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Overview
The following statements describe agreements for participation in learning experiences provided by CTLT and are intended to allow all participants to make the most of their time.

- Be present, participate, and engage fully.
- Listen to learn, limit side conversations.
- Monitor personal technology (turn cell phones off or on vibrate, close laptops during group activities).
- Pay attention to signals to rejoin the whole group – hand-raising.
- Move and engage as a key learning strategy.
- Practice and self-organize table groups; name a facilitator, recorder, reporter and time keeper.
- Use effective communication and exploratory language: paraphrase, clarify, summarize, question, and invite thinking.
- Suspend judgment, live in curiosity.
- Reflect continuously, complete evaluations and reflection logs.
- Provide feedback and post questions on the “Parking Lot.”
- Pay attention to what has meaning for you.
- Commit to follow-through.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcomes</strong></th>
<th><strong>I don’t know what this is</strong></th>
<th><strong>I need more practice</strong></th>
<th><strong>I’ve got it</strong></th>
<th><strong>I can facilitate others</strong></th>
<th><strong>Reflections</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provide and receive feedback about Data Analysis Worksheet and Data Analysis Narrative (Section III) based on Quality Criteria for UIP. <strong>This means:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish annual targets. <strong>This means:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Select and describe interim measures. <strong>This means:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>I don’t know what this is</th>
<th>I need more practice</th>
<th>I’ve got it</th>
<th>I can facilitate others</th>
<th>Reflections</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identify major improvement strategies and associated action steps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This means:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe possible implementation benchmarks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This means:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a calendar for monitoring school/district progress.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This means:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilitate local understanding of plan review.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>This means:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Priority Need Examples and Non-Examples**

**Priority needs are:**
- Specific statements about the school’s performance challenges.
- Strategic focus for the school.
- About the students in the school.

**Priority needs are NOT:**
- What caused or why we have the performance challenge.
- Action steps that need to be taken.
- Concerns about budget, staffing, curriculum, or instruction.
- Data interpretation.
- About the adults.

**Priority Need Examples:**
- Math achievement across all grade-levels and all disaggregated groups over three years is persistently less than 30% proficient or advanced.
- Median Student Growth Percentiles in reading for grades 4 and 5 and all disaggregated groups is below 30 and has declined over the past three years.
- For the past three years, English language learners (making up 60% of the student population) have had median growth percentiles below 30 in writing and math.

**Priority Need NON-Examples (They should NOT look like these!):**
- To review student work and align proficiency levels to the Reading Continuum and Colorado Content Standards
- Provide staff training in explicit instruction and adequate programming designed for intervention needs.
- Implement interventions for English Language Learners in mathematics.
- Budgetary support for para-professionals to support students with special needs in regular classrooms.
- No differentiation in mathematics instruction when student learning needs are varied.
Annual Targets and Interim Measures
## Planning Terminology: UIP Section IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target</strong></td>
<td>A specific, quantifiable outcome that defines what would constitute success in a particular area of intended improvement, within a designated period of time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Measure</strong></td>
<td>A measure (and associated metric) used to assess progress for a given performance indicator, at various times during a school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Major Improvement Strategy</strong></td>
<td>An overall approach that describes a series of related actions intended to result in improvements in performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Step</strong></td>
<td>Something that is done to make progress toward targets. Action steps are created for each strategy and identify resources (people, time, and money) that will be brought to bear so that targets can be reached.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Benchmark</strong></td>
<td>A measure (with associated metric) used to assess the degree to which action steps have been implemented. See also: Measure and Metric.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure</strong></td>
<td>Instruments or means to assess performance in an area identified by an indicator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Metric</strong></td>
<td>A numeric scale for a defined metric indicating the level of a variable of interest. For example, your credit score is a metric that companies use to decide whether to give you a loan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Performance Indicator</strong></td>
<td>A specific component of school or district quality. Colorado has identified four performance indicators that are used to evaluate all schools and districts in the state: student academic growth, student achievement, growth gaps, and postsecondary/workforce readiness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION IV: ACTION PLAN(S)

**School Goals Worksheet: Establish Annual Targets and Interim Measures**
Based on the data analysis and identification of priority needs schools should clarify the targets that will focus their improvement efforts for the next two school years. For the performance indicator areas established by NCLB, annual targets have already been set. Schools will need to set their own annual targets for the performance indicator areas identified by the *Education Accountability Act of 2009*. Annual targets must be identified in every performance indicator area where the school did not meet state or local expectations. These annual targets need to move schools aggressively towards state expectations for each performance indicator, while at the same time considering what is possible in a given timeframe given the schools’ current status. Schools must also identify interim measures, or what they will measure during the year to determine if progress is being made towards each of the annual targets. Annual Targets and Interim Measures must be identified for each performance indicator where the school did not meet state or federal expectations.

**Identify Major Improvement Strategies and Implementation Benchmarks**
Major improvement strategies identified by schools should respond to and eliminate or correct the root causes of each of the school’s prioritized needs. Major improvement strategies should also be research based, in that there should be evidence that using these strategies has previously led to improvements in student performance. Each major improvement strategy will include several key action steps. For each action step, the corresponding resources (federal, state or local) that will be brought to bear to complete the action steps should also be identified. For each improvement strategy, the team should also determine what data will be reviewed to determine if the improvement strategies are being implemented as intended. These measures are called Implementation Benchmarks.

**Monitor Progress**
Both Implementation Benchmarks and Interim Measures should be monitored, throughout the year, to determine if improvement strategies are being implemented with fidelity and are having the desired effects. Implementation Benchmarks can be organized in terms of what will happen in 2 months, 4 months, 6 months, and 8 months. Interim Measures should be based on local performance data that will be available at least twice during the school year. A baseline should be established for both district progress toward targets (based on interim measures) and implementation of major action strategies, and both should be reviewed regularly during the year. A calendar should be developed, at the beginning of the year, for when the planning team will monitor progress during the school year. Reviewing progress involves analyzing and interpreting data about the metrics that have been chosen. If progress is not being made, that may mean that the planned strategies and action steps have not been implemented fully, or it may mean that adjustments need to be made to the plan. Both should be considered and monitored and, if needed, the plan should be revised.
AYP Proficiency Targets, Safe Harbor and Matched Safe Harbor

AYP CALCULATION AND FORMULA:
To meet the AYP Proficiency requirement, students must meet targets for both reading and math. The specific targets are listed below and students scoring partially proficient, proficient or advanced on CSAP and Lectura and emerging, developing or novice on CSAPA are considered AYP proficient. The following formula is used to calculate percentage proficient:

\[
\text{Number of 12+ month students scoring partially proficient, proficient, or advanced on CSAP/Lectura or emerging, developing, or novice on CSAPA}
\]

\[\text{divided by}\]

\[
\text{Number of 12+ month students who took the tests and received a valid score}
\]

To ensure statistical validity, a 95% confidence interval has been included to account for variability in population size in schools or districts. If using the AYP Excel Calculator, the confidence interval around the school’s/district’s proficiency percentage will calculate automatically. If the upper limit exceeds the target, the disaggregated group will have met the AYP target, even if its actual percentage is lower.

Formula to compute confidence limits for proficiency targets:

**Upper Limit Formula:**

\[
\pi_U = \frac{n}{n + \frac{z^2}{2}} \left[ p + \frac{z^2}{2n} + z \sqrt{\frac{pq}{n} + \frac{z^2}{4n^2}} \right]
\]

**Lower Limit Formula:**

\[
\pi_L = \frac{n}{n + \frac{z^2}{2}} \left[ p + \frac{z^2}{2n} - z \sqrt{\frac{pq}{n} + \frac{z^2}{4n^2}} \right]
\]

Where:
- \( n \) = the number of students
- \( z \) = the critical value (CDE is using a 95% confidence level, so \( z = 1.96 \))
- \( p \) = the percentage PROFICIENT
- \( q \) = the difference between 100% and the percentage PROFICIENT
DISAGGREGATED GROUPS: The following disaggregated by groups are accountable for making AYP targets as long as there are 30 or more 12+ month students: White, African-American, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, English Language Learners, Low-Income Students, and Students with Disabilities. Information about groups with less than 30 students is not reported, to ensure confidentiality and statistical accuracy. The school or district as a whole and all disaggregated groups must meet the following targets in order for the school/district to make AYP.

