Using the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic Rubric to assess your implementation capacity: A self-facilitation guide

This document contains:

- A guide explaining the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic process and how to facilitate a self-assessment using the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic Rubric
- A printable version of the rubric for teams working at the state or regional level (this is also available as a separate document)
- A printable version of the rubric for teams working at the district level (this is also available as a separate document)
- A printable self-reflection worksheet for use by individuals (this is also available as a separate document)

To support users of this guide, we have also provided:

- A 15-minute video presentation introducing the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic Rubric and explaining the self-assessment process
- A downloadable, interactive self-reflection tool for use by a team.

What is the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic?

The Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic is a tool designed to support reflection by teams that are implementing accelerated pathways programs as part of the Accelerate ED initiative. It works by breaking down implementation capacity into 10 key elements and inviting teams to "rate" their current capacity for each element, pinpointing areas of strength and challenge.

The diagnostic process aims to create space for teams implementing accelerated pathways programs to step back from the day-to-day work, reflect on their journey so far and identify the implementation practices, systems and behaviors they will most need to strengthen in order for their program to deliver impact for students. As such, it is a tool for continuous improvement and problem solving, building on – rather than recreating – all the planning and thinking that teams have already done. The fundamental aim of self-assessing capacity to deliver is to ask "Based on what we know now, what could we strengthen to give us the best chance of success?"

The Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic was created for Accelerate ED, based on an adapted version of Delivery Associates' Delivery Capacity Review framework, which has been used to assess education and public service system implementation capacity at all levels and across the globe.

Who can use this tool, and when?

Any team (or individual leading a team) implementing an accelerated pathways program can use the diagnostic tool at any time. Whether you are still designing your program or whether you have been implementing the program for several years, the 10 elements of the diagnostic rubric are still relevant and should help prompt reflections that get you to constructive next steps.

However, the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic is likely to be particularly valuable for teams that:

- Are nearing the end of their design phase and want to assess their readiness for implementation

- Have begun implementation and want to pull up and reflect on progress and where refinements are needed to stay on track for delivering a proof point, or
- Are preparing to move from pilot to scale and want to consider how the implementation practices, systems and behaviors they will need in the next phase might be different from what has been sufficient so far.

There are two versions of the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic Rubric, one for teams leading implementation across a state or region and one for leaders implementing pathways programs in local school systems (in a district or group of districts). Choose the right version for you.

How can I use the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic with my team?

You can use the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic Rubric to do your own individual assessment of your program's capacity for implementation with impact at scale. If you want to do this, follow the instructions in the rubric, which should be self-explanatory. You may also find the Self-Reflection Worksheet at the end of this document helpful for recording your ratings and reflections.

However, usually you will get the most out of the diagnostic process if you do the self-assessment as a group exercise. The biggest realizations tend to happen when team members compare their ratings on the 10 elements, unpack the reasons behind each other's ratings where there are differences of opinion, and move to a new, richer understanding of the program's implementation capacity and how it can be strengthened.

Preparing for the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic self-assessment exercise:

- Decide who will participate. The exercise works best with 6-12 participants. Consider the different roles and organizational perspectives it would be helpful to include in the conversation and the potential group dynamics – not everyone needs to have the same level of prior knowledge of the program, but they do need to be able to engage in a full and frank reflective discussion.
- We recommend scheduling the conversation for two hours, but you may need longer with a larger group.
- Decide who will facilitate the conversation – for larger groups, or where multiple organizations are represented, it may be helpful to ask a trusted colleague to facilitate the conversation. This also has the advantage of freeing you up to participate fully.
- If you are facilitating the discussion, make sure you have read and understood the rubric. If someone else is facilitating, ask them to do this.
- Consider if there is background information you would like participants to review in advance of the exercise. This can be particularly valuable if some participants are newer to the team or if there is data or feedback from the field that speaks to any of the questions in the rubric but has not yet be widely shared.
- Print copies of the rubric for everyone who is attending, or make sure they know to come with a laptop/device on which to view the rubric.
- Gather any other materials you will need in the session to facilitate the voting and notetaking (see below).

