

District QC Rubric


Quality Criteria Rubric for Evaluating District Unified Improvement Plans (UIPs)

Overview

The Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) is intended to provide districts and schools with a consistent format to capture improvement planning efforts that streamline state and federal planning requirements and increase student learning. CDE developed the Quality Criteria rubric to offer guidance for creating high quality improvement plans and to establish the criteria for state and local review of district level UIPs, especially for districts on the accountability clock (i.e., Priority Improvement, Turnaround). The criteria in this document sit in the “meets expectation” column of the rubric.

General Directions

- ❑ Access the pre-populated report through the UIP Online System (<https://cdeapps.cde.state.co.us/index.html>) to determine the district’s unique accountability and program requirements.
- ❑ Examine the “Big Five” Guiding Questions, note their alignment with the UIP and determine which they need to address, based on previous CDE feedback (if any).
- ❑ Use the Meets Expectations and Meets Expectations at a High Level columns to guide the process.



The Big Five Guiding Questions

The “Big Five” are five guiding questions that outline the major concepts of the improvement planning process. The questions build upon each other and facilitate alignment across the entire plan. Does the plan:

- 1 Investigate the most critical performance areas and prioritize the most urgent **performance challenges**?
- 2 Identify **root causes** that explain the magnitude of the performance challenges?
- 3 Identify evidence-based **major improvement strategies** that have likelihood to eliminate the root causes?
- 4 Present a well-designed **action plan** for implementing the major improvement strategies to bring about dramatic improvement?
- 5 Include elements that effectively **monitor** the impact and **progress** of the action plan?

Structure

Organized by the “Big Five,” the various plan elements are further defined and include questions that if addressed, *lead to* a well-developed improvement plan. Most of these questions blend best practice and accountability requirements. Districts should aim for meeting the criteria in the two far right columns (Meets Expectations and Meets Expectations at a High Level). The most effective plans build a case that remains coherent across each section of the plan, rather than simply addressing each section independently. Those requirements that only apply to some districts are labeled separately at the end of each section. Greyed out sections will not be reviewed by CDE during the current school year.

1		Does the plan investigate the most critical performance areas and prioritize the most urgent performance challenges? <i>Applicable Plan Elements: Data Narrative, Notable Trends, Priority Performance Challenges</i>			
		Does Not Meet Expectations	Partially Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level
Brief Description	Demographics and Context	Does not include a description of district's context.	Includes an incomplete description of district demographics and relevant contextual information about district and community.	Includes a description of district's demographics and relevant contextual information about district and community.	Includes a thorough and compelling data narrative that can be used as a model for other districts.
	Stakeholder Input and Involvement	Does not include a description of who was involved in development of the UIP.	Provides limited information about who was involved in development of the UIP or stakeholders have only been consulted.	Describes a variety of stakeholders (including teachers and the District Accountability Committee) that have been involved in development of the UIP in a meaningful way.	
Current Performance	Current Performance	Does not include an explanation of district's current performance.	Describes district's current performance relative to just one set of expectations (e.g. local, state or federal expectations).	Includes an explanation of the district's current performance relative to local, state and federal expectations (e.g. DPF, ESSA).	
	Previous Performance Targets		Includes previous year's performance targets, but does not include any reflection and does connect to current plan.	Includes a reflection on previous improvement efforts and attainment of performance targets that provides a basis for the current plan.	
Notable Trends	Trend Statements	Does not include, or trend statements have significant issues. Example: Multiple measures or metrics in one statement (e.g., %P&A to MSS). Example: Trends are outdated (e.g., does not include most recent year).	Includes partially developed statements that consistently miss key elements (e.g., measure, metrics, disaggregated groups, trend direction, years, comparison point).	Consistently describes both positive and negative trends for performance, including key elements (e.g., measure, metric, disaggregated groups, trend direction, years, and comparison point) as appropriate for available n-counts.	
	Trend Analysis		Identifies trends that do not provide a clear picture of the district's data story.	Includes trends that are at the appropriate level of detail given the district's context.	
	Data Sources		Uses only one data source (e.g., CMAS, local interim assessment).	Includes multiple data sources with an explanation of the sources that were included or excluded for analysis.	