AYP TARGETS:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Elementary School</th>
<th></th>
<th>Middle School</th>
<th></th>
<th>High School</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Math</td>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*2002</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>75.86</td>
<td>73.61</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>75.86</td>
<td>73.61</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>76.92</td>
<td>75.86</td>
<td>73.61</td>
<td>59.51</td>
<td>79.65</td>
<td>47.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>82.69</td>
<td>81.90</td>
<td>80.21</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td>84.74</td>
<td>60.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>82.69</td>
<td>83.64</td>
<td>80.21</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td>84.74</td>
<td>60.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>82.69</td>
<td>83.64</td>
<td>80.21</td>
<td>69.63</td>
<td>84.74</td>
<td>60.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>88.46</td>
<td>89.09</td>
<td>86.81</td>
<td>79.75</td>
<td>89.83</td>
<td>73.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>88.46</td>
<td>89.09</td>
<td>86.81</td>
<td>79.75</td>
<td>89.83</td>
<td>73.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>88.46</td>
<td>89.09</td>
<td>86.81</td>
<td>79.75</td>
<td>89.83</td>
<td>73.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>94.54</td>
<td>93.41</td>
<td>89.88</td>
<td>94.92</td>
<td>86.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>94.54</td>
<td>93.41</td>
<td>89.88</td>
<td>94.92</td>
<td>86.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>94.23</td>
<td>94.54</td>
<td>93.41</td>
<td>89.88</td>
<td>94.92</td>
<td>86.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Starting Point

Notes:
- Targets are percentages
- AYP Proficiency = Partially Proficient, Proficient, Advanced on CSAP/Lectura and Emerging, Developing, Novice on CSAPA
- AYP performance targets must be reached by the State overall, each school district and school as a whole, and as well as every disaggregated group of 30 or more 12+ month students. Disaggregated groups with fewer than 30 students are not held to the performance targets.
- Disaggregated groups = White, Black, Hispanic, Native American/Alaskan Native, Asian/Pacific Islander, Economically Disadvantaged, Students with Disabilities, and English Language Learners
SAFE HARBOR: A school/district/disaggregated group that does not meet an AYP performance target (adjusted for confidence interval) for reading/math proficiency may have an opportunity to meet the target by demonstrating a 10 percent reduced non-proficiency rate compared to the previous year. Safe Harbor is limited to schools/districts/disaggregated groups with 30 or more 12+ month students for two years in a row. Safe Harbor compares different students from one year to the next (e.g. 3rd – 5th graders for current year compared to 3rd – 5th graders in previous year).

**Safe Harbor Reducing Non-Proficiency by 10%**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>School</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Native American/Alaskan</th>
<th>Native Asian/Pacific Islander</th>
<th>Free and Reduced Lunch</th>
<th>Students w/ Disabilities</th>
<th>English Language Learner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproficient Results</td>
<td>41.0%</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>49.0%</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10% Reduction</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonproficient Targets</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>46.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003 n* Size</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number scoring in unsatisfactory range</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%Nonproficient ***</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made Safe Harbor?</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>N/A*</td>
<td>NA**</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MATCHED SAFE HARBOR: A school/district/disaggregated group that does not meet an AYP reading/math performance target or Safe Harbor may have another opportunity to meet the target by demonstrating a 10 percent reduced non-proficiency rate from the previous year by students who took the same test (CSAP or CSAPA) in both years. Matched Safe Harbor compares the exact same students from one year to the next (e.g. current 4th – 5th graders who were 3rd – 4th graders in prior year). Matched Safe Harbor is limited to schools, districts, and disaggregated groups that meet the 95 percent match rate: If 95 percent or more current 12+ month students (3rd graders removed) did not test in the prior year, school/district or disaggregated group is not eligible for Matched Safe Harbor.

For Additional Information Contact:
Alyssa Pearson
303-866-6855
send an e-mail

Donna Morganstern
303-866-6209
send an e-mail
Setting Annual Targets for State Performance Indicator Areas:
Turnaround and Priority Improvement Schools

An Approach:

1. **Focus on a priority need**
2. **Review state or local expectations**
3. **Determine timeframe (max 5 years)**
4. **Determine progress needed in first two years**
5. **Describe annual targets for two years**

**Review State Expectations**

The state has identified minimum expectations for school performance for each state performance indicator and sub-indicator. These expectations are provided in the School Performance Framework Reports (pgs 3-4). State expectations are defined as the minimum value for which a rating of “meets” would be assigned for the state metric included in the SPF reports for each sub-indicator. They include:

- **Academic Achievement**: the 50th percentile of % proficient or advanced students for Colorado schools.
- **Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps**: a median growth percentile (MGP) of 55 if MGP is < Adequate Median Growth Percentile, and 45 otherwise.
- **Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness**: Graduation rate at or above 80%, Drop-Out rate at or below the state average, and Colorado ACT Composite Score at or above the state average.

State expectations should be seen as a minimum for school performance. Local districts and/or local school stakeholders may identify higher expectations for school performance in each of the state-defined indicator areas.

There is no state penalty for not making annual targets. The sanction occurs after five consecutive years of receiving a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan assignment, in which case the State Board of Education may take the actions outlined in the Educational Accountability Act of 2009 (SB-163).

Setting Academic Achievement Targets
Setting Academic Achievement Targets

1. Determine the content area(s) of your academic achievement priority need(s).

2. Consider the 50th percentile of Colorado schools for % proficient or advanced for:
   - Your school level (elem, middle, high)
   - The content area(s) that is the focus of your priority need(s).

3. Is the percent of students who score proficient or advanced on CSAP in your school at or above the typical school in Colorado (50th percentile value)?

4. If not, how long would it take for your school to meet that level? Determine the timeframe for your school for meeting minimum state expectations (at most, 5 years).

5. How much progress can you make in the next two years? Write annual targets for the next two years based on this determination.

Setting Academic Growth and Growth Gap Targets

1. On which students do/es your priority need(s) focus?

2. For that group of students, is your school’s median growth percentile < median adequate growth percentile?
   - If yes, set a median growth percentile target of not less than 55.
   - If no, set a median growth percentile target for not less than 50.

   Targets can be set for any state metric (e.g., % catching up, % keeping up), but should include median growth percentile.

Setting Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness Targets

1. On which students do/es your priority need(s) focus?

2. For that group of students, is your school’s:
   - graduation rate at/above 80%?
   - dropout rate at/below the state average?
   - average ACT composite score at/above the state average?

3. If no to any of the above, how long would it take for your school to meet that level? (at most 5 years) Determine the timeframe for your school for meeting minimum state expectations (at most, 5 years).

