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# About

This handbook provides an overview of the Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) process, as well as guidance and support in the process of planning for and creating a school’s UIP.



**Timeline**

**February - May: UIP trainings**

**July 15: Completed first draft of UIP due for renewal schools**

**August 15th: Completed first draft of UIP in online tool**

**September 1st - 15th: Feedback from CSI, make any required updates based on SPF**

**October 15th: Final draft of UIP due**

**November: Final UIPs submitted to CDE for public posting**

***Priority Improvement/Turnaround schools only:* Additional CDE feedback received in March**

**Accessing Online UIP System**

To log on, go to: <https://cdeapps.cde.state.co.us/index.html>

Click “Unified Improvement Planning Online System- School Users”



You will be prompted to enter a username and password. If you do not have a username, please contact Jessica Welch (jessicawelch@csi.state.co.us). Only school leaders who will be completing the UIP will be given log-on credentials.

Once you’ve logged in, click the UIP Home button, which will take you to the UIP navigation page referenced in this document.

**General Considerations for UIP**

The UIP is a publicly available document. As such, when creating your UIP avoid:

* Reporting any achievement data for student groups smaller than 16 students (n<16) and growth data for student groups smaller than 20 students (n<20).
* Making any references that could be construed as negative about the student or family school population (i.e., “students lack motivation”, “parents failed to submit xxx documentation”).
* Focusing on any aspect or issue that is outside the control of the school and/or adult actions. For example, rather than focusing on the lack of academic readiness of incoming students, focus on improving systems that can remediate gaps in student learning.

# Section III, Tab 2: Brief Description

* **Online Support: Where is this in the online system?**



* **Content: What should this section include?**

This section should give a brief “tour” of your school. This section may include:

* Population and demographics
	+ Enrollment, changes in demographics, mobility over the past 2-3 years
* Leadership and staff
	+ Human capital, staff turnover and longevity, priorities
* Instructional model
	+ Assessments, curriculum, programs and any changes in these areas over the past 2-3 years
* Community and family involvement
	+ How is your family community involved in school planning and decision making\*
* Culture and climate
* History of school plan type (improvement, performance, etc.)
* UIP development process
	+ Who was involved?
	+ What was the process?
	+ How were different stakeholders involved?
	+ Who participated in the analysis of the school’s data?
	+ How was analysis conducted (try to include detail beyond “staff determined” or “based on data we concluded”)

*\*Indicates new ESSA requirements*

* **Common Pitfalls: What common issues can be avoided?**
* Make sure to include descriptions of unique programming (Dual Language, Montessori, Core Knowledge, etc.) Don’t assume the reader knows what makes your model unique, and avoid using model-specific jargon.
* Delving into data analysis. Save this for the “Current Performance” section.
* **Exemplars: What does a model example look like for this section?**

This section includes modified exemplars from CSI schools.

|  |
| --- |
| Mountain Song Community School: Brief Description |
| Mountain Song Community School (MSCS), located in Colorado Springs, CO, is a charter school authorized by the Colorado Charter School Institute.  The mission of MSCS is to develop healthy, confident, free-thinking, self-directed children who are passionately engaged with their education and empowered to contribute positively to the world.  To achieve this goal, MSCS utilizes Waldorf educational methods and philosophy integrated with Colorado Academic Standards, and evidence-based curriculum. We are entering our sixth year of operation and serve approximately 315 students in grades K-8, including a Homeschool Enrichment Program for grades 1-8.  The school's population includes about 30% of students eligible for free/reduced lunch (FRL) and is predominately White with approximately 69% of students identifying as White or Caucasian, 22% identifying as Hispanic, and 7% identifying as two or more races.  The remaining 2% identify as Asian, Black or African American, American Indian or Alaskan Native, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander.  Approximately 14% of the student population has an Individualized Education Plan and are receiving Special Education Services.  We currently do not have students who are Non- or Limited-English Proficient.  Our overall mobility rate (unduplicated) from last End of Year 2018 was 14.8%.In its first year, MSCS was given the accreditation rating of Turnaround due to the lower than acceptable performance in Academic Growth and Academic Growth Gap measures based on that year's TCAP scores.  The school improved its status in SY15-16 to Performance with Distinction.  The school has maintained its Performance rating through SY17-18 and currently holds a rating of Performance.After six formative years of operation, Mountain Song still continues to thrive and growth despite its turbulent events and fluctuation of faculty members and administrators.  The school's resilience and strength stem from its dedicated staff and community members, our proven curriculum, and our amazing students to whom we all strive to serve to our greatest capacities.  During the course of the last school year (2017-2018), a new shared leadership model (developed initially to operate temporarily during a search for a replacement for the outgoing Executive Director) proved to be a more stable and sustainable model for the administration and operation of the school.  This Interim Administration Team included the former Games and Movement Teacher, Laura Hassell, Dan Kurschner, the Business Manager, and, Sarah White, the Registrar/School Performance Manager.  The Interim Administration Team members were selected by the Board of Directors because of their roles at the school, their previous work experiences, and dedication to the success of MSCS.  After positive survey results and feedback from community and staff members, the MSCS Board of Directors decided to continue the three-fold governance model in handling the daily fiduciary, disciplinary, and operational functions of the school.  Laura Hassell declined the invitation to continue to serve in her role as Principal and resumed her previous position as Games and Movement Teacher.  A new Principal, Dr. Teresa Woods, was hired in June 2018.  Dr. Woods carries with her deep knowledge and experience in Waldorf education, science, and public education curriculum and alignment.  Dan Kurschner and Sarah White continue to serve in their administrative roles with added executive responsibilities. Collectively serving as the Executive Leadership Team (ELT), the Principal, Director of Operations, and Director of School Performance make consensus-based decisions for the main administrative functions of the school.  The ELT's focus this year is to provide grounding and stability within the school through multiple improvement strategies including: increasing rigor throughout the grades; strengthening and improving classroom management practices in the classrooms; providing professional development for teachers; maintaining positive teacher retention; developing fundraising and community development strategies and goals; and, continuing to build on the strategic identification of students with academic and behavioral needs and the interventions to help them succeed.  The ELT will refer to last year's UIP action steps and goals, along with the goals outlined in the five-year strategic plan created in Spring 2018, as guideposts for making its executive decisions through the year.The primary authors of the UIP are the ELT members.  The UIP goals and actions steps were identified and developed by the ELT, the faculty, Interventionists, Special Education Department, the Board of Directors, and the School Accountability Committee.  The School Accountability Committee reviewed the draft major improvement strategies and priority performance challenges on September 10, 2018 and provided suggestions for increasing parental involvement to address attendance and enrollment issues.   The draft UIP was presented to the MSCS Board of Directors on October 2, 2018 who approved the major improvement strategies.  We will submit the final draft UIP to the Charter School Institute on or before October 15, 2018.   |