Does the plan investigate the most critical performance areas and prioritize the most urgent performance challenges?					
Applicable Plan Elements: Data Narrative, Notable Trends, Priority Performance Challenges					
1 cont.		Does Not Meet Expectations	Partially Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level
Priority Performance Challenges (PPC)	Identification of PPCs	Does not identify PPCs or PPCs have significant issues. Example: PPCs focused on adult actions. Example: PPCs listed as needs or next steps.	Identifies PPCs focused on student performance, but not at the appropriate magnitude or lacks focus (e.g., five PPCs).	Identifies no more than three student-centered performance challenges describing strategic focus for the district at the appropriate magnitude.	Includes a thorough and compelling data narrative that can be used as a model for other districts.
	Rationale		Provides a vague or weak rationale for prioritizing the PPCs.	Provides a rationale for prioritizing the PPCs.	
	Alignment to Trends		Includes a plausible PPC but lacks corresponding trend statements or any supporting data.	PPCs are aligned to trend analysis.	
	Address Indicators		Includes indicators that partially address where the system is not meeting expectations.	PPCs address indicators where the system is not meeting expectations	
Additional Requirements for Some Districts in Data Narrative, Notable Trends, Priority Performance Challenges					
On Watch	Sustained Improvement (Prior Targets)	No reflection on previous efforts	A vague reference to impacts from previous improvement efforts.	Reflection on improvement efforts demonstrate understanding of changes to support sustained or accelerated improvement.	Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other districts.
Late on the clock Year 4 or later	Prior year targets and previous efforts	Does not include a reference to previous efforts.	A general reference of efforts undertaken. Does not describe gaps in needs or insights from implementation.	Includes a description of previous actions to address identified challenges and their degree of effectiveness (e.g., successes, gaps). This may include required Turnaround actions.	
EASI Grant For grantees within Exploration or Offered Services	Integration of evaluation	Does not include reference to the diagnostic, planning or implementation efforts.	References that a diagnostic review, pathway planning or implementation processes took place, but does not integrate results into the plan.	Includes updates to the data analysis and priority performance challenges based on the results of the diagnostic review, pathway planning or pathway implementation process.	
Gifted Education	Prior Years Target	Does not include a description of progress toward previously identified targets.	There may an incomplete or unclear description of results.	Describes the performance of gifted education students compared to previously identified targets.	
	Performance Challenge	Does not provide a clear priority challenge for gifted education students.	There is an incomplete or unclear description of performance needs of gifted students.	Explicitly identifies for gifted education a student-centered performance challenge describing a strategic focus for district improvement efforts, either as a part of a larger district challenge or exclusively for gifted education students.	

<div> <div>1</div> <div>cont.</div> </div> <div> Does the plan investigate the most critical performance areas and prioritize the most urgent performance challenges? <i>Applicable Plan Elements: Data Narrative, Notable Trends, Priority Performance Challenges</i> </div>					
		Does Not Meet Expectations	Partially Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level
21st Century Community Learning Centers <i>For grantees</i>	Analysis of Student Needs (Trends, PPCs)	Does not include a description of how the district identified needs and how they are met through the 21st CCLC out-of-school time programming.	Provides a vague or incomplete description of the needs and how they are met through the 21st CCLC out-of-school time programming.	Includes a description of how the district identified, through its comprehensive needs assessment, how to meet the needs of its students through 21st CCLC out-of-school time programming.	Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other districts.
ESSA <i>Comprehensive Schools and Targeted/ Additional Targeted Schools</i>	Support for identified schools (Data Analysis or Action Planning)	Does not include a description of how the district is supporting low performing schools to exit the ESSA school improvement designation and how it is monitoring implementation of the school's plan.	Provides a vague or partial description of how the district is supporting low performing schools to exit the ESSA school improvement designation and how it is monitoring implementation of the school's plan.	Includes a description of how the district is supporting low performing schools to exit the ESSA school improvement designation and how it is monitoring implementation of the school's plan.	

