

School Unified Improvement Plan Reviewer Feedback

Winter 2016 Review Cycle

Overview

The Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) is designed to provide schools with a consistent format to capture and streamline improvement planning efforts that address state and federal planning requirements. To assist with the improvement planning process, CDE offers several resources available at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uiip/uiip_trainingandsupport_resources. In particular, the UIP Quality Criteria provide the discrete criteria needed to meet all expectations. The feedback provided in this form is intended to convey the areas of highest concern as the school continues to plan for dramatic change and improved student outcomes. While the feedback considers the Quality Criteria, it is not necessarily a comprehensive evaluation of each individual criterion. If applicable, CDE feedback from the 2014-2015 plan was examined along with the current plan to determine plan quality/required changes.

School Name:	SABIN MIDDLE SCHOOL	District Name:	COLORADO SPRINGS 11
School Code:	7556	District Code:	1010
Additional Questions? Consult with your district staff to determine how this feedback might be incorporated into the school's planning work. As a reminder, the UIP must be submitted to CDE by April 15, 2016 for public posting to SchoolView.org.			

Summary Reviewer Feedback

As it is written, this plan:

	2015 Y/N	2016 Y/N
• Investigates the most critical performance areas and prioritizes the most urgent performance challenges;	No	No
• Identifies root causes that explain the magnitude of the performance challenges;	No	No
• Identifies research-based major improvement strategies that have a likelihood to eliminate the root causes; and	No	No
• Presents a well-designed plan for implementing the major improvement strategies to bring about dramatic improvement.	No	No

Summary of Next Steps

Description of Determination	Reason(s) for Determination	Deadline
Required Change(s): The plan has required changes that must be addressed within the next year.	Overall Weak Plan: Few of the Quality Criteria have been adequately addressed.	Reminder for April 15, 2016: Submit the most current version of the UIP to CDE for public posting on SchoolView. Jan 15, 2017: (If applicable) Required changes must be addressed.

Summary of Feedback about the School Plan

<p>Summary W2015</p> <p>Feedback Summary: The UIP provides a summary of performance and specifies where the school did not meet state expectations. However, very little actual data is included in the plan and analysis of data is minimal. Conducting a deeper data analysis will enable school staff to better understand performance challenges and develop notable trend statements across performance indicators. Also consider ways to include local data in trend analysis. Inclusion of local data is especially important over the next two years as the state assessments make the transition from TCAP to CMAS. Multiple root causes are identified throughout the plan. Although the data narrative only indicates a single root cause, the Major Improvement Strategies list different root causes as being addressed. This makes it difficult to determine the focus and intent of the school's plan.</p>	<p>Summary W2016</p> <p>The plan provides a brief description of the school and its demographics. However, it does not appear that the 2015-16 plan has been updated from that written for 2014-15. Very little actual data are included in the plan and analysis of data is minimal. Conduct a more comprehensive data analysis that includes both previous TCAP and current local data, develop notable trend statements across performance indicators for 2015-16, and develop more systemic performance challenges and deeper root causes. Once priority performance challenges and root causes are properly identified, Major Improvement Strategies and effective action plans will be easier to develop. Since student performance is flat or declining, school staff should reflect on which past strategies have and have not had the desired effects. Include more detail on the reasons for continuing action steps that are the same or similar to those in last year's plan.</p> <p>Few of the Quality Criteria have been adequately addressed. See comments for recommendations on strengthening the UIP and increasing the effectiveness of improvement strategies.</p>
---	---

Once priority performance challenges and root causes are properly identified, Major Improvement Strategies and effective action plans will be easier to develop.

Final Feedback Category: Required Changes

Final Feedback Determination: -Few of the Quality Criteria have been adequately addressed.

-Schools in Priority Improvement and Turnaround are required to include family engagement strategies in the UIP.

-The UIP is intended to be a two-year plan, with implementation through the 2015-2016 school year. Expand the timeline and activities into the next school year.