Step 2: Conducting the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic self-assessment exercise:

- The exercise is a combination of individual and group reflection using the Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic Rubric.
- Each row of the rubric defines one of 10 key elements. It sets out questions to consider, as well as descriptors of what "weak" and "strong" capacity would look like for that element.
- In the session, for each of the 10 elements, participants will:

  - Take a few minutes to read and consider the relevant row of the rubric
  - Rate the element on a four-point scale (red, amber-red, amber-green, or green). Red elements are those for which current implementation capacity broadly matches the "weak" descriptor. Green elements are those for which current capacity broadly matches the "strong" descriptor.
  - Compare how they rated the element with other participants – discussing the key strengths and challenges that explain why they "voted" for that rating.
  - Agree on a consensus rating that the whole group can live with.
- In practice, it usually makes sense to discuss the elements in the three sections under which they are grouped in the rubric. So the group will consider and rate all 10 elements, but this takes the shape of three periods of reflection and discussion rather than 10 (which might feel overwhelming).

So the agenda for a two hour session would look like this:

Time	Activity
10 minutes	Introductions Recap the objectives for the session, which are to: ● Use the Ready-to-Deliver diagnostic rubric to reflect on our capacity to deliver equitable access to accelerated pathways at scale ● Identify the implementation practices, systems and behaviors we most need to strengthen in order to deliver impact for students ● Agree next steps Explain how the session will run
30 minutes	For the Delivery Plan section of the rubric (elements 1, 2 and 3): ● Individually, read the rubric and decide on a rating for all three elements (i.e., three separate ratings) – try to take around 5 minutes, and no more than 10 minutes for this individual reflection ● As a group, quickly record everyone's individual ratings for all three elements ● As a group, discuss and capture the key strengths and challenges in relation to each element and agree a consensus rating for each of the three elements
30 minutes	Repeat for the Data and Evidence section (elements 4, 5 and 6): ● Individually reflect with the rubric ● Quickly record everyone's individual ratings ● Discuss and capture the key strengths and challenges, and agree a consensus rating for each of the three elements
40 minutes	Repeat for the People and Relationships section (elements 7, 8, 9 and 10): ● Individually reflect with the rubric ● Quickly record everyone's individual ratings ● Discuss and capture the key strengths and challenges, and agree a consensus rating for each of the four elements
10 minutes	Summarize the biggest takeaways from the conversation Agree and record the next steps to leverage these insights to strengthen the program – ensure each next step has a named owner and deadline

Tips for facilitating a great session:

- Make sure everyone is on the same page about the purpose of doing this self-assessment exercise. You can also do this when you invite participants, but it's still worth recapping in your own words what you hope to get out of the exercise at the start of the session.
- Use the video we have recorded to give participants an overview of the self-assessment process and a brief explanation of each section of the rubric – or you can give your own summary if you feel confident doing so.
- Decide how you are going to capture participants' votes for the ratings, the group's consensus rating for each of the 10 elements and the key reasons for the ratings. We strongly recommend using some kind of visual record so that the whole group can see what is being captured. You can use the downloadable tool we've provided for this purpose (see below for instructions), but you could also record the ratings and reasons on a flipchart/whiteboard or using a virtual tool such a Mural.
- Pace the conversation carefully so that everyone is heard, but the exercise is still completed within the scheduled time – even with agenda shown above the time is likely to go quickly, so watch the clock and move folks on if you feel they are getting stuck on one issue/element.
- Protect time for individual reflection rather than immediately diving into discussion – that way everyone gets to vote independently without being influenced by the loudest voices in the room. Remember: one of the most valuable purposes of this exercise can be to help colleagues see where there are differences of opinion within the group (and equally where everyone is in agreement) and understand why.
- Where there is a divergence of views, push for a genuine consensus – a rating that everyone can "live with" based on what they've heard from. Don't just take the average of the votes. This means spending more time discussing those elements.
- Push for a relative spread of ratings across the 10 elements so that you're elevating the biggest areas of strength and challenge for the program, getting clear about where the team needs to focus attention for improvement. Remember: this is a diagnostic exercise to support continuous improvement, not a summative evaluation. A "red" rating doesn't mean things are awful or that anyone has failed – it just highlights a pressing need to build capacity. Likewise, "green" doesn't mean perfect – it just suggests a situation that needs to be sustained and refined.
- When you've reached consensus on all 10 elements, invite the group to consider if – looking at the whole picture – the ratings match what really feel like the biggest areas of strength and challenge. You can always make adjustments at this point.
- Even if you're pressed for time at the end, make sure to agree on next steps based on the insights that came up in your discussion – or at a minimum take an action to circulate the notes from the session and schedule more time to reconvene and discuss next steps soon.