4. How much progress can you make in the next two years? Write annual targets for the next two years based on this determination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Total Possible</th>
<th>Framework Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Academic Achievement** | The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:  
- at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.  
- below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools.  
- below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools.  
- below the 15th percentile of all schools. | Exceeds 4 | 16 | 25 |
| **Academic Growth** | If the school meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:  
- at or above 60.  
- below 60 but at or above 45.  
- below 45 but at or above 30.  
- below 30. | Exceeds 4 | 12 | 50 |
| | If the school does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:  
- at or above 70.  
- below 70 but at or above 55.  
- below 55 but at or above 40.  
- below 40. | Does Not Meet 1 | 4 | 25 |
| **Academic Growth Gaps** | If the student subgroup meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:  
- at or above 60.  
- below 60 but at or above 45.  
- below 45 but at or above 30.  
- below 30. | Exceeds 4 | 60 | 25 |
| | If the student subgroup does not meet the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:  
- at or above 70.  
- below 70 but at or above 55.  
- below 55 but at or above 40.  
- below 40. | Does Not Meet 1 | 5 for each subject area | 25 |

### Cut-Points for each performance indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut-Point: The school earned ... of the points eligible on this indicator.</th>
<th>Cut-Point: The school earned ... of the total framework points eligible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Achievement; Growth; Growth Gaps  
- at or above 87.5%  
- at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%  
- at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%  
- below 37.5% | Performance  
- at or above 59%  
- at or above 47% - below 59%  
- at or above 37% - below 47%  
- below 37%  
- at or above 47% - below 59%  
- at or above 37% - below 47%  
- below 37% |

### School plan type assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan description</th>
<th>Plan description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Plan</td>
<td>The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>The school is required to adopt and implement an Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Improvement Plan</td>
<td>The school is required to adopt and implement a Priority Improvement Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround Plan</td>
<td>The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Scoring Guide for Performance Indicators on the School Performance Framework Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Indicator</th>
<th>Scoring Guide</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Point Value</th>
<th>Total Possible</th>
<th>Framework Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Achievement</td>
<td>The school's percentage of students scoring proficient or advanced was:</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>(4 for each subject area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• at or above the 90th percentile of all schools.</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below the 90th percentile but at or above the 50th percentile of all schools.</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below the 50th percentile but at or above the 15th percentile of all schools.</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below the 15th percentile of all schools.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Growth</td>
<td>If the school meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(4 for each subject area)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• at or above 60.</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below 60 but at or above 45.</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below 45 but at or above 30.</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below 30.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Growth Gaps</td>
<td>If the student subgroup meets the median adequate student growth percentile and its median student growth percentile was:</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>(5 for each subgroup in 3 subject areas)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• at or above 60.</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below 60 but at or above 45.</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below 45 but at or above 30.</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below 30.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduation Rate</td>
<td>The school's graduation rate was:</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(4 for each sub-indicator)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• at or above 90%.</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• above 80% but below 90%.</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• at or above 65% but below 80%</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• below 65%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dropout Rate</td>
<td>The school's dropout rate was:</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• at or below 1%.</td>
<td>Meets</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• at or below the state average but above 1%.</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• at or below 10% but above the state average.</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• at or above 10%.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Cut-Points for performance indicator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cut-Point: The school earned ... of the points eligible on this indicator.</th>
<th>Cut-Points for plan type assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement; Growth; Gaps; Postsecondary</td>
<td>Total Framework Points</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• at or above 87.5%</td>
<td>Exceeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• at or above 62.5% - below 87.5%</td>
<td>Meets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• at or above 37.5% - below 62.5%</td>
<td>Approaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• below 37.5%</td>
<td>Does Not Meet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### School plan type assignments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan description</th>
<th>Plan description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Performance Plan</td>
<td>The school is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Plan</td>
<td>A school may not implement a Priority Improvement and/or Turnaround Plan for longer than a combined total of five consecutive years before the District or Institute is required to restructure or close the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priority Improvement Plan</td>
<td>The five consecutive school years commences on July 1 during the summer immediately following the fall in which the school is notified that it is required to implement a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnaround Plan</td>
<td>The school is required to adopt and implement a Turnaround Plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparison data

Academic Achievement

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 1-year (2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Elem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th percentile</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th percentile</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of Students Proficient or Advanced by Percentile Cut-Points - 3-year aggregate (2008-10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elem</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Elem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th percentile</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th percentile</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90th percentile</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

Decision tree to determine which scoring guide to use for Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gaps

Did my school meet adequate growth?

YES, met adequate growth

Exceeds 60-99

Meets 45-59

Approaching 30-44

Does not meet 1-29

NO, did not meet adequate growth

Exceeds 70-99

Meets 55-69

Approaching 40-54

Does not meet 1-39

Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness

State Average (Mean) Dropout Rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N of Students</th>
<th>Mean Dropout Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-year (2009)</td>
<td>416,953</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year (2007-09)</td>
<td>1,238,096</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Average (Mean) Colorado ACT Composite Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N of Students</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-year (2010)</td>
<td>51,438</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-year (2008-10)</td>
<td>151,439</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1-year vs. 3-year report

Schools receive a 1-year and a 3-year aggregated School Performance Framework report. CDE produces a report on the basis of three years of data to enable more schools to be considered within the same performance framework. Some small schools may not have public data on the basis of a single year because of small N counts for some performance indicator metrics, but a report on the basis of three years of data increases the N count.

Only one of the two sets of results (1-year or 3-year) is the one that will be the official plan type assignment for the school: the one under which the school has ratings on a higher number of the performance indicators, or, if it has ratings for an equal number of indicators, the one under which it received a higher total number of points and plan assignment. Note that some 3-year reports may be based on only two years of data if that is the only data available. The years of data included in a report are indicated on page 1.
## Progress Monitoring Calendar: Annual Targets and Interim Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Annual Target</th>
<th>Interim Measure</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>How will progress be monitored? By whom? When?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Annual Target</td>
<td>Interim Measure</td>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td>How will progress be monitored? By whom? When?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Major Improvement Strategies and Implementation Benchmarks
### Table III: School Restructuring Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>Role of SEA(^a)</th>
<th>Role of LEA(^a)</th>
<th>Staff Replacement</th>
<th>Additional funding(^b)</th>
<th>Additional personnel</th>
<th>External Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cobb Elementary</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Replaced principal</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holabird Elementary</td>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Replaced principal, experienced 85% staff turnover the summer between principals</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Elder 7-8</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Hired additional teachers, no staff replacement</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Middle</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Targeted staff replacement</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood High</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Intensive</td>
<td>Replaced principal, targeted staff replacement</td>
<td>Limited</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)We categorized the roles played by SEAs and LEAs in the restructuring of the five schools highlighted in this report. “Intensive” indicates that the SEA/LEA provided one or more resources identified as central to the restructuring effort by interviewers, “moderate” indicates SEA/LEA provided some resources identified as beneficial to the restructuring effort, and “minimal” indicates that resources provided by the SEA/LEA were not identified as important in the turnaround or that no/very few resources were provided.

\(^b\)Additional funding has been categorized only as “limited.” Most of the schools received some Title I restructuring funds, and schools used those funds to purchase desks, textbooks, and classroom items such as manipulatives.
Dramatic Change

School Turnaround is a dramatic intervention in a low-performing school that both produces significant achievement gains within two years and prepares the school for long-term transformation into a high-performance organization.

– Mass Insight,  www.massinsight.org/stg

Restructuring means making major, rapid changes that affect how a school is led, and how instruction is delivered. Restructuring is essential to achieving rapid, dramatic improvements in student learning.


Dramatic change for persistent low-performance is not a new idea . . .
- Comprehensive School Reform Designs (New American Schools Development Corp. & IASA)
- School Restructuring (NCLB)
- School Improvement Grants Under Section 1003(g) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965  -- January 2009 amendments –turnaround, transformation, restart or closure.
- Colorado SB09-163 Educational Accountability Act: Turnaround and Priority Improvement.

Steps to prepare for dramatic change:
1. Determine who will engage in planning for dramatic change.
2. Engage in a comprehensive qualitative review of the school (SST).
3. Engage school and community stakeholders (input to the approach)
4. Establish the school data infrastructure.
5. Determine the dramatic change approach.
6. Define a new vision.