# Section III, Tab 3: Prior Year’s Targets

* **Online Support: Where is this in the online system?**



* **Content: What should this section include?**

This section should identify progress towards each target set in the school’s prior UIP, and should include:

* An overview of past target against current performance
	+ What was the previous year’s target?
	+ What was the actual performance on that metric?
	+ Make sure assessment and metric match (if target was CMAS Math mean scale score, provide CMAS Math mean scale score results).
* A reflection on why targets were met or not met (under “Provide Overall Reflection on Targets for XXX=”)
	+ Was the target met or not met? How close or far was actual performance from the target?
	+ Tie performance on target to associated Major Improvement Strategy
* **Common Pitfalls: What common issues can be avoided?**
* Does not include last year’s targets (only an issue for schools who did not use the online system for their last UIP; schools who did use the online tool will have their prior targets auto-populated once they select “Copy from last year”).
* Does not include current data for each target set.
* **Exemplars: What does a model example look like for this section?**

This section includes modified exemplars from CSI schools.

|  |
| --- |
| High Point Academy: Academic Achievement |
| ***Prior Year Target:***According to our end of year STAR interim assessment data, our target for the percent of students who are at or above the 50th percentile rank are: Elementary Math - 56th percentile Middle School Math - 42nd percentile Elementary Writing - 77th percentile Middle School Writing - 67th percentile Elementary Reading - 67th percentile Middle School Reading - 56th percentile ***Performance:***Elementary Math - The target was not met (51%). Middle School Math - The target was met (45%). Elementary Writing - The target was not met (35%). Middle School Writing - The target was not met (34%). Elementary Reading - The target was not met (46%). Middle School Reading - The target was not met (44%). While overall we did not meet the targets (except for middle school math), we did see growth in both math and reading for every single grade level when you compare our fall scores to our spring scores. Within the elementary grades we saw the most achievement growth in 4th grade reading. Within the middle school grades, we saw the highest achievement growth in 7th grade math. Regardless of this excellent fall to spring growth, we are seeing a declining trend from year to year in our students who are performing at or above the 50th percentile rank.***Prior Year Target:***By spring of 2018, middle school will have a mean scale score of 726 in math as measured by CMAS. ***Performance:***The target was not met. The middle school mean scale score was 720 as measured by CMAS. Although we came close to our target and we saw huge gains in our 7th grade math scores, both our 6th and 8th grade math scores did not see the achievement score we were targeting.***Prior Year Target:***By spring of 2018, the elementary school will have a mean scale score of 737 in ELA as measured by CMAS. ***Performance:***The target was not met. The elementary mean scale score for ELA was 733. Once again, we were very close to reaching our target. Our 4th grade students showed the most growth, where our 5th grade students did not see near as much growth.***Prior Year Target:***By spring of 2018, the elementary school will have a mean scale score of 730 in math as measured by CMAS. ***Performance:***The target was not met. The mean scale score for math in elementary was 727, which is very close to our target score.Reflection: High Point achievement mean scale scores saw a decline from 2016 to 2017 in math in our elementary school. While we did not meet the overall achievement target for elementary math, we did see growth from 2017 to 2018. In 2017 the elementary overall mean scale score was 725 and in 2018 the overall mean scale score was 727. In addition we saw an increase in our mean scale score in 3rd and 5th grade. Specifically in 5th grade we saw the mean scale score increase from 715 in 2017 to 727 in 2018. We saw some growth in the percent of student that met or exceeded expectations on CMAS in 3rd grade. In 2017 22% of students met or exceeded expectations and in 2018 32% of students met or exceeded expectations. In 5th grade we saw a similar upward trend. In 2017 5% of students met or exceeded expectations and in 2018 24% of students met or exceeded expectation.With regard to middle school math we saw some growth and an upward trend in our mean scale scores. In 6th grade our mean scale score in 2017 was 718 and in 2018 the score increased to 721. Our 7th grade class saw an increase from 723 to 724. In 8th grade our mean scale score also saw an increase from 718 to 719. We saw some growth in the percent of students that met or exceeded expectations in 6th grade from 9% to 11%. Our elementary ELA achievement scores have also seen growth from prior years. In 3rd grade, in 2017 the mean scale score was 728 and in 2018 the mean scale score increased to 731. In 5th grade we saw a slight increase in mean scale score from 734 to 735. We also saw an increase in the percent of students that met or exceeded expectations in 3rd grade ELA from 19% in 2017 to 32% in 2018. Middle school ELA achievement scores in 6th and 7th grade remained in the meets category. The overall mean scale score dropped one point.Other increases to note in achievement are, the mean scale score in ELA with our GT sub group. In 2017 the GT mean scale score was 722 and in 2018 it increased to 778. We also saw a slight increase in our minority student mean scale score. In 2017 the mean scale score was 720 and in 2018 it went up to 721. We saw a increase in our GT sub score as well. In 2017 our GT math mean scale score was 753 and in 2018 the score increased to 756 In 2017 High Point began a major improvement strategy with regard to curriculum. Significant professional development was conducted in math and ELA to ensure that teachers understand how to implement the curriculum with fidelity. Curriculum training had not been conducted in multiple years. Similarly in 2018 teachers received curriculum training in math and ELA. In addition, 2017 school-wide focus was on student growth. Coaching and evaluation processes were focused on reviewing student data and targeting instruction. A similar coaching and evaluation approach is established for 2018. 2017 was the first full year of our new reading curriculum. Classroom libraries and instructional materials were implemented for the first time and there was a lot of trial and error as teachers learned new approaches. In 2018 we have a deeper understanding of the curriculum and how to implement it with greater efficacy and fidelity. In math in 2018 we have implemented more aggressive progress monitoring tools with a program called 'math facts'. In addition, professional development is focused on differentiation and strategies for ELL students. |