Some groups of participants may appreciate more individual reflection time in advance of the session. If you think this applies to your team, you could consider sending the rubric and asking participants to complete the self-refection worksheet in advance. The balance to strike here is between providing more time for those who want it and not adding unduly to everyone's workload, or setting a task without the context you can provide in the session.

Using the downloadable, interactive self-reflection tool

This is a spreadsheet tool, in which participants can each use their own tab to input their votes for ratings on the 10 elements with a summary tab showing the number of votes cast and with space to select a consensus rating and some key reasons for the decision.

To use this tool you'll need to download a copy from the link above and then upload it to a space where all your participants will have/can be given permission to edit it in real time – for example, as a Google Sheet or an Excel file in Sharepoint.

I have questions – who can I ask for help?

For further information about this tool or the Accelerate ED initiative, visit www.accelerate-ed.org or email info@accelerate-ed.org.

Accelerate ED: Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic Rubric (state/region version)

The Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic process aims to create space for teams implementing accelerated pathways programs to step back from the day-to-day work, reflect on their journey so far and identify the implementation practices, systems and behaviors they will most need to strengthen in order for their program to deliver impact for students.

This rubric is specifically designed to support reflection by regional or state teams implementing accelerated pathways programs as part of the Accelerate ED initiative. In this rubric, "program" is used to mean the collective effort to expand access to accelerated pathways to credentials for high school students, particularly students of color and students experiencing poverty. "Implementation team" is used to mean the core group of colleagues involved in implementing and scaling the program – usually a combination of leaders from across intermediary organizations, K-12, higher education, workforce and student-serving organizations.

The rubric breaks down implementation capacity into 10 key elements (organized under three headings). Each row defines an element and includes key questions to consider, as well as descriptors of what "weak" and "strong" capacity would look like. Users of this rubric can use the questions and descriptors to rate their implementation effort against each element on a four-point scale (red, amber-red, amber-green, or green). Red elements are those for which current capacity broadly matches the "weak" descriptor – suggesting a pressing need for focused effort to build capacity in this area. Green elements are those for which current capacity broadly matches the "strong" descriptor – suggesting a situation that needs to be sustained and refined.

Structure of the rubric:

Delivery Plan
1. Define the ambition
2. Plan for implementation
3. Plot the path to scale

Data and Evidence
4. Understand progress
5. Evaluate impact
6. Use data to drive performance

People and Relationships
7. Secure program governance
8. Visualize the delivery chain
9. Build capacity for scale
10. Communicate and advocate for scale

Delivery Plan

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
1. Define the ambition *How clear and meaningful a definition of success are we working toward?*	● Is there a clearly articulated answer to the question, "What does success look like?" for this program? ● Is success defined in terms of demonstrating impact at a scale that is measurable and meaningful in the local context? ● Are all the partners involved in delivering the program working towards a shared ambition?	● It is not clear what the program is trying to accomplish in the long-run. ● Even if the program met its initial goals for growth, it is not clear that students and communities would feel a meaningful change compared to what was in place previously. ● Stakeholders – and even some key partners – are confused about the scale of the overall ambition.	● Success has been clearly defined as measurable ambition for what outcomes the program is trying to deliver, at what scale and by when. ● Achieving the ambition would represent meaningful change in the context of local needs – a true proof point for scaling equitable access to accelerated career pathways. ● All key partners and stakeholders support the ambition and could articulate it if asked.