2		Does the plan identify root causes which explain the magnitude of the performance challenges? <i>Applicable Plan Elements: Data Narrative, Root Causes</i>			
		Does Not Meet Expectations	Partially Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level
Root Cause Analysis	Identification of RCs	Does not identify root causes or the root causes have significant issues. Example: Focus is not aimed at systems level, weak rationale, and no connection to performance challenges.	Selects root causes that do not fully meet definition (e.g., under control of district, aimed at the systems level, addresses underlying reason for student performance).	Identifies root causes that meet the definition (e.g., under control of district, aimed at the systems level, addresses underlying reason for student performance).	Includes a thorough and convincing root cause analysis that can be used as a model for other districts.
	RC Alignment with PPC and with MIS		Associates root cause(s) with PPC(s) but will not likely lead to its resolution or are so broad the resulting plan lacks focus.	Associates each root cause with at least one PPC that it has a likelihood of addressing and is specific enough that it provides enough focus for the resulting action plan.	
	Verification Process		Includes a vague or incomplete verification process (e.g., only one data source, lacks conclusion drawn from data analysis). May list same root cause for multiple years without progress or re-examination.	References multiple and current data sources (e.g. process data, perception data) used to select and verify root causes.	
	Root Cause Process		Describes the root cause process, but does not provide enough detail to fully understand the rationale or ensure inclusion of stakeholders.	Explains how root causes were identified, including stakeholder involvement and the rationale for selecting the root cause.	
Additional Requirements for Some Districts in Root Cause Analysis					
EASI Grant <i>For grantees within Exploration or Offered Services</i>	Identification of Systems Needs of School	Does not reference analysis as a result of activities approved through the EASI application as expected.	Provides an incomplete or unconnected systems analysis as a result of exploration work through EASI grant participation.	Provides an integrated systems analysis as a result of exploration work through EASI grant participation.	Provides a through response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other districts.
Late on the clock Year 4 or later	Reassessment of RCs Over Time	Root causes are problematic and do not address past CDE feedback.	Refers to the same root cause as in previous plans without critical re-examination. The description does not fully respond to past CDE feedback.	Root cause analysis reflects a current examination of causes.	
Course Taking Analysis	Analysis of course taking patterns	Does not include an analysis of course taking patterns by disaggregated groups.	Includes an analysis of student course taking patterns, but it is incomplete (e.g., does not examine by disaggregated groups).	Includes an analysis of student course taking patterns by disaggregated groups.	

Does the plan identify root causes which explain the magnitude of the performance challenges?

Applicable Plan Elements: Data Narrative, Root Causes

2 cont.

		Does Not Meet Expectations	Partially Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level
ECE Needs Assessment (SB 17-103) <i>For districts on clock</i>	<i>ECE Needs Assessment</i>	Does not include a reference to an Early Childhood needs assessment.	References a need assessment generally but does not provide an analysis of the needs assessment or summarize needs, or is not specific to schools with a priority improvement or turnaround plan type.	Describes an analysis of the needs assessment that considers the required elements ¹ and provides an indication of what the district is doing with the results, specifically with schools with a priority improvement or turnaround plan type.	Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other districts.
EASI Grant <i>For grantees (as appropriate for Exploration and Offered Services)</i>	Identification of Systems Needs of District	Does not reference analysis as a result of activities approved through the EASI application as expected.	Provides an incomplete or unconnected systems analysis as a result of exploration work through EASI grant participation.	Provides an integrated systems analysis as a result of exploration work through EASI grant participation.	
Equitable Distribution of Teachers (Title I) <i>For identified districts</i>	Root Cause Analysis Process Description and Validation	Does not address the analysis.	References a need assessment generally but does not provide an analysis of the analysis or summarize needs.	Describes an analysis of the equitable distribution of teachers (ESEA requires districts to ensure that poor and minority children are not taught at higher rates than other children by inexperienced, unqualified or out-of-field teachers).	

¹ Required ECE needs assessment elements can be found at: http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/implementing_sb17_103

3						Does the plan identify evidence-based major improvement strategies that are likely to eliminate the root causes? <i>Applicable Plan Elements: Major Improvement Strategies</i>					
		Does Not Meet Expectations		Partially Meets Expectations		Meets Expectations		Meets Expectations at a High Level			
Major Improvement Strategies	Evidence-Based Strategies	Does not identify major improvement strategies or the strategies have significant issues. Example: Rationale for selection, evidence base, alignment to root cause are missing and the overall strategy is weak.	Provides some evidence or rationale for the effectiveness of the selected MIS, but it is incomplete.		Identifies MIS that are clearly defined, evidence-based and provides rationale for why this strategy is a good fit for the school.		Identifies high leverage major improvement strategies that can be used as a model for other districts.				
	Alignment to root causes		Offers a loose or incomplete connection between MIS and root causes. May list same MIS for multiple years without progress or re-examination.		Includes MIS that align and respond to identified root causes.						
	Strength of MIS		Identifies strategies that are broad and not achievable in two years. Provides a vague case for impacting student outcomes.		Identifies MIS that address the magnitude of the identified PPCs and have a likelihood of resolving the root cause(s).						
Additional Requirements for Some Districts in Major Improvement Strategies											
Accountability Clock Strategies <i>For districts on clock</i>	Likelihood of success	Lacks urgency and does not identify MIS that will result in adequate change in performance.	Provides an incomplete plan that has a loose connection to changing performance enough to exit the district from the accountability clock within a reasonable timeframe.		Conveys a sense of urgency and has a likelihood of resulting in adequate change in performance for the district to exit the accountability clock within a reasonable timeframe.		Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other districts.				
	Turnaround strategy For Turnaround	Does not identify a state-required turnaround strategy or lacks detail on selected strategy.	Identifies a required turnaround strategy, but does not include detail in the action plan.		Identifies a state-required turnaround strategy and details within the action plan that are aligned to the needs identified in the data narrative.						