Web Resources:
Center on Innovation & Improvement (CII):  http://www.centerii.org/
Learning Point Associates:  http://www.learningpt.org/
Mass Insight Education:  http://www.massinsight.org/
Public Impact:  http://www.publicimpact.com/school-turnarounds
School Turnaround Strategies That Have Failed
How to avoid past mistakes in addressing the needs of low-performing schools

Historically, states and districts have attempted to help low-performing schools by providing “light-touch” strategies that failed over time because they focused on only one aspect of the problem rather than addressing underlying systems and operating conditions. Innovation Fund and Race to the Top applications should not rely on these partial or incremental reforms. States and districts may also need to clear the “underbrush” of such approaches already in existence, or rigorously re-align them, in order to focus turnaround effort and dollars on the intensive support of effective intervention targeted by the US ED in its federal stimulus guidelines. Common turnaround approaches to avoid include:

1. **Layering Multiple, Overlapping School Partner Organizations**
   Over time, many low-performing schools have been inundated by organizations providing an array of services including tutoring, technical assistance, and leadership training. Often the activities of the various partner organizations are poorly aligned, involve multiple assessment frameworks, and lead to confusion and additional burdens on a school campus.

2. **Requiring Additional Improvement Plans**
   In the past, low-performing schools have been required to complete multiple school improvement plans for NCLB reporting, state accountability and funding requirements, and, in many cases, district-mandated plans. For many schools, writing such plans has become simply an act of compliance; the proliferation of plans leads to a fragmentation of effort, and school leadership must manage the competing accountability frameworks on top of their other work.

3. **Sending in External Improvement Teams**
   Often, states and districts have brought in external improvement teams to help schools in need of improvement. The teams are comprised of experts who, in a week or two, complete a superficial needs assessment of a school and a proposed plan of action, leaving the school site staff to implement their plan. Such a process does not help to build buy-in among school site staff or improve capacity to address needs.

4. **Creating Additional Categorical Funding Streams**
   In an effort to help low-performing schools, many states pass legislation providing restricted categorical funding for particular programs or interventions. While additional funding is welcome, the restrictions do not allow the budget flexibility required to align available resources with needs. School budgeting becomes an allocation balancing act rather than a performance-driven exercise focusing on identified school needs.

5. **Mentoring/Coaching from Retired Administrators and Teachers**
   Districts and states often hire retired administrators, teachers, and other experts to help mentor and assist principals and staff at low-performing schools on an on-going basis, but only for a few hours each week or month. If not adequately screened or trained, such mentors may provide little value to the school.

6. **Creating Large “School Improvement” Offices With Inadequate Authority and Accountability**
   Some districts or states create central or regionalized offices charged with helping dozens of low-performing schools. Because staff at such offices are often disconnected from the activities of schools, and do not have the capacity to support so many schools at once or alter the fundamental conditions under which they work, their activities become cursory and, at times, burdensome, for schools.

7. **Relying Solely on School Choice or SES for Schools Not Meeting AYP**
   *No Child Left Behind* requires that schools failing to make AYP provide school choice options and Supplemental Education Services (SES). In many cases, parents choose not to take advantage of the choice provisions in the law. After-school SES providers, while helpful in some cases, are often disconnected from school instructional programs and do little to improve student achievement.
The Way Forward for School Turnaround

A more successful and sustainable approach focuses on creating **turnaround zones with flexible operating conditions** in order to provide schools with sufficient authority over school resources. Rather than working with a myriad of partner organizations, districts need to align accountability and responsibility in a **new turnaround “lead partner,” who will manage small clusters of schools and be held accountable for student achievement** through clear, externally benchmarked performance indicators. In exchange for accountability, school leaders and their cluster lead partners will have authority over:

- **People**—Who is recruited, hired, and fired
- **Time**—The length of the school day and year
- **Money**—How school budgets are allocated
- **Program**—The implementation of a rigorous, standards-based curriculum

Lead partners should sign three to five year performance contracts in order to create the sustainability needed for turnaround. The turnaround zone approach is evidence-based, integrated, and designed for the scale-up needed to meet President Obama's and Secretary Duncan’s turnaround target of 5,000 schools in five years.

More Effective Approaches Possible Within a Turnaround Zone

Listed below are recommendations for how the less successful historical approaches to turnaround can be tackled more effectively within a comprehensive turnaround framework:

Layering Multiple, Overlapping School Partner Organizations

...**A more successful approach**: One turnaround lead partner should sign a three to five year agreement with the district that holds them accountable for the results of a small cluster of schools with common challenges or goals. The turnaround lead partner may contract with other supporting partners but all organizations working with the school must work through the lead partner.

Requiring Additional Improvement Plans

...**A more successful approach**: All plans should be consolidated into a single school plan that is strategic, concise, and action-oriented. School leaders can draw upon zone or cluster best practice models developed by the lead partner, while spending their time carefully aligning specific action items and school budgets with school-level data analysis in order to ensure programs are based on school need. Those creating the plans should be responsible for their implementation. These single plans should be easily accessible on-line.

Sending in External Improvement Teams

...**A more successful approach**: Effective action comes from the alignment of responsibility and accountability, and the presence of sustained support. Within turnaround zones, schools can form internal improvement teams comprised of a diverse group of school stakeholders, under the leadership of the principal. Lead partners can facilitate internal teams visiting other exemplar schools, help provide recommendations for the school’s strategic plan, and provide on-going support for the achievement of performance standards on which they are also being measured.

Creating Additional Categorical Funding Streams

...**A more successful approach**: States can provide greater flexibility in the use of categorical funding in exchange for greater accountability for results (following the recent federal lead in proposing waivers for specific 1003g allocations). Funding from existing and new restrictive categorical programs
can be consolidated into block grants (similar to charter school allocations). States should withhold funding if significant progress is not made within three years. In exchange for greater flexibility, states and districts should hold schools accountable for results.

**Mentoring/Coaching from Retired Administrators and Teachers**

**...A more successful approach:** “Turnaround specialists” may work, but only if they are part of or coordinated by a lead partner organization that provides on-going, comprehensive support to a failing school. Alternatively, if schools are provided with control over budget and staffing, they can develop internal coaching mechanisms such as identifying “master” teachers and paying them an additional stipend to assist other teachers over a sustained period of time. Within well-designed school clusters principals can also meet regularly to share practices, provide support, monitor progress, and mutually ensure results.

**Creating Large “School Improvement” Offices With Inadequate Authority or Accountability**

**...A more successful approach:** States and districts should give clusters of 3-4 schools under lead partners greater authority over school resources -- in exchange for significantly greater accountability and performance contracts. The role of the central district office would then be to manage the performance contracts, removing partners where necessary, and encouraging lead partners with successful clusters to replicate the results with a small number of additional clusters.

**Relying Solely on School Choice or SES for Schools Not Meeting AYP**

**...A more successful approach:** After-school programming can be a valuable part of successful school transformation, but only as part of a more comprehensive and integrated system of accountability for results like a turnaround zone. While outside providers should be integrated by the zone lead partner, school site staff should also be eligible to apply for competitive funding to create after-school tutoring programs that are completely aligned with the instruction provided during the day. Such instruction should be tracked through the school’s individualized student data system.