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
2. Plan for implementation *How clear and realistic is the implementation plan to achieve the ambition?*	• Has the implementation team translated the Blueprint into a clear, actionable plan to drive the day-to-day work of implementation? • Does the plan identify a prioritized set of strategies for achieving the ambition, connected by a coherent theory of change? • Are clear leaders and adequate resources assigned for each strategy and action?	• Plans have not been built out or updated beyond the original Blueprint from the design phase (or, if the design phase is still ongoing, no thought has been given as to how the final Blueprint will be translated into an actionable implementation plan). • Each partner involved in implementation is working to their own plan – there is no single articulation of how the team is working to a shared set of strategies. • To the extent that strategies have been identified, they are not sufficient to achieve the ambition OR they are an unmanageable laundry list of tasks. • It is unclear who is responsible for delivering what or whether the resources assigned will be sufficient to achieve the ambition. • Program success rests on some big assumptions – e.g., on policy and funding – and it is not clear how the program could adapt to reach scale if obstacles arise.	• The program is being implemented according to a clear plan (or, if the design phase is still ongoing, we have a plan that is implementation-ready). • The plan is structured under a prioritized set of strategies, connected by a coherent theory of change; the implementation team is confident that these are the right strategies to achieve the ambition and are realistic in the timeframe. • Strategies are planned out in just enough detail to drive day-to-day implementation – the plan defines key actions over time, resources needed and named owners for each strategy and action. • Contingency plans have been developed for managing major risks that could prevent the program from scaling, including risks relating to policy levers and funding streams.

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
3. Plot the path to scale *Have the ambition and associated metrics been translated to concrete end targets and trajectories?*	• Is the Blueprint and/or implementation plan supported by numerical targets that are specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, and time-limited (SMART)? • Has the implementation team plotted the trajectory – a series of interim targets over time – for key program metrics, including the metric used to define the overall ambition? • Are targets and trajectories rooted in evidence of what is achievable from past experience or research?	• The plan is largely narrative – it is difficult to know if implementation is on track. • Where targets do exist, there is a big leap from the baseline (if known) to the target, with no sense of the path to get there. • Any targets that exist are the result of guesswork; program leaders have not considered whether the planned strategies will be enough to achieve the targets.	• SMART targets are defined for each of the program's key metrics. • The plan clearly demonstrates the expected numerical progress over time on key metrics, giving a clear sense of how the program will get to scale. • Targets and trajectories are based on available evidence about what can be achieved with the time and resources available, benchmarked against relevant internal and/or external comparators, and take into account the estimated impact of each strategy.

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
4. Understand progress *Does the program have the data it needs to understand progress?*	• Is data available to understand student progress and experience along the relevant pathway(s)? • Are partners sufficiently aligned on the key indicators that need to be tracked and protocols for disaggregating data by subgroup? • Are partners clear on their responsibilities for collecting, housing, and reporting data?	• It is not currently possible to track students' progress through the pathway(s) except through ad-hoc sharing of headline data. • Partners are using inconsistent definitions to collect student data; it is not possible to disaggregate key data by subgroup. • Role and responsibilities are unclear.	• The implementation team is able to tell the story of students' journey through the pathway(s) using a rich set of implementation and outcome indicators, including student interest, participation, persistence, completion, perceptions and programmatic outcomes (i.e., work-based learning experiences completed). • Partners are using consistent protocols to collect and share a common set of core indicators; all indicators are disaggregated to ensure equitable scale. • Partners are clear on their roles, allowing for key data to be collected, shared and reported efficiently.