# Section III, Tab 4: Current Performance and Data Analysis

* **Online Support: Where is this in the online system?**



* **Content: What should this section include?**

This section should be the most detailed of the “Data Narrative” subsection. It should include the information your team uses to make instructional and programming decisions. The section may include:

* Description of current state of the school (academic, but may also include cultural and ‘whole child’ indicators)
* Description of and references to state and local data points (see table below)
	+ Include disaggregation of data, and the comparison of disaggregated groups to school as a whole.
* Supporting qualitative data
	+ Observational data, survey data, behavior data
* Summary of school’s SPF and CARS report
	+ Must include data and analysis of any area that school fell below Meets; may highlight and/or include indicators that were at or above Meets as well.
* Describe the impact of the previous improvement efforts
	+ Connect to previous Major Improvement Strategies
	+ Were they effective? If so, why? If not, why not?
* Course Taking Analysis (**state requirement**): Include analysis of student course taking patterns by disaggregated groups.
* READ Act (**state requirement**): Include trend data that considers K-3 literacy.
* State Assessment Participation (state requirement): If the school did not meet 95% participation, address this in the data narrative (e.g. cautions in data interpretation, potential causes for low participation).

Guiding Questions

* What is the percentage of students at each performance level at your school overall? How did these percentages change year over year?
* Which disaggregated groups have the highest performance/lowest performance? How does this inform which students in your school need additional support?
	+ - Grade
		- ELL status
		- FRL status
		- SpEd status
		- Ethnicity
* What are areas/grades/subjects/student groups of strength?
* What areas need to be targeted for further development and support?

***Table 1. Local Data for Planning***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Data | Demographic Data | Process Data | Perception Data |
| * Local summative and interim assessment results
* Student work samples
* Classroom assessment results
* K-3 reading assessment results (required by READ Act)
 | * School location and size of student body
* Student characteristics, including poverty, language proficiency, IEP, race/ethnicity
* Student mobility rates
* Staff characteristics (experience, attendance, turnover)
 | * External school reviews
* Observations of instruction
* Academic interventions available to students
* Student attendance
* Discipline referrals and suspension rates
* Schedules and class size
* Family and community involvement
* Services and/or programs
* MTSS fidelity of implementation
 | * Teaching and learning conditions (e.g. staff surveys)
* Perception survey data (parent/student surveys)
* Self-assessment results
 |

* **Common Pitfalls: What common issues can be avoided?**
* Simply restating the SPF results with no reflection or analysis
* Data dump (tables/charts with no reflection or analysis)
* Lack of disaggregated analysis of student groups
* Lack of analysis around Post-Secondary Readiness; over-reliance on CMAS 9th grade
* Missing course taking analysis
* Missing READ Act analysis
* Missing science and social studies (if aplicable) analysis
* Including data that was not tracked the entire school year
* **Exemplars: What does a model example look like for this section?**

This section includes modified exemplars from CSI schools.

|  |
| --- |
| School of Learning Charter: Current Performance |
| The School of Learning received a Priority Improvement rating on the 2016 School Performance Framework, earning 40 out of 100 possible points. This section will address the areas in which the school did or did not meet expectations, and will also address the magnitude of SoL’s performance challenges.***Academic Achievement – Middle School***In every content area and with respect to every subgroup of students large enough to be included, SoL’s middle school received a Does Not Meet rating.  State assessments reveal SoL’s middle school students to be among the lowest-performing students in the state, ranking at or below the 5th percentile in English language arts and math, and below the 15th percentile in science. Percentile Rank, SoL Middle School Student Groups, 2016 SPF

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subject | All Students | English Learners | FRL-Eligible | Minority |
| English Language Arts | 5 | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| Math | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Science | 13 | 2 | n/a | n/a |

 Under SoL’s 2015-16 Unified Improvement Plan, it was expected that 20 percent of students in the middle school would meet or exceed grade-level expectations on English language arts and that 15 percent would meet or exceed grade-level expectations in math..  None of these targets were met using state assessments.SoL also uses NWEA MAP data to assess student progress.  A review of MAP data for AY 2015-16 shows that MAP does have students performing at higher levels than does the PARCC, but still below expectations.  SoL’s MAP data shows that 32-37 percent of middle school students are performing at or above the 50th percentile (see section on Trend Analysis for more detailed information).The magnitude of SoL’s challenges in middle school academic achievement is extremely large, both in terms of the breadth of the challenge across content areas and students groups and in terms of the progress that must be made to put the school back on track.***Academic Achievement – High School***SoL’s high school received an Approaching rating in English language arts overall and with respect to every student subgroup, except that minority students received a Does Not Meet rating.  Every student group received a Does Not Meet rating in math.  There were insufficient numbers of students taking the state assessment in science to receive ratings in this area. SoL’s high school academic achievement percentile ranks are shown below.Percentile Rank, SoL High School Student Groups, 2016 SPF

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Subject | All Students | English Learners | FRL-Eligible | Minority |
| English Language Arts | 24 | 16 | 28 | 13 |
| Math | 8 | 6 | 10 | 6 |