---

For the research on how school intervention to date has generally fallen short of what’s needed for transformation, and for more on Mass Insight Education’s proposed framework for more successful and scalable turnaround, see:

- the 2009 follow up *Meeting the Turnaround Challenge* -- an integrated set of reports and tools to help states and districts “operationalize” *The Turnaround Challenge* framework [www.massinsight.org/turnaround/reports.aspx](http://www.massinsight.org/turnaround/reports.aspx)

Mass Insight is an independent non-profit that organizes public schools, higher education, businesses, and state governments to significantly improve student achievement, with a focus on closing achievement gaps. The work of the Institute’s School Turnaround Strategy Group is defined by two convictions: that change at scale depends on the practical integration of research, policy, and practice; and that only dramatic and comprehensive change in high-poverty schools will produce significant achievement gains. The Group is working with states, districts, the developing partner marketplace, and national reform players to help them respond to US ED’s challenge to turn around the nation’s lowest performing schools.
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What Rural Districts Are Doing


“This brief summarizes the lessons learned during a February 2010 AYPF study mission to North Carolina that examined how rural education systems are providing high quality instruction and improving the readiness of young people for life beyond high school. Participants learned about how federal and state policies and funding streams affect rural school districts; the unique challenges of providing high quality instruction in rural settings; and innovative approaches to providing comprehensive education in rural communities. The brief outlines several key issues affecting rural education nationwide and discusses how current federal policy priorities affect rural education.”


http://www.centerii.org/survey/

“The purpose of this report is to describe a framework for district capacity building and improvement and…explore how districts can engage in rapid and sustainable improvement efforts. The supporting research, [the] framework, and a corresponding set of rapid improvement indicators [are] provided….Included in the report is a summary of issues for consideration by state officials and districts focused on creating the conditions necessary to catalyze rapid and sustainable district improvement.” Two detailed case studies of rapidly improving districts, urban and rural, provide illustrative examples of “how districts can engage in rapid and sustainable improvement efforts.” The rural district, Burrton Public Schools in central Kansas, reorganized the district office to support improvement efforts, supported collective problem solving, created a culture of shared responsibility and accountability, and built instructional capacity. Over a five-year period, student proficiency rates improved from the 50–60% range to 92% in reading and 88% in mathematics.


http://www.centerii.org/leaders/

How do states provide support for rural schools and districts? This webinar examines statewide efforts to disseminate, institutionalize and sustain strategies for school improvement in small and rural schools and districts, taking into consideration the challenges and opportunities inherent in these communities. Featured presenters are Andrea Browning (American Youth Policy Forum (AYPF)), Bryan Setser (North Carolina Department of Education) and Mark Bounds (South Carolina State Department of Education). Andrea Browning begins the webinar by presenting the context and reporting on AYPF latest field trip examining secondary education in rural settings. Bryan Setser shares one of North Carolina’s innovative strategies—the North Carolina Virtual Public Schools—as one state’s approach using information technology to address the instructional and curricular needs of the state’s students. Mark Bounds discusses how South Carolina addresses the human capital pipeline for the states’ rural schools by profiling the
strategies the states use to recruit, train, and support teachers and principals going to rural schools and districts. Presenters reveal how the various innovations and strategies are designed, implemented, and sustained and discuss the challenges and issues to consider.


(a) Testimony of Rollin Abernethy, associate provost for academic affairs, University of Wyoming, Laramie, and President, Wyoming P-16 Education Council

http://help.senate.gov/imo/media/doc/Abernethy.pdf

The presenter focuses on six strategies that “will advance a more rigorous, effective and seamless educational system and support high school reform.” These initiatives include:

1. A defined and rigorous high school curriculum;
2. Articulations by disciplinary faculty members across grades 9 through 16;
3. The Wyoming P–16 Education Council’s high school and college course comparison charts;
4. Common Core State Standards initiative and comprehensive standards assessment consortia;
5. Teacher preparation at the University of Wyoming; and
6. Engaging the community to support more effective schools.

(b) Testimony of Brandon Jensen, principal, Cody High School, Cody, Wyoming


This principal shares his “perspective about how high schools have changed and adapted to meet the diverse needs of students,” strategies being used at his high school “to engage students in their education and prepare them with the knowledge and skills they need for success in postsecondary education and the workforce” the transformation of the school culture to one that is “collaborative, learning-focused, and dynamic.” The speaker also addresses “some of the benefits and challenges that are specific to small rural high schools.”

(c) Testimony of Kevin Mitchell, superintendent, Park County School District #1, Powell, Wyoming


Superintendent Mitchell outlines the strategic plan of his district and highlights a number of initiatives. The strategic plan discusses for improving student achievement, ensuring effective, efficient operations, and communications with stakeholders. The district high school offers AP classes, collaborates with a college on dual enrollment, and has established grade-level academies to achieve closer student–teacher relationships thereby reducing school dropouts. It collaborates with local businesses to offer a school-to-work program and job shadowing. Several intervention strategies have been implemented to prevent class failures, including the Lunch Intervention Program, in which students “eat lunch in the media center where they complete missing or incomplete assignments with the assistance of a tutor.”

(d) Testimony of Jim Rose, executive director, Wyoming Community College Commission.
This speaker’s U. S. Senate testimony concerns preparation for post-secondary schooling and work. He focuses on three themes. He asserts that students “be guided in exploring and developing their own interests for future careers using the career pathways identified by the [ED] and adopted by the Wyoming Department of Education.” Wyoming has sought to improve engagement and relevance by enacting legislation that allows high school students both concurrent (on school campus) and dual enrollment (off school site or on-line) in college courses. To address remediation in post-secondary institutions, Wyoming is considering joining a consortium of states in developing a common assessment of common core standards. The state has also recently approved a plan “to strengthen linkages between the K–12 system and the seven community colleges.”

(e) Testimony of Lyn Velle, CTE coordinator, Campbell County School District “Restructuring Rural High Schools—A Career Academy Model”

This speaker catalogues the hurdles to be overcome in establishing career academies/pathways in larger rural high schools. High schools with 1000 or more students tend to see decreasing benefits in personalization and motivation from the implementation of smaller learning communities. Campbell County High School, with 1400 students, is in the process of implementing three career academies and phasing one out. The speaker addresses coursework, student and teacher recruitment and interests, teacher preparation and development, curriculum, community collaboration, school counselors, class scheduling, district and building support, physical setting, and so forth.


Testimony of Tim Mitchell, superintendent of schools, Chamberlain School District, Chamberlain, South Dakota

This speaker reports that students in his poor, high-minority rural district made significant academic gains between 2003 and 2009. He attributes this turnaround to “a relentless focus on instruction and professional development; the cultivation of teacher and principal support; the use of research-based instructional practices and strategies; and the conscious encouragement of collegiality and collaboration among all staff members.”


This paper asserts that the challenge of obtaining high-quality, rural education “often comes with difficult odds—ineffective financing, teacher shortages, and inaccessible or unaffordable services for children and families. The partnerships and approach of ‘full-service community schools’ may hold the greatest potential for addressing rural education’s challenges and ensuring that every child has at least a near-equal opportunity to succeed. This paper combines data from the
literature and other public sources, interviews, site visits, and the organizational experience of The Rural School and Community Trust in an examination of community schools from a rural perspective. It provides a context for rural community schools and discusses the need for clarification of the language used to describe the concept of community school. Three examples of successful rural community schools [in Kentucky, Vermont, and Maine] provide a framework for discussing the benefits, characteristics, and policy implications of rural community schools….These cases provide guidance and encouragement for low-resource, rural communities that often succumb to poverty and isolation and accept less than they would hope for their children.”
Developing Major Improvement Strategies: Practice

Background:
Major improvement strategies respond to priority needs (performance challenges), and should dissolve or eliminate the “root cause(s)” of the performance challenges. The steps in developing major improvement strategies include:

1. Focus on a priority need (or related priority needs).
2. Clarify the “root cause(s)” of that priority need(s).
3. Determine the scope of change needed – Would elimination of the root cause(s) require dramatic change?
5. Identify associated major improvement strategy (or strategies).

Priority Need(s):

Root Cause(s):

Will dramatic change be required to address this root cause(s)? □ Yes □ No

Develop a Theory of Action

1. Describe the probable future if no action is taken. If we continue to do what we’ve been doing, what is the most likely result?