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
5. Evaluate impact *How well is the implementation team able to understand the impact of the program for decision-making and evaluation purposes?*	● Does the implementation team have a strong sense of how well the program is working? ● Does the implementation team regularly analyze the data to interrogate trends and understand the root causes of performance? ● Does the program have a sufficiently robust evaluation approach to demonstrate a proof point?	● Impact of program activities is poorly understood; there is little sense of how activities are contributing to students' experience, achievement or retention in the program. ● Analysis of data takes place infrequently; trends are spotted too late to take action; discussion of root causes tends to be anecdote-driven. ● Data and measurement approaches will likely only allow for descriptive analysis of the program; there is no clear plan for summative evaluation.	● The implementation team has a clear understanding of why the program is performing the way it is; they regularly use both quantitative and qualitative data to identify trends and unpack root causes. ● Data analysis enables the implementation team to make timely course corrections to improve student experience and success. ● The implementation team has a clear plan for how they will demonstrate the impact of the program on student outcomes, including through the use of external evaluators (where appropriate); data to enable summative evaluation (e.g., pre/post measurements, relevant comparator groups) are already being collected.

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
6. Use data to drive performance *Are there regular data-driven conversations that allow for reflection and problem solving?*	• Does the implementation team have regular, structured conversations to review progress, solve major challenges, and make decisions to drive implementation forward? • Do these “routines” provide the implementation team with a shared picture of how implementation is going (using available indicators)? • Are routines well-executed, so that they enable the right conversations to occur and result in action?	• Conversations for monitoring progress occur infrequently, if at all; they are often canceled or postponed in favor of conversations about whatever seems most pressing right now. • Conversations do not focus on performance data, and instead focus on merely sharing what work has been done; if performance data are used, they center on headline metrics only. • Conversations about progress are not well-prepared and do not have a clear agenda; as a result, they frequently get off-topic and do not lead to clear conclusions or action.	• The implementation team (and other key figures if appropriate) have regular conversations to discuss progress, problem-solve, and identify what action is needed – both to keep implementation on track and to unlock potential barriers to enabling impact at scale (e.g., funding, policy). These routines occur on a regular cycle, to ensure that aspects of implementation are consistently reviewed. • Routines take into account relevant quantitative and qualitative data on implementation, including progress on key programmatic and outcome indicators, disaggregated by subgroup to surface inequities. • Routines are well-prepared, with clear roles assigned, resulting in a productive, focused conversation; team members leave with a shared picture of progress and clear next steps.

People and Relationships

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
7. Secure program governance *Does the implementation team have strong arrangements for managing implementation and engaging key stakeholders in support of the ambition?*	• Does the implementation team have clear governance arrangements and agreed ways of working? • Is there a single, well-placed person responsible for coordinating implementation and keeping the focus on the ambition? • Has the implementation team identified the 5-10 influential stakeholders who are critical to achieving the ambition and established effective ways to engage them?	• Responsibility for managing implementation is fragmented – the question of who is in the implementation team is fluid and creates confusion. • No one (or someone with too many other responsibilities) is in charge of coordinating implementation – seen as “everyone’s responsibility”. • Any program management arrangements are “check box” in nature, lacking the ability to influence key decision makers. • Key stakeholders beyond the implementation team itself have not been identified or engaged.	• The implementation team follows agreed ways of working, which are efficient and compatible with the systems and culture of each partner organization; team members know what is required of them. • If partners work together at a sub-regional level, governance is also clear – including the expected level of consistency between sub-regions. • A single person (with adequate skills, resources and time) has been designated as most responsible for coordinating implementation and holding team members to account for their agreed contributions. • Program management arrangements keep the ambition for scale and impact front and center. • The implementation team has built strong relationships with a coalition of influential people, and uses these relationships strategically to remove institutional, policy and funding barriers to implementation at scale.