 Under SoL’s 2015-16 Unified Improvement Plan, it was expected that 35 percent of students in the high school would meet or exceed grade-level expectations in English language arts.  As an overview, the figure below shows a histogram by test norm percentile of all NWEA MAP assessments (Reading Math and Language Usage) administered in Spring 2016 to SoL students in grades 6-10, disaggregated by ELL status.  Overall, we note that 52% of all students tested below the 50th percentile outlining the magnitude of the Academic Status challenge.  Further, we observe the discrepancy between ELL and non-ELL students by comparing the distribution curves below.  The distribution of percentile scores of Non-ELL students is relatively uniform with a median percentile of 53, with 42% of students testing below the 50th percentile.  The distribution of ELL percentiles, however is strongly left-skewed with a median percentile of 28, with 72% of students testing below the 50th percentile.***Academic Growth – Middle School***SoL’s middle school received a Does Not Meet rating for Academic Growth in every content area and with respect to every student subgroup, except for two.  Free- and reduced-price lunch-eligible students’ growth in English language arts received an Approaching rating, and English language learners’ growth in English language proficiency also received an Approaching rating. Median Growth Percentile, SoL Middle School Student Groups, 2016 SPF

| **Subject** | **All Students** | **English Learners** | **FRL-Eligible** | **Minority** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| English Language Arts | 21 | 25 | 45.5 | 21 |
| Math | 18 | 18 | 22.5 | 18 |
| English Language Proficiency | n/a | 46 | n/a | n/a |

 All of these MGPs are below the MGP of 50 set as targets in the prior UIP, and most are much lower.  Given the low academic achievement discussed above, it is vitally important for SoL that its students performing below expectations not only reach the target MGP of 50, but exceed it and accelerate their growth substantially.  The magnitude of this challenge is substantial.***Academic Growth – High School***SoL’s high school received an Approaching rating for Academic Growth in English language arts and math with respect to every subgroup with sufficient numbers for reporting.  SoL had insufficient numbers of English language learners in the high school for reporting purposes.Median Growth Percentile, SoL High School Student Groups, 2015 SPF

| **Subject** | **All Students** | **English Learners** | **FRL-Eligible** | **Minority** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| English Language Arts | 45 | n/a | n/a | 43 |
| Math | 43.5 | n/a | n/a | 47 |

***Postsecondary and Workforce Readiness – High School***SoL’s high school had the following outcomes for measures of postsecondary and workforce readiness:

| **Indicator** | **All students** | **English Learners** | **FRL-Eligible** | **Minority** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Dropout rate | 4.0% | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| CO ACT | 18.3 | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Matriculation - all | 77.8% | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Matriculation – 2 yr | 11.1% | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Matriculation – 4 yr | 63% | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Matriculation - CTE | 3.7% | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Graduation | 81.3% | n/a | 66.7% | 55.6% |

 SoL received full points for matriculation, with graduates entering postsecondary programs at a rate of 77.8 percent.  The school's overall graduation rate (81.3 percent) met its target of 80 percent.  However, its dropout rate (4.0 percent) is relatively high and did not meet the target of less than 1 percent.  There are also significant graduation gaps, with FRL-eligible students (66.7 percent) and minorities (55.6 percent) failing to meet the target rate of 80 percent.  In addition, student ACT scores (18.3) are much lower than state expectations (20) and the past year's UIP target (22).  This is particularly troubling for an early college school.***Advanced Course Summary***Graduation requirements at SoL demand that all students take college courses.  The table below illustrates the percentages of students within disaggregated subgroups that were enrolled in the college courses in the Fall of 2016.  We observe that 80% of all 10th grade students, 90% of all 11th grade students and 100% of 12th grade students are enrolled in college courses.  These percentages are consistent across disaggregated subgroups showing that there are no concerns regarding access to advanced courses at SoL.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Grade** | **All Students** | **FRL** | **Minority** | **ELL** |
| 9 | 3.6% | 3.4% | 2.4% | 3.8% |
| 10 | 80.4% | 72.0% | 80.0% | 87.0& |
| 11 | 94.0% | 90.9% | 90.3% | 95.2% |
| 12 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

 |

# Section III, Tab 5: Trend Statements

* **Online Support: Where is this in the online system?**



* **Content: What should this section include?**

This section should include information on trends (three years if available- if school has been open fewer than three years; include as much longitudinal trend data as possible) and include:

* Information on the test, the content area, the data points, the direction/trend, the years, and a comparison point to demonstrate magnitude.
	+ Comparison points can be: state-wide results, school-wide result, grade-level results, etc.
* Explicitly mention if three years of data is not available, or if N-sizes are too small
* One statement per online text box
* Make sure to select which trends are Notable; Notable trends will populate into the next section (Priority Performance Challenges)
* Describe both positive and negative trends for all performance indicators based on three years of data (if available).
	+ Never leave the reader to make assumptions (for example, about why data is not included).
* K-3 literacy trend (**state requirement)**
* Use this part of the plan to narrow focus by prioritizing trends (remember- select prioritized trends as “Notable” in online tool)

**\*\*TIP: Sentence Framework for Trend Statements**

**Template:** (School Name) students are on a (direction) in (subject) on (test) between (year) and (year) (Year- Data; Year- Data; Year- Data). Compared to the (school overall/geographic district) this is (above/below) by X.

**Example:** Smith Middle School Students are on a slight decline in reading on CMAS between 2015 and 2017 (2015= mean scale score 720; 2016= 713.5 2017= 710.1).This is a notable trend because it is well below the state-wide 50th percentile of 740.1.

Common Pitfalls: What common issues can be avoided?

* Lack of comparison points to determine if trend is notable
* Forced fit for three years of data- blending TCAP and CMAS. If three years of data are not available, include what you have and state the reason for the lack of data. Be clear about why only one or two years of data are available (in brief description of trend statement).
* Including only a trend statement, without specific data to support the statement.
* Lack of multi-year READ data.
* Lack of local, school-specific data. Overreliance on state data.
* **Exemplars: What does a model example look like for this section?**

This section includes modified exemplars from CSI schools.