4						Does the plan present a well-designed plan for implementing the major improvement strategies to bring about dramatic improvement? <i>Applicable Plan Elements: Action Plan</i>			
		Does Not Meet Expectations	Partially Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level				
Action Plans	Alignment to MIS	Does not include action steps or they are so limited that readers cannot understand what is needed for implementation of MIS.	Provides loose alignment between action steps and MIS.	Aligns action steps to MIS.	Identifies high leverage action steps that can be used as a model for other districts.				
	Specific and Reasonable Action Steps		Describes theoretical activities or ongoing activities rather than specific tasks to achieve MIS; provides a sequence that is not logical.	Lists action steps that are thorough, attainable and can be completed within the designated time frame.					
	Two-Year Action Plan		Outlines an action plan that spans less than two years.	Guides plan implementation for at least two academic years.					
	Assigned Resources		Assigns some resources (e.g., personnel, funds) but at too broad a level to carry out actions.	Assigns adequate resources (e.g., personnel, funds) necessary to implement action steps.					
Additional Requirements for Some Districts in Action Steps									
Student Course Taking Report <i>CDE will not check until TSDL Collection reopens.</i>	Action to address Inequities in course taking patterns	Does not include action steps to address identified patterns of disparities in disaggregated groups taking challenging coursework.	Includes vague steps to address significant disparities in disaggregated groups taking challenging coursework, but it is not clear that those steps will have an impact.	Includes action steps to address identified patterns of significant disparities in disaggregated groups taking challenging coursework.					
On Watch	Sustained Improvement	There is little or loose connection to previous improvement efforts.	Actions reflect a general theme from previous improvement efforts.	Action steps reflect alignment and urgency building upon previous improvement efforts that moved the school off the clock.	Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other districts.				
READ Act	Strategies to Address K-3 Reading	Does not include strategies that address the K-3 students identified as having significant reading deficiencies.	Includes some reading strategies, but it is not evident that they will have meaningful impact for K-3 students identified as having significant reading deficiencies.	Includes strategies that address K-3 students identified as having significant reading deficiencies.					

<div> <div>4</div> <div>cont.</div> </div>		Does the plan present a well-designed plan for implementing the major improvement strategies to bring about dramatic improvement? <i>Applicable Plan Elements: Action Plan</i>			
		Does Not Meet Expectations	Partially Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level
21st Century Community Learning Centers <i>For grantees</i>	Aligned program activities	Does not include action steps specific to 21st CCLC program activities.	Includes vague or limited action steps specific to 21st CCLC program activities that align to district's overall action plan.	Includes action steps specific to 21st CCLC program activities that align to district's overall action plan.	Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other districts.
	Family Engagement Strategies	Does not include action steps specific to 21st CCLC program family engagement and learning strategies.	Includes vague or limited action steps specific to 21st CCLC program family engagement and learning strategies that align with the district's action plan.	Includes action steps specific to 21st CCLC program family engagement and learning strategies that align with the district's action plan.	
	21st Century Learning Skills	Does not include action steps focused on 21st Century Learning Skills (e.g., STEM, Literacy).	Includes vague or limited action steps focused on 21st Century Learning Skills and provides a limited description about how 21st CCLC out-of-district program activities support and loosely align with action steps.	Includes action steps focused on 21st Century Learning Skills (e.g., STEM, Literacy) and provides a description about how 21st CCLC out-of-district program activities support and align with the action steps.	
EASI Grant <i>For grantees within District Design and Led and Offered Services</i>	Aligned Action Plan	Does not reference activities approved through the EASI application as expected.	Action steps provide a vague or incomplete alignment with activities approved through the EASI grant.	Action steps provide alignment with activities approved through the EASI grant.	
Gifted Education	Actions to Support Gifted Students	Does not identify actions that will explicitly support the needs of gifted education students.	Provides a vague or misaligned approach to meeting the performance needs of gifted education students.	Describes an explicit approach to meet the performance needs of gifted education students.	