Detailed Feedback on School UIP

1. As written, does the plan investigate the most critical performance areas and prioritize the most urgent performance challenges? No		
Feedback in this section addresses the Quality Criteria related to Previous Performance Targets, Notable Trends, and Priority Performance Challenges.		
<i>CDE's feedback from Winter 2015</i>	<i>Feedback for Winter 2016</i>	<i>Required Change 2016</i>
<p>The UIP presents a review of the performance summary provided in the School Performance Framework and specifies where the school did not meet state expectations. There is some reflection on how prior actions impacted performance. For example, "Last year, data indicated a need for increasing the growth of our inclusion-special education students in all content areas. Growth was shown for this group of students in both reading and math. We believe that this growth is a direct reflection of the following actions from the 2013-14 USIP action plan: engagement in a "Quality Indicators Review," observations at area schools whose students with IEPs were growing more than ours, and engagement in co-teaching opportunities."</p>	<p><i>If CDE reviewed the plan last year (2014-15) and feedback included required changes, were these changes addressed? N/A</i></p> <p>The Data Narrative has not been updated from 2014 with current local data, even though the targets imply that NWEA MAP tests are administered in the school/district. The plan does not identify trends across all indicators or content areas based on at least three years of data (e.g., TCAP percentiles compared with local assessment percentiles, where available.) The UIP also does not indicate which trends are notable. The reflection states that a district team visited classrooms, however no results of these findings were included in the plan.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Although the plan includes some longitudinal data, it doesn't identify trends across all indicators or content areas based on at least three years of data. The UIP also does not indicate which trends are notable. Provide a comparison to expectations so that the degree of difference between current and expected performance is evident. Examples of notable trend statements might be:

Growth on TCAP math has been low and flat since 2011 and MGP is significantly below AGP (in 2011 MGP =35 and AGP =68; in 2014 36/69). AND

Performance on TCAP writing has declined from 52.6% in 2011 to 47.55% in 2014 which is below the state expectation of 58.34%.

Once the comparison to expectations is completed, examine all trends and determine which, if focused on by the school, would result in the greatest increases in performance. Identify Priority Performance Challenges for those. An example might be:

Performance on TCAP writing has been low and flat for both academic achievement and growth over the past three years (in 2014, 47.55% P/A and MGP of 35 compared to AGP of 66).

AND/OR

Writing growth for students with disabilities has been flat and well below the AGP for the past three years with MGP of 34, 36, and 35 for 2012, 13, and 14 while AGP is above 90 for those years.

Currently, the plan only identifies a performance challenge around writing. After conducting a deeper data analysis, consider whether this focus will be enough to move the school out of priority improvement.

Required Change: No

Just as in last year's UIP, the plan identifies three performance challenges that address only writing, although achievement and growth scores are below expectations in all content areas. Conduct a deeper data analysis that considers current local assessment data as well as previous years' TCAP results, identify performance challenges that reflect the low achievement and growth of all students in all content areas.

Data Narrative: Required Change: No		
--	--	--

2. As written, does the plan identify root causes that explain the magnitude of the performance challenges?	No
--	-----------

Feedback in this section addresses the Quality Criteria related to Root Cause Analysis.

<i>CDE's feedback from Winter 2015</i>	<i>Feedback for Winter 2016</i>	<i>Required Change 2016</i>
<p>Because the priority performance challenges are not clearly identified, it is difficult to determine whether the root cause identified in the data narrative directly addresses the school's performance challenges. Additionally, the plan does not include a description of how the root cause was verified (e.g., classroom observations, perception surveys). Consider leading staff through a process that allows them to examine why each performance challenge exists. For example, why is there a lack of alignment of expected rigor amongst: learning targets, learning activities and questions, and assessments? Examining more data and continuing to ask "why" may help staff to arrive at a deeper underlying cause. In order to get at a deep enough root cause, think about whether resolving the issue would lead to dramatic improvements. If the answer is no, then root causes may not be accurate.</p> <p>Also note that additional root causes are identified in Major Improvement Strategies 2 and 3. Since these are not included elsewhere in the plan, it is not clear how they were identified or whether they are appropriate. Consistent identification of root causes throughout the plan will provide clearer connections and may lead to the development of deeper, more focused major improvement strategies.</p>	<p><i>If CDE reviewed the plan last year (2014-15) and feedback included required changes, were these changes addressed? N/A</i></p> <p>The root cause analysis process was conducted in 2014. It is unclear whether a root cause analysis process was conducted this school year. The connection between the performance challenges and the root causes is unclear. For example, the priority performance challenges are focused on writing, yet the root causes are focused on cognitive complexity and Tier II and III instruction. Consider leading the staff through a process that allows them to focus on systemic challenges rather than a narrow issues such as one content area. Performance challenges that address systemic concerns have the potential to increase the performance of students in all subject areas. The UIP states that a district team observed classrooms in September 2015. It is unclear what the results of these observations were or how they guided the verification of the root causes. A more comprehensive analysis of data and deeper root causes analysis should assist staff tin the identification of well-defined performance challenges, focused root causes, and major improvement strategies that are powerful enough to create the needed dramatic change.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