|  |
| --- |
| Two Rivers Charter School: Trend Analysis |
| https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1523996003000/CDE_direction/CDE_decreasing.jpg**Academic Achievement (Status):**TRCS middle school students are on a decline in ELA on CMAS between 2016 and 2018 (2016=MSS 765, 2017=753, 2018=743). Though these scores are still meeting state expectations, they are significant when combined with the decline in MGP from the same years (2016=76.5, 2017=53, 2018=47).  Trend Direction: *Decreasing*https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1523996003000/CDE_direction/CDE_stable.jpg**Academic Achievement (Status):**TRCS students with SRDs have been relatively stable as seen on the percent of students places on READ plans between 2016 and 2018 (2016=10.3%, 2017=11.4%, 2018=10.3%). This trend is notable as an indicator of success in early elementary reading programming.Trend Direction: *Stable*https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1523996003000/CDE_direction/CDE_increas_decreasing.jpg**Academic Growth:**TRCS EL students are increasing and decreasing in CMAS ELA growth between 2016 and 2018 (2016=MGP 49, 2017=MGP 57, 2018=40). This trend is significant because of the severity of the decline from 2017 to 2018 from MGP 57 to MGP 40.Trend Direction: *Increasing then decreasing* |

# Section III, Tab 6: Priority Performance Challenges

* **Online Support: Where is this in the online system?**



* **Content: What should this section include?**

This section contains statements on current performance, as identified and prioritized in the Trend Analysis section. It should include:

* Actual student performance statements
* A Priority Performance Challenge (PPC) for each indicator where the school did not meet expectations.
	+ If the school didn’t receive any Did Not Meet ratings, PPCs should address the lower performing indicators as well as the areas that will impact the largest number of students.
* Identified based on notable trends that are of significant magnitude given the overall performance of the school; the rationale for determining the magnitude should de described (there is a separate text box for rationale).

Guiding Questions

* In the trend and data analyses, what are the challenges that impact the majority of students?
* What percent of the student population is impacted by the different challenges?
* Are there significant performance challenges evident across all disaggregated groups?
* Is there one or more disaggregated student group in which performance is weaker?
* Are there significant performance challenges evident across all content areas?
* Does performance (achievement and growth) differ across content areas?
* Are the identified PPCs focused on student performance, rather than on adult actions?
* **Common Pitfalls: What common issues can be avoided?**
* Not a need statement about adults or systems. Not a target about where school needs to go.
* In some cases, may be too narrow when there are broader needs.
	+ Missing patterns of need within the system. Does not take into account review of data across levels, groups, content, etc.
* Prioritization narrative is not completed or is not adequately answered. Decision process for focusing on identified challentges is not described. Rationale for prioritization of challenges is not clearly explained.
* Too many PPCs: limit to 3-5.
* **Exemplars: What does a model example look like for this section?**

This section includes modified exemplars from CSI schools.

|  |
| --- |
| James Irwin Charter Academy: Priority Performance Challenges |
|  https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/PriorityPerformanceChallenge.png**Declining Academic Achievement in Math**JICA 3rd-5th Graders state assessment Math scores have been declining the last three years. (2016=753.7, 2017=751.2, 2018=743.9) The percentile rank has moved from 87 to 70. Our NWEA confirms the decline in percentage of students who are above the 50th%tile. (Fall 2016=66%, Fall 2017=68% Fall 2018=63%). We have to examine the mastery level of our K-2 students in order to make sure students have necessary skills to move forward successfully and establish effective interventions for our new students.https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/PriorityPerformanceChallenge.png**Declining Academic Growth for 3rd-5th Graders for ELA and Math**Our students' MGP scores are fluctuating in state assessments for ELA, but overall decreasing. (2016= 51.5, 2017=40, 2018=49) Math median growth percentile in state assessment expectations are decreasing (2016=46.5, 2017=47,2018=35). NWEA for math growth continues to decrease. (2016=38.5% above 50%tile, 2017= 46.6% above 50%tile and 2018= 63% above 50%tile). These are notable trends because overall for ELA, reading and math students are not achieving adequate growth according to our SPF. Again, we realize we need to look at K-2 students to determine if there is a root cause regarding mastery of those fundamental skills.**Provide a rationale for why these challenges have been selected and address the magnitude of the overall performance challenges:**When we analyze both our state assessment data and our internal data (NWEA) we find that our students are decreasing, particularly in math. Although they are meeting academic achievement, their achievement scores are declining overall. We are also seeing a decrease in the growth scores for ELA. We definitely see an opportunity for students to increase achievement and growth in ELA and math. The longer our student cohort remains with us we expect to see their scores increase rather than decrease. Although the numbers speak volumes, we are more concerned that our students are learning to mastery and they are able to retain previously gleaned knowledge and apply it to new material.These challenges will help us to explore the following:Adequate instructional time for reading, grammar, composition, and mathAddress amount of scaffolding and support (too much or too little)Accurate reporting on student progressGreater focus on mastery rather than lesson progression   |

# Section III, Tab 7: Root Cause Analysis

* **Online Support: Where is this in the online system?**



* **Content: What should this section include?**

This section should include information on the underlying causes behind each priority performance challenge identified in the prior step. These are the root causes that, if addressed, would result in the elimination or substatial reduction of the performance challenges. This section of the online tool allows you to assign a root cause to each priority performance challenge, and provide a rationale for how each Root Cause was selected and verified. Root causes should include:

* Adult actions the school can control: not characteristics of the student or school (poverty, mobility, motivation, etc.)
* Include more than one source of data, in addition to performance data, in the verification of the root cause.
* Root causes should be aligned with other plan elements including the current performance narrative and the priority performance challenges.
* **Common Pitfalls: What common issues can be avoided?**
* Avoid wording root causes as desired outcomes. For example, use “We lack…”, “The school does not have…” instead of “If we implement this, then…”, “The school needs…”.
* Overly simplistic issue identified; lack of a deep analysis of the underlying problem(s).
* Including items out of the schools’ control.
* Root causes written blaming staff; deeper analysis should be conducted to identify the systems failure that led to staff members not meeting expectations.
* **Exemplars: What does a model example look like for this section?**

This section includes modified exemplars from CSI schools.

