Sources of Revision to Data Analysis

The sources of revision to the data analyses processes for unified improvement planning include: ESEA Waiver Implications, Lessons Learned from UIP Reviews, and the UIP Needs Assessment Survey. Each is described below.

ESEA Waiver Implications for UIP

Data Analysis

- **Disaggregated graduation rates** added to SPF/DPF and UIP Template.

- **CELApro growth** including median growth percentiles and median adequate growth percentiles added to SPF/DPF and UIP Template.

- **Adequate Yearly Progress** (AYP) is no longer a part of school or district accountability; metrics removed from UIP.

Lessons Learned from UIP Reviews

Data Narrative

CDE reviews of unified improvement plans revealed the following patterns of weakness in the data narrative of plans:

- Reporting of data analysis was limited to previous targets only and didn't provide information about what contributed to the progress, or lack thereof, toward those targets.

- All required elements were not included.

- Trends were described and priority performance challenges were identified, but no root causes were determined.

- Little or no information provided about the process by which planning occurred and which stakeholders were involved, for example:

    - "…the staff determined the priority needs and root causes…"
    - "Additionally, we concluded that there was a great need to build awareness and understanding of how to effectively teach toward greater English language acquisition."

- In describing prior year's targets and current performance, no reference was made to the impact of improvements to date. What changes have been made as a result? Are improvement efforts a continuation? Does the data support it?

- No or little information about why the school selected to address some priority performance challenges over others.

Trend Statements

CDE reviews of unified improvement plans revealed the following patterns of weakness in trend statements within the data narrative:

- Required information about current performance – indicator areas in which the school/district did not at least meet expectations (Does Not Meet and Approaching) – was not included.

- Some trends that were critical to describing their performance were not identified.

- The reporting about the data analysis was limited and often did not meet basic federal program requirements.

- Local student performance data was seldom included in identifying trends.

- Trends for Growth Gaps were mistakenly described as gaps between the disaggregated group and not the disaggregated group rather than the difference between median growth percentiles and adequate growth percentiles for the disaggregated group.

- Data was provided in lists or tables, but trends were not described.

Prioritized Performance Challenges

CDE reviews of unified improvement plans revealed the following patterns of weakness in priority performance challenges within the data narrative:

- The performance challenges that were prioritized were not consistent with the magnitude of the overall performance challenge (e.g. schools with significant performance challenges overall that prioritized a small group of students within the school).

- Identification of priority performance challenges often did not include the most substantial challenges faced by the school or district.

- Achievement and growth were identified as separate priority performance challenges even when the metrics were focused on the same grade level and content area (separate challenges for 5th grade writing growth and 5th grade writing achievement).

- Priority Performance Challenges articulated what needed to be done, rather than the prioritized problem in student performance. For example, in order to meet state targets for a level increase to MEETS, reading Median Growth Percentile (MGP) must increase from 45 to 55 MGP.

- Little or no information about the process of how the team prioritized their performance challenges, or of why certain performance challenges were prioritized over others.

- It was unclear as to why some performance challenges were selected over others; this includes the following: too many (8-22) prioritized performance challenges, or the relationship between the priorities and the trends is unclear.

Root Cause Analysis

CDE reviews of unified improvement plans revealed the following patterns of weakness in root causes identified within the data narrative:

- The identified root cause(s) were frequently not appropriate given the performance challenges facing the school.

- Not framed as adult actions.

- Not within the control of the school and/or included student attributes. For example: "Students with disabilities, while receiving intensive and targeted instruction in reading, continue to underperform due to lack of instructional time and level of significant impairments."

- The root causes identified were inconsistent with the magnitude of the performance challenge.

- Little or no information provided about how root causes were verified, or no mention of what additional data was used.

- Did not identify data sources and results that were used to verify root causes. For example:

    – "We feel this is due to low expectations…"

    – "Ineffective planning of units and lessons has led to ineffective instruction because the intended outcomes are not the main focus."

    – "Leadership discussions with the teaching and non-teaching staff confirmed the lack of analysis and use of data to inform management, classroom, and instructional practices."

- Many schools listed the same Root Cause for each Priority Performance Challenge.

- Some plans included examples of verification of Root Cause with data from sources outside the school, such as citing quantitative research (e.g. coaching and teacher evaluations archives or instructional research of professional development).

UIP Needs Assessment Survey

Interpreting Colorado Growth Model Data

The percent of respondents who indicated that for School-Level staff it was somewhat challenging or their staff had a lot of trouble…

Topic	Percent
Interpreting median student growth percentiles	38%
Interpreting adequate growth percentiles	44%
Interpreting catch-up, keep-up and move-up growth	53%
Identifying trends in growth	37%
Setting performance targets for growth	51%

Engaging in Unified Improvement Planning Processes

The percent of respondents who indicated that for School-Level staff it was somewhat challenging or their staff had a lot of trouble . . .

Topic	Percent
Analyzing data and identifying performance trends	33%
Prioritizing performance challenges	49%
Determining root causes of performance challenges	64%
Developing a data narrative	47%

Priorities for additional support

The percent of respondents who indicated that the following UIP topics were a medium or high priority for additional support. . .

Topic	Percent
Analyzing, interpreting, and using growth model data	45%
Understanding the district and school performance framework report	40%
Developing a data narrative	49%
Analyzing data to identify performance trends (over at least 3 years)	35%
Prioritizing performance challenges	61%
Identifying root causes of performance challenges	68%