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
8. Visualize the delivery chain *How well does the implementation team understand the chain of actors through which implementation must occur?*	● Has this "delivery chain" – the chain of actors, and the relationships between them, through which the program will be implemented at scale – been articulated and is it widely understood? ● Has the implementation team identified potential weak links and risks associated with implementation at scale? ● Has the implementation team identified "feedback loops" – opportunities for collecting data to understand whether implementation is happening as planned?	● The implementation team's picture of exactly who does what to implement the program is fuzzy; partners have differing views about how implementation will happen. ● Implementation risks are only understood in very broad terms or are assumed to be the same as in the pilot phase. ● The implementation team has little insight into what is happening "on the ground."	● The implementation team can clearly articulate, and agree on, the chain of actors through which implementation must occur; this has been documented for clarity. ● The delivery chain has been analyzed to identify potential risks as the program scales (e.g., complexity, bottlenecks, duplicated effort, inconsistency of provision, weak relationships and information funds, gaps in capacity and funding); robust plans exist to mitigate these risks. ● The implementation team has identified a range of ways to gather intelligence and data to understand what is happening along the delivery chain, even as the program scales.

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
9. Build capacity for scale *To what degree is building implementation capacity a priority for the implementation team and an ongoing endeavor?*	● Does the implementation team regularly and deliberately assess the necessary "skill and will" of individuals throughout the program to deliver on the aspiration? ● Is there a clear sense of what additional capacities will be needed as the program scales, and where, and a realistic plan for how to build them? ● Do the structures and processes within the program support the continuous building of capacity?	● The implementation team accepts the human and technological capacity of the system they are operating in "as is." ● There is an untested assumption that the human and technological capacity present in the system will be capable of growing with the program, without any deliberate effort to develop or marshal it. ● Organizational structures and processes inhibit or provide perverse incentives that prevent staff or other stakeholders from developing new skills would be valuable for the program.	● The implementation team is deliberate about identifying the skills needed for staff and other stakeholders to implement the program at scale – both in terms of what skill sets and certifications will be needed in greater quantities and in terms of the new skills, approaches or technologies that could make the program more sufficient or sustainable at scale. ● There is a clear, evidence-based, adequately funded plan for developing human and technological capacity to scale the program; partners understand and are fulfilling their roles in executing the plan. ● The program has built in opportunities for staff and other stakeholders to develop new skills; organizational barriers to learning have been removed or mitigated.

Element	Questions to consider	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
10. Communicate and advocate for scale *How impactfully does the program team communicate?*	• Are communications anchored in the program's ambition and implementation plan, and monitored rigorously? • Are communications targeted at the most important audiences (internal and external to the program)? • Are communications two-way? • Are communications consistent and effective in engaging stakeholders in the implementation effort?	• The work of implementation is disconnected from the work of communication, such that communications activities do not help (or even hinder) program implementation and scaling. • Communications are not targeted to different audiences; some important stakeholders are not reached. • Communication only flows downwards/outward; little or no feedback is gathered from key stakeholders. • Communications from the program are inconsistent and confusing; stakeholders do not feel engaged.	• Communications are anchored in the ambition and implementation planning; communication efforts are monitored and refined to support implementation. • A prioritized set of audiences has been identified; the implementation team uses insights to understand the different needs and motivations of each audience (e.g., students, families, educators, employers, policymakers) and has set audience-specific objectives to inform the message and means of communication. • Communication is two-way; feedback is collected and acted on. • Communications from the program are clear, consistent and valued by stakeholders; stakeholders throughout the program feel engaged.

This rubric has been adapted from Delivery Associates' Delivery Capacity Review framework for the purpose of supporting the Accelerate ED initiative.

Accelerate ED: Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic Rubric (district version)

The Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic process aims to create space for teams implementing accelerated pathways programs to step back from the day-to-day work, reflect on their journey so far and identify the implementation practices, systems and behaviors they will most need to strengthen in order for their program to deliver impact for students.

This rubric is specifically designed to support reflection by teams that are implementing pathways programs in local school systems (in a district or group of districts). In this rubric, “program” is used to mean the collective effort to expand access to accelerated pathways to credentials for high school students, particularly students of color and students experiencing poverty. “Implementation team” is used to mean the core group of people involved in implementing the program – usually local K-12 leaders, and potentially also partners from higher education, workforce and student-serving organizations.