|  |
| --- |
| Mountain Village Montessori: Root Causes |
| https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/PriorityPerformanceChallenge.png**Priority Performance Challenge:**Declining Achievement in ReadingDespite providing more scheduled intervention to support students below grade level in reading, there continue to be about 1/4 of the students still below benchmark in reading.**Root Cause (s) Associated with this Performance Challenge** [ [Add / Associate Root Cause](https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/apex/Section3_Root_Causes?id=a010G00000awIjwQAE) ]https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/RootCause.png**Staff Inexperience/Training in Montessori Scope and Sequence and State Standards** - As a new school, many of our staff members are new to the Montessori method and/or state standards. While all lead teachers have completed Montessori training, many did so very recently and have not had experience aligning the Montessori scope and sequence and the state standards. It became apparent in data conversations that there was a disconnect between what was being taught in the classroom and the academic standards at some levels due to the lack of alignment between the two entities, academic standards and Montessori scope and sequence.https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/RootCause.png**Lack of Targeted, Coordinated Goal Setting/Identification** - Despite the 16/17 UIP identifying multiple improvement strategies including data cycle conversations at the team level, this was never fully implemented. With a change in leadership between school years, there was never a supported, systematic approach to viewing data and student growth and achievement thus producing action plans.https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/RootCause.png**Limited Professional Development Around Literacy** - Due to both funding and coordination there were very few opportunities for staff to engage in professional development around evidence based best practices for teaching reading. Many of our staff members desire and would benefit from more professional development in this area.https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/RootCause.png**Limited Vertical and Horizontal Alignment of Instruction** - In our second year, staff began, but still needs to be better supported in the work of aligning instruction across classrooms in order to better support one another and have clear curricular goals, plans and management of materials in order to ensure that all students are exposed to the content that they are ready for.**Provide a rationale for how these Root Causes were selected and verified:**In analyzing potential root causes for poor academic performance in both reading and math representatives from the SAC and the Head of School reviewed data from Dibels and Star Math in comparison to state wide state and local data.  Additionally, group conversations with the staff led by both the instructional coach consultant and another Montessori consultant were factored in to the selection.**Staff Inexperience/Training in Montessori Scope and Sequence and State Standards-**The challenge to integrate the Montessori Curriculum and State Standards is one that many public Montessori schools are grappling with.  MVMCS is no different and is particularly engaged in due to the limited experience of many of our teachers.  Staff reports being overwhelmed by the learning curve of being new to the Montessori curriculum, and then has the added challenge of bringing it into the public sector and working within the expectations of the accountability standards.  **Limited Vertical and Horizontal Alignment of Instruction-** Similar to the limited staff experience of integrating Montessori and State Standards, there is also limited vertical and horizontal alignment of instruction simply due to the age of our school (2 years) and experience of staff.  Montessori classrooms are mixed age, looping classrooms and therefore within a traditional Montessori setting there is a greater level of flexibility in terms of timing of introduction, engagement and mastery of content. However, that level of flexibility does not exist when it comes to grade level specific standards and assessment.  As with most classrooms, there is an incredibly diverse range of skills and meeting the needs of all students is difficult especially with a limited, aligned curriculum that is mutually used by all. Staff is eager to take on the challenge of alignment as it relates to both Montessori curriculum and state standards.  They also see that value in teaming and doing this work together.   **Limited Professional Development-** Staff reports a strong desire and need for professional development.  Staff desires organized, systematic approaches to offering  and planning professional development in order for everyone to have a common baseline level of knowledge and school-wide goals based on that learning and knowledge. Due to the age of our school and limited funds, professional development opportunities were limited.  **Lack of Targeted, Coordinated Goal Setting/Identification / Failure to Identify and Support High Academic Expectations** - Despite the 16/17 UIP identifying goals, there was never a targeted, school-wide focus on those goals.  While teachers did meet as teams, there was not a reliable, systematic approach to data driven instruction.  As such, there was very limited clarity around expectations at each level and strategies and support needed to meet those expectations at each level. **Lack of Interventions**- Students who are below benchmark in math have not received appropriate time and/or intensity of tier 1 literacy instruction or the appropriate tier 2 literacy intervention for their specific math deficit. Alternatively, the instruction or interventions received to this point have not impacted the children's scores on assessments. |

# Section IV, Tab 1: Major Improvement Strategies

* **Online Support: Where is this in the online system?**

 

* **Content: What should this section include?**

This section includes detailed information on your Major Improvement Strategies. This section of the online tool should be completely filled in, including:

* The name of each Major Improvement Strategy, which should be a specific approach tailored to the current needs of the school
	+ NOT “Implement better systems for literacy”, rather, “Implement formative assessment practices in grades K-3 during reading instruction”
		- Be specific!
* Improvement Strategies address associated root causes such that the performance challenges are mitigated
* Strategies are under adult/school control
* What will success look like?
	+ Describe an end outcome so that school (and reader) will know when and how the MIS is attained
	+ Description is about adult actions, systems, practices, and structures, **not student outcomes.**
* Describe the evidence/research that supports implementing the strategy **(state/ESSA requirement)**
* **Common Pitfalls: What common issues can be avoided?**
* Written as a goal, not a strategy
* Not clearly aligned to identified root cause
* Too broad; does not allow for specific and achieveable action steps
* No evidence provided for why the strategy will postively impact the root cause identified
* **Exemplars: What does a model example look like for this section**?

This section includes modified exemplars from CSI schools.

|  |
| --- |
| Crown Point Academy: Major Improvement Strategy |
| https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/MajorImprovementStrategy.png**Major Improvement Strategy:  Restructure Math Groups****Describe what success will look like:**We will no longer ability group students in math. This practice limits students' exposure to different abilities and ways of solving problems and it limits growth for all students.**Describe the research supporting the strategy:**Jo Boaler's "Mathematical Mindsets" discourages ability grouping in math for the reasons stated above. Students must be exposed to different ways of thinking and problem solving, feel comfortable making mistakes, and learn from one another in order to improve.**Root Cause**https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/RootCause.png**Middle School Math Groups:** In middle school, students are given the opportunity to work above their grade level. Classes of students were divided between two math instructors based on their performance, but that failed to give students the opportunity to work with students of higher or lower ability levels. In this, the math grouping did a disservice to the students. The math groups did not push or challenge students to perform at higher levels.https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/RootCause.png**Advanced Grouping Leaves Gaps in Grade-Level Content:** When students are working a year above their grade level in math, it often leaves gaps in their grade level knowledge. We have seen an increase in this issue over the past three to four years, and have since determined to limit the amount of math groups. |