5

Does the plan include elements to effectively monitor the impact and progress of the action plan?

Applicable Plan Elements: Targets, Interim Measures, Implementation Benchmarks

		Does Not Meet Expectations	Partially Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations	Meets Expectations at a High Level
Performance Targets	Measures and Metrics	Does not include annual performance targets or is missing big sections (e.g., provides achievement but not graduation targets).	Lists targets that do not specify measures or do not specify metrics.	Specifies the measure (assessment method) and metric (standard of measurement).	Identifies a thorough progress monitoring plan that can be used as a model for other districts.
	Alignment to PPCs		Provides targets that are not aligned to identified PPCs.	Identifies targets that address PPC(s).	
	Quality of Target		Lists targets that are general and not likely to be attainable. The district will likely not meet state expectations in a reasonable timeframe.	Provides targets that are specific, ambitious, yet attainable. The timeframe is reasonable.	
Interim Measures	Measures and Metrics	No plan for checking student performance throughout district year or interim measures are off mark. Example: Measures reference system or adult behaviors.	Names interim measure but consistently lacks metrics.	Specifies interim measure that names student measure (assessment method) and metric (standard of measurement).	
	Alignment to Target		Lists interim measures with an inconsistent or unclear relationship to annual target.	Aligns interim measure to corresponding annual target.	
	Quality of Interim Measures		Lists interim measures but it is not clear student progress can be assessed more than once a district year or provides vague expectations for student progress.	Lists interim measures with a schedule that specifies expected student progress multiple times a year.	
Implementation Benchmarks	Alignment to MIS	Does not include benchmarks to monitor implementation progress or benchmarks are off mark. Example: Written as targets or student performance expectations or action steps.	Lists implementation benchmark(s) without a clear relationship to the MIS.	Each MIS has at least one aligned implementation benchmark.	
	Quality of Implementation Benchmarks		Includes implementation benchmarks that use a checklist approach, rather than assessing effectiveness. It may not be clear that implementation can be assessed or mid-course corrections made.	Provides benchmarks that enable staff to determine whether implementation of MIS are occurring in an effective manner and allows for mid-course adjustments that change practice.	

5

cont.

Does the plan include elements to effectively monitor the impact and progress of the action plan?
Applicable Plan Elements: Targets, Interim Measures, Implementation Benchmarks
**Does Not Meet
Expectations**
Partially Meets Expectations
Meets Expectations
**Meets
Expectations at a
High Level**
Additional Requirements for Some Districts in Progress Monitoring

READ Act	READ Act Targets (SRD)	Does not specify target(s) for reducing number of students who have significant reading deficiencies.	Includes reading target(s), but does not focus on reducing number of students who have significant reading deficiencies.	Specifies target(s) for reducing number of students who have significant reading deficiencies.	Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other districts.
	READ Act Targets (Grade Level Expectations)	Does not specify target(s) to ensure that each student achieves grade level expectations in reading by end of grade 3.	Includes reading target(s), but does not ensure that each student achieves grade level expectations by end of grade 3.	Specifies target(s) to ensure that each student achieves grade level expectations in reading by end of grade 3.	
	READ Act Interim Assessments	Does not reference interim assessments that are aligned with K-3 literacy targets.	References interim assessments that are aligned with K-3 literacy targets in an incomplete way.	References interim assessments that are aligned with K-3 literacy targets.	
EASI Grant <i>For grantees within District Design, Led, Offered Services</i>	Evaluation plan	There is no implementation monitoring plan of approved EASI activities.	Implementation benchmarks provide a vague or incomplete strategy to monitor activities approved through the EASI grant.	Includes implementation benchmarks that describe how the school will monitor implementation of activities approved in the EASI grant.	
Gifted Education	Gifted Education Targets	Does not provide targets for gifted education students.	Provides unclear or misaligned targets for gifted education students.	Describes annual performance targets for gifted education students.	
	Gifted Education Interim Measures	Does not provide interim measures for gifted education students.	Provides unclear or misaligned interim measures to targets for gifted education students.	Describes interim measures aligned to performance targets for gifted education students.	