The rubric breaks down implementation capacity into 10 key elements (organized under three headings). Each row defines an element and includes a key question to consider, as well as descriptors of what “weak” and “strong” capacity would look like. Users of this rubric can use the questions and descriptors to rate their implementation effort against each element on a four-point scale (red, amber-red, amber-green, or green). Red elements are those for which current capacity broadly matches the “weak” descriptor – suggesting a pressing need for focused effort to build capacity in this area. Green elements are those for which current capacity broadly matches the “strong” descriptor – suggesting a situation that needs to be sustained and refined.

Structure of the rubric:

Delivery Plan
1. Define the ambition
2. Plan for implementation
3. Plot the path to scale

Data and Evidence
4. Understand progress
5. Evaluate impact
6. Use data to drive performance

People and Relationships
7. Secure program governance
8. Visualize the delivery chain
9. Build capacity for scale
10. Communicate and advocate for scale

Delivery Plan

Element	Key Question	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
1. Define the ambition	Do we have a clear, meaningful, shared answer to the question, “What does success look like?”	It is not clear what we are collectively trying to accomplish in the long-run by implementing this program and whether that would represent a meaningful impact for students.	Success has been clearly defined as a measurable, meaningful ambition, with all key partners clear on what outcomes the program is trying to deliver, at what scale and by when.
2. Plan for implementation	Do we have a clear, actionable plan to drive the day-to-day work of implementing the program?	Plans have not been built out or updated beyond the original proposal/application to join the program. It is unclear who is responsible for delivering what or whether the resources assigned to the program will be sufficient to achieve the ambition.	The program is being implemented according to a clear plan, structured under a coherent set of strategies. The plan defines key actions over time, resources needed, named owners for each strategy and action, and consideration of how to manage major risks. The implementation team is confident that these are the right strategies to achieve the ambition and are realistic in the timeframe.
3. Plot the path to scale	Have we plotted the “trajectory” showing how the program is expected to scale – e.g. how numbers for student enrollment, participation in advising and work-based learning/ career-connected activities, and credit and credential attainment will change over time?	The plan is largely narrative – it is difficult to know if implementation is on track. Where targets do exist, there is a big leap from the baseline (if known) to the target, with no sense of the path to get there, or why we believe that is achievable.	The plan clearly demonstrates the expected numerical progress over time on key metrics (based on relevant benchmarking), giving a clear sense of how the program will achieve the long-term ambition. Targets are specific, measurable, ambitious, realistic, and time-limited (SMART), based on available evidence about what can be achieved with the time and resources available.

Data and Evidence

Element	Key Question	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
4. Understand progress	Do we have the data we need to understand student progress and experience along the pathway?	It is not currently possible to track students' progress in a systematic way and disaggregate key data by subgroup. Partners are unclear or inconsistent about what data needs to be collected by whom, and how data should be recorded and shared.	The implementation team is able to tell the story of students' journey through the pathway using a rich set of implementation and outcome indicators, such as student interest, participation, persistence, perceptions, and programmatic outcomes (e.g. work-based learning experiences completed). Partners use consistent protocols to collect and share a common set of core indicators, all of which are disaggregated to understand equity gaps.
5. Evaluate impact	How well are we able to understand the impact of the program for decision-making and evaluation purposes?	We do not have a clear sense of how well the program is working or how different activities are contributing to students' experience, achievement or retention in the program. Data analysis takes place infrequently; trends are spotted too late to take action. There is no plan for evaluating the program's overall impact.	We have a clear picture of why the program is performing the way it is, based on regular analysis of quantitative and qualitative data, which enables us to make timely course corrections to improve student experience and success. We know exactly how, in the long-run, we will demonstrate the impact of the program on student outcomes.
6. Use data to drive performance	Are there regular data-driven conversations that allow for reflection and problem solving?	Conversations about progress occur infrequently, if at all. There is no protected time to reflect on data; discussions focus on sharing general updates, often get off topic and do not lead to clear conclusions or action.	The implementation team has regular data-driven conversations to discuss progress, problem-solve, and identify what action is needed – both to keep implementation on track and to unlock potential barriers to achieving the ambition. These conversations are well-prepared and structured, resulting in a productive, focused discussion and next steps.