|  |
| --- |
| The Pinnacle Charter School: Major Improvement Strategy |
|  **https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/MajorImprovementStrategy.pngMajor Improvement Strategy:  Student Support Services Will Adopt a Push-in Model to Align Practices****Describe what success will look like:**English Language Development (ELD), Literacy/Reading, Special Education and Gifted and Talented will structure services to align with the common language and instructional practices of classroom teachers. Services will support individualized needs of students while attempting to bridge the gap between the student's identified skill level and grade level expectations. Success will be providing support within the context of the mainstream while showing accelerated growth for the students receiving support. Success will be measured by grades, attaining goals within individualized plans, interim assessments, and growth and academic achievement measures on State tests. Students' affective filter will also be positively impacted by an inclusive model of services.**Describe the research supporting the strategy:**The Colorado Department of Education's High Achieving Schools (HAS) Study advocates for this model based upon research. Push-in services have proven to have more effective outcomes for student performance.**Root Cause**https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/RootCause.png**Instruction for CLDs must be more rigorous and engaging.** PMS is not consistently implementing high effect size strategies for CLD students to meet academic growth targets.https://co-uip--c.na93.visual.force.com/resource/1519767221000/UIP_assets/img/RootCause.png**Achievement gaps were not sufficiently closed.** PCS needs to identify individual students' areas of greatest academic needs or strengths to adequately inform and differentiate instruction. Staff must reflect and act upon DuFour's questions of, "What do we want students to learn?" "How will we know a student has learned it?" "What will we do if a student has not learned it?" "What will we do if a student has learned it?" |

# Section IV, Tab 2: Planning Form (Action Plans and Implementation Benchmarks)

* **Online Support: Where is this in the online system?**

 

* **Content: What should this section include?**

This section details the action plan and implementation benchmarks that are associated with each Major Improvement Strategy, and should include:

* Each Major Improvement Strategy
* Action Steps associated with each MIS
	+ Action steps should be specific
	+ Action steps should span two years
	+ New school staff should be able to pick up the action plan and easily follow it
	+ **Resources:** Schools must indicate which funding source will be used to fund each action step. Schools receiving Title funds must demonstrate how funds will be used through their Action Step Resource column. **(state/ESSA requirement)**
* Implementation Benchmarks
	+ How will the school know the adult actions in the plan are having an impact? How can the school progress monitor the impact of the action plan? What changes in quality will be observed due to each action step?
	+ One implementation benchmark can suffice for one, several, or even all action steps. More than one implementation benchmark can also be applied to a single action step.
	+ Implementation Benchmarks should be usable by the school and/or CSI checkpoints to gauge the effectiveness of the action plan associated with each Major Improvement Strategy
* Parent Engagement Strategy **(ESSA requirement)**
	+ This requirement satisfies ESSA guidelines on parent engagement. Schools may choose to have an entire Major Improvement Strategy focused on family engagement, or may elect to include a family engagement-related Action Step under one or more MIS.
* **Common Pitfalls: What common issues can be avoided?**

Action Steps

* Lacks specificity to guide implementation
* Does not show progression
* Action steps are written at such a large scale that they could serve as improvement strategies
* Action plans are too broad

Implementation Benchmarks

* Benchmarks not provided
* Lack of distinction between action steps and benchmarks
* Benchmarks are worded such that they are not observable/measurable
* **Exemplars: What does a model example look like for this section?**

This section includes modified exemplars from CSI schools. School names have been changed.

|  |
| --- |
| Colorado City Charter: Planning Form |
| ***Action Plan (Actions Steps and Implementation Benchmarks)******Major Improvement Strategy: Scale up MTSS pilot program*****Implementation Benchmarks Associated with MIS****Name: Implementation of tier 2 and 3 supports****Description: Consistent implementation of tier 2 and tier 3 supports school-wide for students identified for support, as tracked by monthly school-level MTSS meetings and regular classroom observations****Start/End Date: Target date: December 2018****Key Personnel: MTSS team leads****Status: In progress** ***Major Improvement Strategy: Scale up MTSS pilot program*****Action Steps Associated with MIS****Name: Create MTSS team by level (ES, MS, HS)****Description: Staff members involved in last year’s pilot program will create teams by level. They will be responsible for providing training for teams, tailored to the structure and needs of their designated level.****Start/End/: August 2018****Repeats: Annually****Key Personnel: Administration, Grade level team leads****Resource: General Fund****Status: Completed**  |

# Section IV, Tab 4: Target Setting

* **Online Support: Where is this in the online system?**



* **Content: What should this section include?**

This section should include specific annual targets. At a minimum, targets should be set for each of the performance indicators where state expectations were not met (these should be associated with a priority performance challenge). Target setting should include:

* Student related, end of year goals regarding student outcomes
* Targets should only be set for indicators with PPCs (not every indicator)
* Targets should be related to accountability measures (publicly reported; don’t include internal measures in annual targets)
* Should be specific, rigorous, and attainable.

Tips for setting targets:

* Use CARS as a reference when setting targets
* Targets should be aligned with the Performance Chalenges in terms of test, metric, and student group
* Two years of targets must be set
* Interim measures should align with the target (what are you using as a school to ensure progress towards the end of year target?)
* **Common Pitfalls: What common issues can be avoided?**
* Targets are not set intentionally; they are too high or too low
* Growth operates differently than achievement; it is not incremental. Set growth targets with extreme caution (consider setting growth targets as percentage of students with low,medium,high growth rather than a MGP)
* Interim measures lack clarity in terms of identifying whether school is on track or off track to meet goal
* Targets are not aligned with PPC
* **Exemplars: What does a model example look like for this section?**

This section includes modified exemplars from CSI schools. School names have been changed.