Required Change: No		
----------------------------	--	--

3. As it is written, does the plan identify research-based major improvement strategies that are likely to eliminate the root causes?		No
Feedback in this section addresses Quality Criteria related to the Major Improvement Strategies.		
<i>CDE's feedback from Winter 2015</i>	<i>Feedback for Winter 2016</i>	<i>Required Change 2016</i>
<p>Since root cause analysis may not have gone deep enough to identify the underlying causes for performance challenges, it is also difficult to determine whether the identified major improvement strategies will be sufficient to improve performance. Additionally, there is not clear alignment between the various sections of the plan. For example:</p> <p>The data narrative and data worksheets identify writing as the only priority performance challenge, but the action plan includes action steps that address multiple content areas.</p> <p>Major Improvement Strategy #2 and #3 include root causes that are not included anywhere else in the plan:</p> <p>"Consistent, effective interventions are needed by all students at Tier II and III, so that they are able to demonstrate appropriate</p>	<p><i>If CDE reviewed the plan last year (2014-15) and feedback included required changes, were these changes addressed? N/A</i></p> <p>Since root cause analysis may not have gone deeply enough to identify the underlying causes for performance challenges, it is difficult to determine whether the identified major improvement strategies will be sufficient to improve performance. Additionally, there is not clear alignment among the various sections of the plan. Writing is identified as the only focus of priority performance challenges, root causes identify broader issues such as cognitive complexity, while a major improvement strategy address parent involvement, an issue that is not addressed anywhere else in the plan. As was indicated last year, once school staff has determined the root causes for performance challenges, develop major improvement strategies that are designed to specifically address and eliminate each root cause.</p>	Yes

<p>and expected growth." AND "Lack of outreach for community/parent/stakeholder involvement."</p> <p>While these strategies and action steps may be appropriate, the reasoning behind their inclusion (e.g., root cause analysis and verification) is not specified in the written plan.</p> <p>Once school staff has determined the root causes for performance challenges, develop major improvement strategies that are designed to specifically address each root cause.</p> <p>Required Change: No</p>		
<p>Dramatic Change: Dramatic Enough Change Required Change: No</p>	<p>Dramatic Change: The plan does not identify an approach to improvement that appears to result in enough change in performance for the school to have a plan type assignment of Improvement or above (thus moving off of the accountability clock) within a reasonable time frame.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>4. As it is written, does the UIP present a well-designed plan for implementing the major improvement strategies to bring about dramatic improvement? No</p>		
<p>Feedback in this section addresses the Quality Criteria related to targets, interim measures, action steps, timeline, key personnel, resources, and implementation benchmarks.</p>		
<p><i>CDE's feedback from Winter 2015</i></p>	<p><i>Feedback for Winter 2016</i></p>	<p>Required Change 2016</p>
<p>Targets and Interim Measures: Interim measures are not identified. Required Change: No</p> <p>Action Steps: Required Change For 2015-16: The UIP is intended to be a two-year plan, with implementation through the 2015-2016 school</p>	<p><i>If CDE reviewed the plan last year (2014-15) and feedback included required changes, were these changes addressed? N/A</i></p> <p>As previously noted, the major improvement strategies and action steps are not aligned with the root causes. Much of the action plan is the same as last year's plan. Since student performance declined, leading to the identification of the school as Priority Improvement, school staff should reflect more on which of the current strategies have and have not had the desired effects.</p>	<p>Yes</p>

<p>year. Currently, the timeline only indicates implementation for 15-16 for a few of the action steps. Expand the timeline and activities more fully into the next school year.</p> <p>Much of the action plan is the same as last year's plan. Since student performance declined, leading to the identification of the school as Priority Improvement, school staff should reflect more on where the current strategies have and have not had the desired effects. Include more detail on the status of action steps that are the same or similar to those in last year's plan. Specifically, what has/has not been implemented from last year? How are current year activities designed to build on what was put into place last year?</p> <p>Required Change: Yes</p>	<p>Include more detail on the status of action steps that are the same or similar to those in last year's plan. Specifically, what has/has not been implemented from last year? How are current year activities designed to build on what was put into place last year?</p> <p>Consider establishing interim metrics for what administrators expect to observe school-wide as they observe for application of the teachers' learning to the classroom practices. For example, "by the end of the first quarter, 50% of the teachers are effectively applying the principals of Close Reading/Reciprocal Teaching expectations in their instructional plans and lesson execution. By the end of the third quarter, 80% of the teachers are observed effectively applying the principals of Close Reading/Reciprocal Teaching expectations in their instructional plans and lesson execution." Identifying specific metrics allows school staff to know whether the improvement efforts are being implemented with fidelity in the classroom.</p>	
<p>Parent Engagement Strategy: Parent Engagement: Required Change for 2015-16: The action steps do not include activities to increase parent engagement as required for schools in Priority Improvement and Turnaround.</p> <p>In the Action Plan, describe how the school will partner with parents and the community to improve results for students. It is recommended that schools and districts link family outreach initiatives to the standards adopted by Colorado in 2009, the National Standards for Family-School Partnership. To access family engagement training materials, go to: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/trainingmaterials. Parent Engagement Required Change: Yes</p>	<p>Parent Engagement Strategy:</p>	<p>No</p>