| Title I Corrective Action Plan |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| AYP                            | High:  |  |  |  |
| Performance                    | -Districts that have not made AYP for 5 years in a row   |  |  |  |
| Level                          | -Districts that made 95 to 99 Percent of their AYP targets   |  |  |  |
|                                | -AYP two year trend is stable or increasing  |  |  |  |
| Type of                        | Self Evaluation  |  |  |  |
| Evaluation                     |  |  |  |  |
| Type of                        | Program Change: The district must amend or strengthen its Title I Program  |  |  |  |
| Change                         | Improvement Plan.  |  |  |  |
| To Meet                        | An Approvable Plan will:   |  |  |  |
| Requirements                   | <ol> <li>Include a determination as to why the LEA's previous plan did not bring about increased student academic achievement OR justification for continuing the existing Program Improvement plan.</li> <li>Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs of the schools in the LEA, especially the academic problems of low-achieving students;</li> <li>Define specific measurable achievement goals and targets for each of the student subgroup whose disaggregated results are included in the State's definition of AYP.</li> <li>Incorporate strategies grounded in scientifically based research that will strengthen instruction in core academic subjects;</li> <li>Include, as appropriate, student learning activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during any extension of the school year;</li> <li>Provide for high-quality professional development for instructional staff that focuses primarily on improved instruction;</li> <li>Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the schools served by the LEA</li> </ol> |  |  |  |

|                      | Title I Corrective Action Plan   |  |  |  |
|----------------------|--|--|--|--|
| AYP                  | Good:  |  |  |  |
| Performance          | -Districts that have not made AYP for 5 years in a row   |  |  |  |
| Level                | -Districts that made 95 to 99 Percent of their AYP targets and their two year trend  |  |  |  |
|                      | shows the number of targets met is decreasing; or  |  |  |  |
|                      | -Districts that made 85 to 94 Percent of their AYP targets and their two year trend  |  |  |  |
|                      | shows that the number of targets met is increasing.  |  |  |  |
| Type of Evaluation   | Self Evaluation with the help of an outside consultant   |  |  |  |
| Type of              | Program Change: The district must amend or strengthen its Title I Program  |  |  |  |
| Change               | Improvement Plan with the help of an outside consultant.   |  |  |  |
| To Meet              | An Approvable Plan will:   |  |  |  |
| To Meet Requirements | <ol> <li>An Approvable Plan will:         <ol> <li>Include the resume or other relevant background information showing the specific expertise of the consultant(s) chosen to assist the district in the areas the district failed to make AYP.</li> <li>Address the fundamental teaching and learning needs of the schools in the LEA, especially the academic problems of low-achieving students;</li> <li>Define specific measurable achievement goals and targets for each of the student subgroup whose disaggregated results are included in the State's definition of AYP.</li> <li>Incorporate strategies grounded in scientifically based research that will strengthen instruction in core academic subjects;</li> <li>Include, as appropriate, student learning activities before school, after school, during the summer, and during any extension of the school year;</li> <li>Provide for high-quality professional development for instructional staff that focuses primarily on improved instruction;</li> <li>Include strategies to promote effective parental involvement in the schools served by the LEA;</li> <li>Include a determination as to why the LEA's previous plan did not bring about increased student academic achievement OR justification for continuing the existing Program Improvement plan.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> |  |  |  |
|                      |  |  |  |  |

## **Independent Consultant Qualifications**

Districts that are identified for Corrective Action and their AYP Performance Level is rated as "Good" must develop a Corrective Action plan in consultation with an expert(s) in the areas that the district is not making AYP.

- 1. A qualified consultant will have documentation showing an extensive background in educational consulting with K-12 districts.
- 2. A qualified consultant will have knowledge of the Colorado Model Content Standards.
- 3. A qualified consultant will have knowledge of the Colorado Student Assessment Program.
- 4. A qualified consultant will have demonstrated expertise in the area(s) that are keeping the district from making AYP.

| Name of District:  |
|--|
| Name of Consultant:  |
| Consultant Qualifications: (Include a resume(s), credentials, websites, business portfolio or other relevant background information that shows the qualifications of the consultant(s)). |
|  |
|  |
|  |

| Title I Corrective Action Plan |   |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| AYP                            | FAIR:   |  |  |  |
| Performance<br>Level           | -Districts that have not made AYP for 5 years in a row -Districts that made 85 to 94 percent of their AYP targets and their two year trend shows the number of targets met is stable or decreasing; or -Districts that made below 85 percent of their AYP targets and their two year trend shows that the number of targets met is increasing.  |  |  |  |
| Type of Evaluation             | Intensive Self Evaluation or Facilitated Evaluation   |  |  |  |
| Type of Change                 | Systems Change: The district must go through an intensive self-evaluation or a facilitated evaluation using CDE's 9 standards for district improvement.  Training for the self evaluation will be required for districts that fall into this category.  Should a district choose to use a facilitator for this process a list of approved facilitators will be provided.  |  |  |  |
| To Meet<br>Requirements        | An Approvable Plan will:  1. Include a description of the self evaluation process (agendas, participants, procedures, data collected, etc.) Districts must go through the self evaluation training that will be scheduled in September of 2006.  2. Address the findings of the self evaluation through a strategic plan for systemic change.  3. Define specific measurable goals that are tied to the findings of the self evaluation and have a likelihood of success.  4. Incorporate strategies grounded in scientifically based research.  5. Provide for high-quality professional development for relevant staff that focuses on systemic change.  6. Include a determination why the LEA's previous plan did not bring about increased student academic achievement. |  |  |  |