|  |
| --- |
| The Pinnacle Charter School: School Target Setting |
| **Priority Performance Challenge : MS: PCMS students Did Not Meet expectations on CMAS ELA****PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Academic Achievement (Status)**MEASURES / METRICS:** ELA**2018-2019:** MS Students will grow on CMAS ELA by 5 MSS points in 1 year from 726 to 731.**2019-2020:** MS Students will grow on CMAS ELA by 8 MSS points in 2 years from 726 to 734 .**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2018-2019:** MS: In Fall 2018-2019 NWEA Reading Assessment, an average of 42% of students in grades 6-8 scored in the average,high average, or high percentile ranges (41->80 percentile). In Winter 2018, NWEA Reading will show an increase of 5 points to an average of 47% of students ingrades 6-8 scoring in the average, high average, or high ranges. |

|  |
| --- |
| New America School- Lowry: School Target Setting  |
| **Priority Performance Challenge : Attendance/Truancy and Post-completion Success Below State Expectation****PERFORMANCE INDICATOR:** Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness**MEASURES / METRICS:** Dropout Rate**2018-2019:** Decrease NAS Lowry's dropout rate from 28.4% to 18.2%, approaching state expectations.**2019-2020:** Decrease NAS Lowry's dropout rate to 17.5%, approaching state expectations.**INTERIM MEASURES FOR 2018-2019:** Consistent tracking of enrollment number, ADA, course completion rate, and GPA |

# Appendix

**Background**

The *Colorado Achievement Plan for Kids* (S.B. 08-212) established the primary purpose of improvement planning as aligning efforts to ensure all students exit the K-12 education system ready for postsecondary education, and/or to be successful in the workforce, earning a living wage immediately upon graduation. Furthermore, the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) – including Titles IA, IIA and III – requires improvement planning to focus on ensuring that all students in the state reach proficiency in English language arts/reading and mathematics. All schools/districts must use a common online format to document and publicly report their improvement efforts. Each year, schools and districts are required to consider newly available state and local performance data to write, rewrite, or update a two-year UIP (one that spans the current and subsequent school year), and submit their plan to the state. In 2016, the Colorado legislature expanded flexibility around biennial (every other year) submission of the Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) through HB 16-1440. This flexibility is now available to all schools with a Performance plan type assignment.

**UIP and Authorization**

During a renewal year, schools may choose to submit their UIP to satisfy the Academic Narrative requirement of the charter renewal application. In addition to satisfying the Academic Narrative requirement, a school’s Major Improvement Strategies will be used to inform the CSI site visit associated with charter renewal. Schools may also be asked to present their UIP and progress made towards UIP goals to the CSI Performance Management Committee during the [charter renewal process](https://www.csi.state.co.us/renewals/).

**School Accountability Committee (SAC) and the UIP**

Per state law (see [CRS 22-11-402](https://www.cde.state.co.us/sites/default/files/documents/cdedepcom/download/pdf/senatebill163.pdf)), schools are required to involve the SAC in the creation of the UIP. Specifically, the SAC must “advise” the school leader(s) on the creation and contents of the UIP.

**ESSA and the UIP**

Under ESSA, all schools are required to perform a comprehensive needs assessment as part of their Consolidated Grant Application for Title funds. The UIP may be used to satisfy this requirement. Schools must align their Action Plan with their Consolidated Application (see Section IX for more information).

In addition to aligning the Action Plan, schools must indicate how they involved stakeholders (in addition to the SAC) in the creation of the UIP. ESSA requires the involvement of the following stakeholders in the development of a comprehensive needs assessment:

“teachers, principals, other school leaders, paraprofessionals, specialized instructional support personnel, charter school leaders, parents, community partners, and other organizations or partners”

§§ 1003a(d)(4), 1112(a)(1)(A), 1112(a)(5), 1114(b)(6), 1115(a), 2102(b)(3), 2102(b)(2)(D), 3116(b)(4)(A), 3116(b)(4)(c), 4106(c), 8306(a)(7

**Targeted Support and Comprehensive Support schools**

Per ESSA requirements, CSI must monitor and evaluate the impact of the improvement plans CSI and TS schools. As such, CSI staff will perform a **quarterly review** of the Action Plan component of each CS/TS school’s UIP. CSI staff will work with school leaders to verify that the Action Steps identified in the UIP have been completed by their target date, and will request verification that Implementation Benchmarks have been met. If necessary, CSI staff will provide technical support in order to adjust improvement plans that are falling short of planned benchmarks.

Additionally, any funds received by schools as a result of CS/TS status must be allocated in the Resource column of the school’s Action Plan.

**Performance Concern**

Schools that see decline in student outcomes year to year may be asked to attend a CSI Board of Directors meeting in order to discuss academic performance. School leaders and school board members will be asked to discuss current levels of performance at their school and the strategies that have been implemented to improve student outcomes. These discussions will be based in the school’s most recent Unified Improvement Plan.

**Priority Improvement and Turnaround**

For schools with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround (PI or T) rating, there are unique requirements in addition to the UIP requirements for all schools. These include:

* Schools with a PI or T rating must provide written notice to families of the school within 30 days of receiving the initial plan type assignment. This must include:
	+ Type of plan required
	+ Performance results that led to the plan assignment
	+ Timeline for developing and adopting the required improvement plan
	+ Data, time, and location of the public meeting of the School Accountability Committee (SAC) to draft the plan
	+ Date, time, and location of the public hearing held by the school board to review the plan prior to adoption (this must be at least 30 days after the date on which the school provides written notice of hearing).
* School with a Turnaround rating must completed the Turnaround addendum along with their UIP. This requires selecting a state required strategy, and incorporating this strategy into the improvement plan.
* Schools with a PI or T rating will receive additional UIP review from the CDE State Review Panel. This may include required feedback that must be addressed prior to public posting.

**Accreditation contract requirements**

In the event that the School is in the accreditation category of either Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan or Accredited with Turnaround Plan in subsequent academic school years, the Institute staff may take one or more of the following actions:

* Institute Executive Director meeting with the School's board and leadership for the purpose of discussing continued low performance;
* Requiring the dissemination of parent letters and/or public hearings on the topic of the School's performance;
* Requiring the setting of annual additional performance targets by subgroup;
* Requiring the use of interim assessment analysis and monitoring;
* Requiring a third-party, subject to approval by CSI, to review and assist with the School's Unified Improvement Plan;
* Requiring targeted School board training and development; and
* Taking additional actions, to be determined under the circumstances of a particular situation.