People and Relationships

Element	Key Question	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
7. Secure program governance	Do we have strong arrangements for managing implementation and engaging key stakeholders in support of the ambition?	Roles and responsibilities are unclear; no one (or someone with too many other responsibilities) is in charge of coordinating implementation. Some key stakeholders have not been identified or engaged.	Roles and responsibilities for implementing the program are crystal clear. A single, well-placed person (with the skills and time) is responsible for coordinating implementation and has agreed to efficient ways of working with all partners, including those at the state or regional level. The implementation team has developed strong relationships with influential stakeholders, which they leverage to strategically remove barriers.
8. Visualize the delivery chain	How well do we understand the chain of actors through which implementation must occur and the relationships between them?	Our picture of what is happening – beyond our own immediate work and direct relationships – is fuzzy. We have not thought systematically about the different people and institutions that shape students' experience of the program and the risks we might need to manage.	The implementation team has a shared, articulated understanding of the key actors involved in shaping the student experience. We have identified the potential risks and know how we will mitigate them. We have created "feedback loops" that give us insight into what is happening beyond our immediate bilateral relationships (e.g. how teachers/counselors are advising students).
9. Build capacity for scale	Do we prioritize building the capacities we need to run the program at the desired scale on a sustainable basis?	We are working on the untested assumption the program can be implemented with the existing human and technological capacity available. Organizational structures and processes inhibit or provide perverse incentives that prevent staff or other stakeholders from developing new skills that would be valuable for the program.	The implementation team is deliberate about identifying and planning for the skills needed for staff and other stakeholders to implement the program with impact at the desired scale. There is a clear, evidence-based, adequately funded plan for developing human and technological capacity as the program embeds and scales.

Element	Key Question	Weak readiness (Red)	Strong readiness (Green)
10. Communicate and advocate for scale	How impactfully do we communicate?	Communications from the program are inconsistent and confusing. Stakeholders do not feel engaged.	Communications from the program are clear, consistent, customized for and valued by target audiences (e.g., students, families, educators, employers, policymakers) and informed by a clear understanding of what each stakeholder needs to do to enable the program to have impact. Communication is two-way; feedback is collected and acted on. Stakeholders throughout the program feel engaged.

This rubric has been adapted from Delivery Associates' Delivery Capacity Review framework for the purpose of supporting the Accelerate ED initiative.

Ready-to-Deliver Diagnostic: Self-refection worksheet

Element	Rating	Reflections
DELIVERY PLAN		
1. Define the ambition How clear and meaningful a definition of success are we working toward?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	
2. Plan for implementation How clear and realistic is the implementation plan to achieve the ambition?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	
3. Plot the path to scale Have the ambition and associated metrics been translated to concrete end targets and trajectories?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	
DATA AND EVIDENCE		
4. Understand progress Does the program have the data it needs to understand progress?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	
5. Evaluate impact How well are the implementation team able to understand the impact of the program for decision-making and evaluation purposes?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	
6. Use data to drive performance Are there regular data-driven conversations that allow for reflection and problem solving?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	

PEOPLE AND RELATIONSHIPS		
7. Secure program governance Does the implementation team have strong arrangements for managing implementation and engaging key stakeholders in support of the ambition?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	
8. Visualize the delivery chain How well does the implementation team understand the chain of actors through which implementation must occur?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	
9. Build capacity for scale To what degree is building implementation capacity a priority for the implementation team and an ongoing endeavor?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	
10. Communicate and advocate for scale How impactfully does the program team communicate?	☐ Red (weak) ☐ Amber red ☐ Amber green ☐ Green (strong)	
Key takeaways and next steps:		

This framework has been adapted from Delivery Associates' Delivery Capacity Review framework for the purpose of supporting the Accelerate ED initiative.