration** | | School wide systematic celebration of student and staff accomplishments is goal oriented and occurs throughout the school year. | | Celebration of student and staff accomplishments is goal oriented and occurs throughout the school year. | Teams inconsistently celebrate growth and successes across all PLC components, or do so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation | |
| 1. **Fidelity** | | The monitoring results from teams are utilized to adjust adult actions and structures, and are communicated openly. | | Teams monitor the fidelity of implementation across all PLC components using an appropriate assessment instrument (i.e. Implementation Rubric, MO PLC Benchmark Assessment Tool, etc.) on an ongoing basis. | Teams inconsistently monitor fidelity across all PLC components, or do so in a limited fashion. | Little or no evidence of implementation | |
| **Notes/Evidence:** | | | | | | | |

**PLC Implementation Rubric Summary Sheet**

1. **NOTES: Transfer the results of the Implementation Rubric to this summary sheet by checking the level of implementation for each indicator. The term “ALL” in the Implementation Rubric is applied to the indicators where involvement of teams must be 100% for proficiency. However, should an indicator be determined to be proficient with a few exceptions, identify the exceptions in the NOTES section below, and briefly describe why the exception is acceptable and/or what plans are in place to correct the exception. Throughout the IR, the phrase “inconsistently and/or in a limited fashion” is used. “Inconsistently” will be defined as implements sometimes and not others, irregularly. “In a limited fashion” will be defined as may be implemented regularly, but poorly, partially, or inappropriately. Both or either descriptors may be appropriate for a given situation**.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Implementation Level** | **Deep** | **Proficient** | **Partial** | **Minimal** |
| **Strand 1: Foundation for Learning Community Culture** | | | | |
| 1. Mission |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Vision |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Values/Commitments |  |  |  |  |
| 1. SMART Goals |  |  |  |  |
| 1. School Culture |  |  |  |  |
| **Strand 2: How Effective Building-Level Leadership Teams Work** | | | | |
| 1. Shared Leadership |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Meeting Conditions |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Communication |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Progress Monitoring |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Feedback to Teams |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Support |  |  |  |  |
| **Strand 3: Administrative Leadership** | | | | |
| 1. Modeling |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Change |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Communication |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Shared Leadership |  |  |  |  |
| **Strand 4: How Effective Teams Work** | | | | |
| 1. Meeting Conditions |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Collaborative Meetings |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Corollary Questions |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Team Monitoring |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Evidence |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Focusing on Results From Data |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Trust/Participation |  |  |  |  |
| **Strand 5: What Students Need to Know and Do** | | | | |
| 1. Essential Learning Terminology |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Identified ELOs |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Unwrapped ELOs |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Instructional Timeline (map) |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Review and Revise ELOs |  |  |  |  |
| **Strand 6: Assessment For/Of Learning** | | | | |
| 1. Purpose and Type |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Methods |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Feedback |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Student Involvement |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Scoring |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Data |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Grading Practices |  |  |  |  |
| **Strand 7: Systematic Process for Intervention/Student Success** | | | | |
| 1. Collective Responsibility |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Data Communication |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Tier 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Tier 2 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Tier 3 |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Protocols for Enrichment |  |  |  |  |
| 1. School-Wide Implementation |  |  |  |  |
| **Strand 8: Continuous Improvement** | | | | |
| 1. Induction |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Action Research |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Data Analysis |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Celebration |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Fidelity |  |  |  |  |
| **TOTAL FOR ALL LEVELS** |  |  |  |  |
| **NOTES AND EXCEPTIONS:** | | | | |

**Signature of Principal:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Signatures of Leadership Team Members:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Signatures of Resource Specialists:\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**