2. Preferred future. If we eliminate the root causes of our performance challenges, what would our preferred future look like?

Description of preferred future by key stakeholders
### Stakeholders: What would they be doing differently?

| Stakeholder               | Actions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Staff (teachers)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership Team</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents/Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Brainstorm Major strategies** that would result in our preferred future:
   (Focus on root causes. Stay at the major strategy level.)

4. **Prioritize your possible strategies.**
5. Articulate a **Theory of Action** (for priority strategies)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>If...</strong></th>
<th><strong>Then...</strong></th>
<th><strong>And...</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This converts an explanation or process into an essential instructional practice. Example: <em>If</em> teachers formatively assess students and continuously provide them information about their progress towards grade-level expectations in writing.</td>
<td>This describes what students will be able to do as a result. Example: <em>...Then</em> students will have common understanding of their own writing and progress towards grade-level expectations and will be able to take action to close any gaps between current performance and the expectations.</td>
<td>This identifies how to evaluate the implementation of teacher practices and student learning. Example: <em>...And</em> teacher records will show the progress students are making towards meeting grade-level writing expectations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Write your "if statement" as a **major improvement strategy**.
Theories of Action

A theory of action leads to the identification of a Major Improvement Strategy, or strategies.

Developing a Theory of Action:

1. Describe the probable future (if no action is taken).
   - Consider performance challenges and root causes.
   - If we continue to do what we’ve been doing, what is the most likely result?

2. Identify a desired future (if action is taken, from the perspective of various local stakeholders)
   - If we eliminate the root cause of our performance challenges, what would our preferred future look like?
   - What will different local stakeholder groups do differently? (consider students, staff members/teachers, school leadership, parents/community)

3. Brainstorm strategies to get to the desired future.
   - Consider “root causes” that need to be eliminated.
   - Don’t get caught in the specifics, rather say at the “major” strategy level.

4. Articulate a Theory of Action (If, then, and, then).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If...</th>
<th>Then...</th>
<th>And...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS

WHAT IS A FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS?
- A tool for looking at change in an organizational context.
- Change is a dynamic process that generates energy and movement in individuals and in organizations.
- One approach to looking at change is to view the change as a dynamic between forces that are seeking to maintain a status quo, and forces that are seeking to drive the status quo to change.
- Kurt Lewin, who developed the Force Field Analysis, suggests that when driving forces are the stronger force, change moves forward. When restraining forces are stronger or equal to the driving forces, movement can be blocked.

WHAT DOES A FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS DO?
A Force Field Analysis:
- helps people to think together about all the facets of a desired change;
- develops consensus as an environmental scan, enabling participants to articulate key dynamics relevant to an upcoming change
- aids in comparing the positives and negatives of a situation;
- encourages honest reflection on the real underlying roots of a problem or situation;
- encourages creative thinking;
- promotes agreement about the relative priority of restraining versus driving factors; and it provides a starting point for selection of action steps.

WHEN SHOULD WE CONSIDER USING A FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS?
- This tool is useful when the team wants to approach change either from the perspective of strengthening driving forces or reducing restraining forces.

HOW DO WE USE A FORCE FIELD ANALYSIS?
- Select a major improvement strategy.
- Brainstorm the existing forces/factors that are driving the school towards that major improvement approach. The forces may be internal or external. List them on the left side of the T-chart
- Brainstorm the forces that are holding the school back or driving it AWAY from the strategy. List them on the right side of the T-chart.
- Clarify, explain, reach agreement on the items that have been listed. Eliminate duplications and combine items as needed.
- Prioritize the restraining forces* that would allow the most movement toward the desired state if they were removed.
  1) Have each person rank each statement (3 = “most important” to 1 = “least important”).
  2) Add up the points for each statement and put the statements in rank order.
  3) Begin action planning with the statement getting the highest number of points.
  4) Move through the rest of the list as needed.

*Driving forces can also be prioritized, but experienced users of this tool remind us that sometimes pushing positive factors can have a negative effect by creating resistance. Removing barriers tends to break the “bottleneck of change” rather than just pushing on all the good reasons to change.
### Major Improvement Strategy:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DETRIN NG FORCES</th>
<th>RESTRAIN NG FORCES</th>
<th>PRI ORITY LEVEL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>B.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>D.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>E.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>F.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>G.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>H.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>I.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>J.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Progress Monitoring Calendar: Action Steps and Implementation Benchmarks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Action Step(s)</th>
<th>Implementation Benchmark</th>
<th>Metrics</th>
<th>How will progress be monitored? By whom? When?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Month</td>
<td>Action Step(s)</td>
<td>Implementation Benchmark</td>
<td>Metrics</td>
<td>How will progress be monitored? By whom? When?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plan Review
## State Requirements for School Improvement Plans

Performance Plans, Improvements Plans and Priority Improvement Plans should include strategies that are appropriate in scope, intensity and type. Additional requirements are listed for Turnaround Plans on p. 2. *All* school plans must be posted on SchoolView by April 2011 and must contain the following elements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Requirements</th>
<th>Possible Location in Unified Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Did the plan meet requirements?</th>
<th>What still needs to occur?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Targets</strong></td>
<td>Plan provides ambitious but attainable targets that the school shall attain on the four key statewide Performance Indicators (achievement, growth, gaps and PWR).</td>
<td>Section IV (Action Plan). See the School Goals Worksheet on pp. 6-7 of the template.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trends</strong></td>
<td>Positive and negative trends are listed in the plan for the performance indicators.</td>
<td>Section III (Data Analysis). See Data Analysis Worksheet on p. 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Root Causes</strong></td>
<td>Root causes are identified for any low-performance at the school that must be addressed to raise the levels of attainment on the performance indicators and, if applicable, to improve school readiness.</td>
<td>Section III (Root Cause Analysis). See Data Analysis Worksheet on p. 5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Plan includes specific, research-based strategies that are appropriate* in scope, intensity and type to address the school’s root causes of any low-performance</td>
<td>Section IV (Action Plan). See major improvement strategies and action steps in action plans on pp. 8-9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources</strong></td>
<td>Local, state and federal resources that the school will use to implement the identified strategies are identified in the plan.</td>
<td>Section IV (Action Plan). See major improvement strategies and action steps in action plans on pp. 8-9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark and Interim Targets</strong></td>
<td>Plan provides detail on benchmarks and interim targets and measures to assess whether the identified strategies are carried out with fidelity.</td>
<td>Section IV (Action Plan). See major improvement strategies and action steps in action plans on pp. 8-9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Depending on the type of plan required, the strategies appropriate for each school will vary.*
Turnaround Plans must include the indicators listed on p.1. Furthermore, they must include **one or more** of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Options</th>
<th>State Requirements</th>
<th>Possible Location in Unified Improvement Plan</th>
<th>Did the plan identify at least one of the options? What still needs to occur?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Turnaround Partner**   | • A lead turnaround partner has been employed that uses research-based strategies and has a proven record of success working with schools under similar circumstances.  
  • The turnaround partner is immersed in all aspects of developing and collaboratively executing the plan and serves as a liaison to other school partners. | Section IV (Action Plan). See major improvement strategies and action steps in action plans on pp. 8-9. Activity should be tied to the data analysis and root cause analysis in section III.                                                                                          |                                                                             |
| **School Management**    | • The oversight and management structure of the school has been reorganized.  
  • The new structure provides greater, more effective support.                                                                                                                                             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                             |
| **Innovation School**    | School has been recognized as an innovation school or is clustered with other schools that have similar governance management structures to form an innovation school zone pursuant to the Innovation Schools Act. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                             |
| **School Management**    | A public or private entity has been hired that uses research-based strategies and has a proven record of success working with schools under similar circumstances to manage the school pursuant to a contract with the local school board or the Charter School Institute. |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                             |
| **Charter Conversion**   | (For schools without a charter) The school has converted to a charter school.                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                             |
| **Restructure Charter**  | (For schools with a charter) The school’s charter contract has been renegotiated and significantly restructured.                                                                                               |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                             |
| **Other**                | Another action of comparable or greater significance or effect has been adopted, including those interventions required for low-performing schools under ESEA (e.g., “turnaround model”,  
  “restart model”, “school closure”, “transformation model”).                                                                                   |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |                                                                             |
The following table is provided to help the district/school ensure that the specific plan requirements for Title IA schools identified for Corrective Action are addressed in the UIP template. The requirements are in addition to the Targeted Assistance or Schoolwide components. If a Title I school identified for Corrective Action is also identified for Turnaround under the State’s accreditation system, then the option chosen for Turnaround likely will meet the requirements for Title I Corrective Action.