## Intensive Self Evaluation: Description

Districts that are identified for Corrective Action and their AYP Performance Level is rated as "Fair" must go through an intensive self evaluation using CDE's 9 standards for district improvement.

A district may also choose to use the services of an approved facilitator to assist it in the self evaluation process. CDE will provide districts with a list of approved facilitators.

Participants on the self evaluation team must participate in a training session that will be scheduled in September of 2006.

## The self evaluation will:

- 1. Be conducted by a team made up of a variety of stakeholders who have been trained in the self-evaluation process (teachers, Title I coordinators, administrators).
- 2. Result in a report of the findings of the self evaluation. The training will provide details regarding the generation of the report.
- 3. Contain checks and balances to ensure an honest and open appraisal of the district and its functioning based on the 9 standards for district improvement.

| Title I Corrective Action Plan |   |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| AYP                            | LOW:  |  |  |  |
| Performance                    | -Districts that have not made AYP for 5 years in a row  |  |  |  |
| Level                          | -Districts that made below 85 percent of their AYP targets and their two year trend   |  |  |  |
|                                | in the number of targets met is stable or decreasing.   |  |  |  |
| Type of                        | Independent Evaluation using:   |  |  |  |
| Evaluation                     | -Comprehensive Appraisal for District Improvement; <b>OR</b>  |  |  |  |
|                                | -An approved independent consultant(s) to perform a systemic assessment.  |  |  |  |
| Type of                        | Systems Change:   |  |  |  |
| Change                         | The independent evaluation will serve as the foundation for strategic planning for  |  |  |  |
|                                | the implementation of the change process.   |  |  |  |
| To Meet                        | An Approvable Plan will:  |  |  |  |
| Requirements                   | 1. Include a copy of the report produced by the external evaluators.  |  |  |  |
|                                | 2. Address the findings of the independent evaluation through a strategic plan for systemic change.   |  |  |  |
|                                | 3. Define specific measurable goals that are tied to the findings of the self   |  |  |  |
|                                | evaluation and have a likelihood of success.  |  |  |  |
|                                | 4. Incorporate strategies grounded in scientifically based research.  |  |  |  |
|                                | 5. Provide for high-quality professional development for relevant staff that  |  |  |  |
|                                | focuses on systemic change.   |  |  |  |
|                                | 6. Include a determination why the LEA's previous plan did not bring  |  |  |  |
|                                | about increased student academic achievement.   |  |  |  |
|                                | 7. If the appraisal is conducted by a group other than CADI the plan must include the resume or other relevant background information showing the specific expertise of the consultant(s) chosen to perform the |  |  |  |
|                                | appraisal.  |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |
|                                |   |  |  |  |

## **Outside Evaluator Qualifications**

Districts that are identified for Corrective Action and their AYP Performance Level is rated as "Low" must go through an independent evaluation that takes a look at the "systems" that exist in the district as they relate to CDE's 9 standards for District Improvement. Those 9 standards are: Curriculum, Assessment, Instruction, District Culture, Community support, Professional growth, Leadership, Organizational structure and resources, and Effective planning.

The district may schedule a CDE Comprehensive Appraisal for District Improvement (CADI) visit or it may enlist the services of a qualified outside evaluator. The group that will do the evaluation must be approved by CDE prior to the evaluation. Below is a list of qualifications.

- 1. A qualified evaluator will have documentation showing an extensive background in educational consulting with K-12 districts.
- 2. A qualified evaluator will have knowledge of the Colorado Model Content Standards.
- 3. A qualified evaluator will have knowledge of the Colorado Student Assessment Program.
- 4. An appropriate evaluation will assess the district in how it is functioning with regard to the 9 standards of Curriculum, Assessment, Instruction, District Culture, Community support, Professional growth, Leadership, Organizational structure and resources, Effective planning.
- 5. An appropriate evaluation must be thorough and comprehensive.

This portion only needs to be completed if the district is using a group other than CADI.

| Name of District:  |   |
|--|---|
| Name of Outside Evaluator:   |   |
| Outside Evaluator Qualifications: (Include a resume(s), credentials, websites, portfolio or other relevant background information that shows the qualification consultant(s)).                                     |   |
| Include the proposed agenda and a description showing the thoroughness and oprocess. Describe who will be interviewed, what data will be used and what treport will be generated after the evaluation is complete. | 1 |