### Title I Corrective Action Requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Element (definition)</th>
<th>Possible Location in the UIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corrective Action Options</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For schools identified for Corrective Action, the LEA must take at least one of the following corrective actions:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Institute a new curriculum grounded in scientifically based research and provide appropriate professional development to support its implementation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extend the length of the school year or school day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Replace the school staff who are deemed relevant to the school not making adequate progress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Significantly decrease management authority at the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Restructure the internal organization of the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appoint one or more outside experts to advise the school (1) how to revise and strengthen the improvement plan it created while in school improvement status; and (2) how to address the specific issues underlying the school’s continued inability to make AYP. §1116(b)(7)(C); §200.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section IV: Action Plans**

- See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9
- Identify the Corrective Action Option the district/school will take and provide a description of the process in section IV.
# UIP Coordination with Title IA Plan Components

The following table is provided to help the district/school ensure that the specific plan requirements for Title IA schools identified for Improvement are addressed in the UIP template. The requirements are in addition to the Targeted Assistance or Schoolwide components.

## Title IA School Improvement Plan Requirements
For schools identified for Title IA School Improvement, Year 1 and Year 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Element (definition)</th>
<th>Possible Location in the UIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strategies</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section IV: Action Plans</strong>&lt;br&gt;See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The plan incorporates strategies based on scientifically based research that will strengthen the core academic subjects of reading and math</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Core Subjects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section III (Data Analysis) and IV (action plan).</strong>&lt;br&gt;Priority needs should be included in the data narrative (p. 6) and the approach should be detailed in the action plans (pp. 8-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Policies and practices concerning the core academic subjects have been adopted that have the greatest likelihood that all groups of students will meet the States proficient level of achievement on CSAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professional Development</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section IV: Action Plans</strong>&lt;br&gt;See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9. PD should be tied to priority needs identified in section III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The plan describes how the school will provide its teachers and principals with high-quality professional development&lt;br&gt;• The plan describes how the funds for professional development will be used to remove the school from school improvement status&lt;br&gt;• The plan includes a teacher mentoring program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interim Measures and Implementation Benchmarks</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section III (Data Analysis) and IV (Action Plan).</strong>&lt;br&gt;For interim measures, see School Goals Worksheet (pp. 6-7). For Implementation Benchmarks, see action plans (pp. 8-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Specific annual, measurable objectives for continuous and substantial progress toward meeting the State’s proficient level of achievement on CSAP are established</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The school has provided written notice about the identification to parents of each student enrolled in the school&lt;br&gt;• The plan outlines strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical Assistance</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section II (Improvement Plan Information), Section III (Data Analysis) and Section IV (Action Plan)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The technical assistance provided to the school by the LEA and the state is described in the plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table is provided to help the district/school ensure that the specific plan requirements for Title IA schools identified for Restructuring are addressed in the UIP template. The requirements are in addition to the Targeted Assistance or Schoolwide components. If a Title I school identified for Restructuring is also identified for Turnaround under the State’s accreditation system, then the option chosen for Turnaround likely will meet the requirements for Title I Restructuring.

**Title I Restructuring Requirements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Element (definition)</th>
<th>Possible Location in the UIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restructuring Options</strong></td>
<td>Section IV: Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In its continuing effort to improve the instructional program of the school in restructuring, the LEA must prepare a restructuring plan to implement at least one of the following actions:</td>
<td>Identify the Restructuring Option the district/school will take in the “Major Improvement Strategies” section and provide a description of the process in Section IV (Action Plan).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Replace all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school’s inability to make adequate progress</td>
<td>See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Enter into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Turn the operation of the school over to the SEA if this action is permitted under state law and the State agrees</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Re-open the school as a public charter school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Implement any other major restructuring of the school’s governance that is consistent with the principles of restructuring</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table is provided to help the district/school ensure that the specific plan requirements for Title IA are addressed in the UIP template. All Title I schools must include the components of either a Targeted Assistance Program or a Schoolwide Program in the school UIP.

## Plan Components for a Title IA Targeted Assistance Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Element (definition)</th>
<th>Possible Location in the UIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Instructional Strategies and Program Coordination</strong></td>
<td>Section IV: Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of instructional strategies and programs which coordinate with and support the regular program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Subject areas to be served</td>
<td>See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Scheduling models to be used (before or after school; extended day/year)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Supplemental instructional activities that are aligned with the regular classroom practices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Methods of Identifying Students</strong></td>
<td>Section III: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of the method by which children with the greatest need are selected</td>
<td>Using information from Steps One and Two, incorporate into Data Analysis Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- PK – 2 selection criteria (can include teacher referral)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3-12 selection criteria (multiple objective criteria required)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Rank Order</strong></td>
<td>Section IV: Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of provisions made to serve all eligible children in rank order of need, including economically disadvantaged, disabled, migrant, LEP, and homeless children, as well as those who have participated in Head Start or Even Start or who received services from an Neglected or Delinquent institute during the previous two years.</td>
<td>See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Professional Development</strong></td>
<td>Section IV: Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description of professional development opportunities for Title I teachers and other individuals as appropriate. PD must align with the needs of Title I students served.</td>
<td>See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5. Parental Involvement</strong></td>
<td>Section IV: Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies planned to increase the level of parental involvement, such as family literacy, and that aren’t included in the School Parent Involvement Policy and Compact.</td>
<td>See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Parent Involvement Policy and Compact should be added as an attachment to the UIP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Element</strong></td>
<td><strong>Possible Location in the UIP</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Coordination of Resources</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section IV: Action Plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures to be used for coordination of Title I resource with other resources to enable children served to meet the State content standards and State student performance standards</td>
<td>See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7. Progress Monitoring</strong></td>
<td><strong>Section IV: Action Plans</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Process for reviewing the progress made by participating children, on an ongoing basis, and the process for revising the program as needed to provide additional assistance to enable these children to meet the State content standards and State student performance standards</td>
<td>See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following table is provided to help the district/school ensure that the specific plan requirements for Title IA are addressed in the UIP template. All Title I schools must include the components of either a Targeted Assistance Program or a Schoolwide Program in the school UIP.

Plan Components for a Title IA Schoolwide Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Required Element (definition)</th>
<th>Possible Location in the UIP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Comprehensive Needs Assessment</strong></td>
<td>Section IV: Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive needs assessment of the entire school (including taking into account the needs of migratory children that is based on information which includes the achievement of children in relation to the State academic content standards and the State student academic achievement standards.</td>
<td>Step Four: Action Plans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School Goals Worksheet and Action Planning Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate into Major Improvement Strategies in Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section III: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using information from Steps One and Two, incorporate into Data Analysis Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. Data Analysis</strong></td>
<td>Section IV: Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe how teachers are involved with the analysis of academic assessment (especially CSAP) to improve the achievement of individual students and impact the overall classroom instruction</td>
<td>Step Four: Action Plans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incorporate into Title I Accountability Provisions (following Action Plans)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3. Reform Strategies</strong></td>
<td>Section IV: Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Identify what all students need in order to meet the state’s proficient and advanced achievement levels.</strong></td>
<td>Step Four: Action Plans:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Implement scientifically research based methods and instructional strategies that:</strong></td>
<td>School Goals Worksheet and Action Planning Worksheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Strengthen core academic programs</td>
<td>Incorporate into Major Improvement Strategies in Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase the amount and quality of learning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- <strong>Explain how the reform strategies:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Meet the needs of historically underserved populations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Address the needs of all students, particularly low-achieving students who are at risk of not meeting the state academic achievement standards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Include strategies to support the needs of all students, especially low-achieving students, to include counseling, pupil services, mentoring (if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Include strategies to support the needs of all students at the secondary level, especially low-achieving student, to include college and career awareness, personal finance education, integration of vocation and technical education programs (if appropriate)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Element (definition)</td>
<td>Possible Location in the UIP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify how school staff will determine that all students’ needs have been met, including on-going evaluation for effectiveness and processes to make instructional adjustments as necessary</td>
<td>Section IV: Action Plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Describe how academic achievement results for each student are provided to parents in a language they can understand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Timely Intervention**

- Describe how timely assistance will be given to students who have difficulty mastering proficient and advanced level work
- Describe how at-risk students are early-identified

Section IV: Action Plans

- Step Four: Action Plans:
  - Action Planning Worksheet
  - Incorporate into Major Improvement Strategy in Action Plans

5. **Teacher Qualification**

- Describe the qualifications of all teachers
- Describe the qualification of all classroom/instructional paraprofessionals
- Include strategies to attract and maintain quality highly-qualified teachers

Section IV: Action Plans

- Step Four: Action Plans:
  - Action Planning Worksheet
  - Title I Accountability Provision: Teacher/Paraprofessional Qualifications (following Action Plans)

6. **Professional Development**

- Describe on-going professional development opportunities that are based on assessments of student and staff needs
- Include professional development opportunities for classroom teachers, principals, pupil services personnel, other staff, and parents

Section IV: Action Plans

- Step Four: Action Plans:
  - Action Planning Worksheet
  - Incorporate into Major Improvement Strategies in Action Plans

7. **Integration of Programs**

- Describe how programs such as Head Start, Early Reading Fist, Even Start, Parents as Teachers, etc. are integrated into the plan (as appropriate)

Section IV: Action Plans

- Step Four: Action Plans:
  - Action Planning Worksheet
  - Incorporate into Major Improvement Strategies in Action Plans

8. **Parent Involvement/Communication**

- Strategies planned to increase the level of parental involvement, such as family literacy, and that aren’t included in the School Parent Involvement Policy and Compact.

Section IV: Action Plans

- See Major Improvement Strategies and Action Steps in Action Plans on pp. 8-9

- School Parent Involvement Policy and Compact should be added as an attachment to the UIP.

9. **Transition plans**

- Describe how the school assists with the transition for children from preschool to kindergarten

Section IV: Action Plans

- Step Four: Action Plans:
  - Action Planning Worksheet
  - Incorporate into Title I Accountability Provisions: Transitions (following Action Plans)

10. **Coordination of Federal, State, and local services**

- Describe how other NCLB Title Programs (Title I, Parts B, C, F, Title II, Title IV, Parts A & B, and Title V) are integrated and coordinated with the unified plan, if applicable
- Integrate other programs (such as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, etc.)

Section IV: Action Plans

- Step Four: Action Plans:
  - Action Planning Worksheet
Required Element (definition) | Possible Location in the UIP
--- | ---
- List the various Federal, State and local programs that are consolidated within the plan (if applicable)
- Describe how the plan will be evaluated yearly by staff and parents, and updated as needed

**Plan Development**
The following describe activities that must occur, but are not elements of the plan:

- Developed/amended plan with the support of and in consultation with the district and other technical support
- Developed plan in coordination with programs under Early Reading First, Even Start, Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998 and the Head Start Act (as appropriate)
- Developed plan with the involvement of parents, other community members and school staff, including teachers, principal, program administrators (such as Even Start, Homeless Education, etc.), pupil services personnel, and, if the plan relates to a secondary school, students from such school.
- Made the plan available to the district, parents and the general public in an understandable, uniform format and in a language parents can understand
Process for Reviewing School Priority Improvement and Turnaround Plans

Aug: Office of Performance and Policy issues School Performance Framework Report, and makes initial recommendation that school adopt a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan

Oct: If district disagrees with CDE’s initial recommendation, district submits additional data, which may include evidence from third-party review of school performance

Nov: State Board makes final determination, assigning school to adopt a Priority Improvement or Turnaround Plan

Nov/Dec: Upon request of district, CDE provides technical assistance to district and school in developing plan

School Accountability Committee provides input to local school board in development of plan

Jan: Local school board adopts plan and district submits to CDE for review

CDE reviews plan and provides feedback

State Review Panel evaluates plan and makes any recommendations for modification to commissioner. Commissioner recommends modifications to local school board

Turnaround plans must be submitted to CDE for approval no later than March 30th.

Apr: CDE publishes plans on SchoolView
School Accountability Committees

Composition of Committees:

Each school is responsible for establishing a School Accountability Committee (SAC), which should consist of at least the following seven members:

- The principal of the school or the principal’s designee;
- At least one teacher who provides instruction in the school;
- At least three parents of students enrolled in the school;
- At least one adult member of an organization of parents, teachers, and students recognized by the school; and
- At least one person from the community.

The local school board will determine the actual number of persons on the SAC and the method for selecting members. If the local school board chooses to increase the number of persons on the SAC, it must ensure that the number of parents appointed or elected exceeds the number of representatives from the group with the next highest representation. A person may not be appointed or elected to fill more than one of these required member positions in a single term.

If the local school board determines that members are to be appointed, the appointing authority must, to the extent practicable, ensure that the parents who are appointed reflect the student populations that are significantly represented within the school. If the local school board determines that the members are to be elected, the school principal must encourage persons who reflect the student populations that are significantly represented within the school to seek election. Such student populations might include, for example, students who are members of non-Caucasian races, students who are eligible for free or reduced-cost lunch, students whose dominant language is not English, and

---

2 Note: Generally, a parent who is an employee of the school or who is a spouse, son, daughter, sister, brother, mother or father of a person who is an employee of the school is not eligible to serve on a SAC. However, if, after making good-faith efforts, a principal or organization of parents, teachers and students is unable to find a sufficient number of persons who are willing to serve on the SAC, the principal, with advice from the organization of parents, teachers and students, may establish an alternative membership plan for the SAC that reflects the membership specified above as much as possible.
students who are migrant children, students who are identified as children with disabilities and students who are identified as gifted children.

SACs must select one of their parent representatives to serve as chair or co-chair of the committee. If a vacancy arises on a SAC because of a member’s resignation or for any other reason, the remaining members of the SAC will fill the vacancy by majority action.

The members of the governing board of a charter school may serve as members of the SAC. In a district with 500 or fewer enrolled students, members of the local school board may serve on a SAC, and the DAC may serve as a SAC.

**Committee Responsibilities:**

Each SAC is responsible for the following:

- Recommending to the principal of the school priorities for spending school moneys;
- Making recommendations to the principal of the school and the superintendent concerning preparation of a school Performance or Improvement plan, if either type of plan is required;
- Making recommendations to the local school board concerning preparation of a school Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan, if either type of plan is required; and
- Meeting at least quarterly to discuss whether school leadership, personnel, and infrastructure are advancing or impeding implementation of the school’s Performance, Improvement, Priority Improvement, or Turnaround plan, whichever is applicable, and other progress pertinent to the school’s accreditation contract.