**Colorado’s Unified Improvement Plan for Districts for 2015-16**

Organization Code: [xxxx] District Name: [Name] AU Code: [xxxx] AU Name: [Name] Official 2014 DPF: [1-Year/3-Year]

**Section I: Summary Information about the District/Consortium**

**Directions:** This section provides an overview of the district/consortium’s improvement plan. To complete this section, copy and paste the district/consortium’s Priority Performance Challenges, Root Causes and Major Improvement Strategies from Section III and IV of the 2015-16 UIP once it has been completed. In the UIP online system, this section will populate automatically as the UIP is written.

|  |
| --- |
| **Executive Summary** |
| **How are students performing? Where will the district focus attention?****Priority Performance Challenges:** *Specific statements about the district’s performance challenges (not budgeting, staffing curriculum, instruction, etc.), with at least one priority identified for each performance indicator (achievement, growth, growth gaps, PWR) where the district did not meet federal, state and/or local expectations.* |
|  |
| **Why is the education system continuing to have these challenges?****Root Causes:** *Statements describing the deepest underlying cause, or causes, of the performance challenge(s), that, if dissolved, would result in elimination, or substantial reduction of the performance challenge(s).* |
|  |
| **What action is the district taking to eliminate these challenges?****Major Improvement Strategies:** *An overall approach that describes a series of related actions intended to result in improvements in performance.* |
|  |

Access the District Performance Framework here: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance>

**Pre-Populated Report for the District**

**Directions:** This section summarizes program accountability requirements unique to the district/consortium based upon federal and state accountability measures. Historically, this report has included information from the District Performance Framework; because of the state assessment transition and passage of HB15-1323, 2015 DPFs will not be created. In the table below, CDE has pre-populated the district/consortium’s data in **blue** text. This data shows the district/consortium’s performance in meeting minimum federal and state accountability program expectations.

**Student Performance Measures for State and Federal Accountability**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Indicators | Measures/ Metrics | 2014-15 Federal and State Expectations | 2014-15 Grantee Results | Meets Expectations? |
| **English Language Development and Attainment** | AMAO 1**Description:** Academic Growth sub-indicator rating for English Language Proficiency | A rating of Meets or Exceeds on the Academic Growth sub-indicator for English Language Proficiency.  | [Rating] | [Yes/No] |
| AMAO 2 **Description:** % of ELLs that have attained English proficiency on WIDA ACCESS | 13% of students meet AMAO 2 expectations. | [%] | [Yes/No] |
| AMAO 3 **Description:** Academic Growth Gaps content sub-indicator ratings (median and adequate growth percentiles in reading, mathematics, and writing) for ELLs; Disaggregated Graduation Rate sub-indicator for ELLs; and Participation Rates for ELLs | (1) Meets or Exceeds ratings on Academic Growth Gaps content sub-indicators for ELLs, (2) Meets or Exceeds rating on Disaggregated Graduation Rate sub-indicator for ELLs and (3) Meets Participation Requirements for ELLs. | R | N/A | N/A |
| W | N/A |
| M | N/A |
| Grad | N/A |
| Partici-pation | N/A |

**Accountability Status and Requirements for Improvement Plan**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Summary of District Plan Timeline**  | October 15, 2015 | (Districts on Priority Improvement or Turnaround) An optional submission for review is available on October 15, 2015 for early feedback. For required elements in the improvement plan, go to the Quality Criteria at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp>.  |
| January 15, 2016 | (Districts on Priority Improvement or Turnaround) The district UIP is due to CDE for review on January 15, 2016 through Tracker or the UIP online system.  |
| April 15, 2016 | (All Districts) The UIP is due to CDE for public posting on April 15, 2016 through Tracker or the UIP online system. Some program level reviews will occur at this same time. For required elements in the improvement plan, go to the Quality Criteria at: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp>.  |

**Accountability Status and Requirements for Improvement Plan** (cont.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Identification Process | Identification for District | Directions for Completing Improvement Plan |
| **State Accountability and Grant Programs** |
| **Plan Type for State Accreditation**  | Plan type is assigned based on the district’s overall 2014 District Performance Framework score (achievement, growth, growth gaps, postsecondary and workforce readiness) and meeting requirements for finance, safety, participation and test administration. | [Plan Type] [Year] | [Customized Directions] Districts with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type based on the 2014 DPF must submit the plan to CDE for review on January 15, 2016. Districts with a Turnaround plan type assignment must complete the required addendum for Turnaround districts. Note the specialized requirements for Turnaround districts are included in the Quality Criteria document. |
| **School(s) on Accountability Clock** | At least one school in the district has a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type – meaning that the school is on the accountability clock. | Number of Schools on Clock: [#] | [Customized Directions] Districts are encouraged to include information on how schools on the accountability clock are receiving additional intensive supportaimed at increasing dramatic results for students.  |
| **Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District)** | In one or more of the four prior school years, the district (1) had an overall postsecondary and workforce readiness rating of “Does Not Meet” or “Approaching” on the District Performance Framework and (2) had an on-time graduation rate below 59.5% or an annual dropout rate at least two times greater than the statewide dropout rate for that year.  | [Yes/No] | [Customized Directions] Districts that need to complete a Student Graduation and Completion Plan must submit a UIP for CDE review. Note that specialized requirements for Designated Graduation Districts are included in the Quality Criteria document. |
| **Gifted Education** | All Administrative Units (AUs) that are the lead agency for the Gifted Program. Multiple district AUs (including BOCES) may incorporate the Gifted Program requirements into each individual district level UIP. | [AU Lead for Gifted Program/Not the AU Lead for Gifted Program] | [Customized Directions] Grantees with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type must submit a UIP for review on January 15, 2016. All other AUs must submit the district level plan for review by April 15, 2016. If a multiple district AU has a member district that has a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type, the Gifted Program plan may still be submitted by the April deadline. All AUs must complete the required Gifted Education addendum.   Note that specialized requirements are included for all AUs leading a Gifted Program in the Quality Criteria document. The state expectations for Gifted Education Programs are posted on the CDE website at:  <http://www.cde.state.co.us/gt/director.html>. Directors may use disaggregated data provided in data folders like last year.  |

**Accountability Status and Requirements for Improvement Plan** (cont.)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Program | Identification Process | Identification for District | Directions for Completing Improvement Plan |

|  |
| --- |
| **ESEA and Grant Accountability** |
| **Title IA** | Title IA funded Districts with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type assignment. | [Yes/No] | [Customized Directions] Priority Improvement and Turnaround districts must complete the required addendum for ESEA programs. Note that specialized requirements are included for Title I in the Quality Criteria document. |
| **Title IIA** | Title IIA funded Districts with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type assignment. | [Yes/No] | [Customized Directions] Priority Improvement and Turnaround districts must complete the required addendum for ESEA programs. Note that specialized requirements are included for Title IIA in the Quality Criteria document. |
| **Program Improvement under Title III** | District/Consortium missed AMAOs for two or more consecutive years. | [Yes/No] | [Customized Directions] Grantees with a Priority Improvement or Turnaround plan type must submit a UIP for review on January 15, 2016. All other grantees identified under Title III must submit a plan for review on April 15, 2016. All identified grantees must complete the required Title III addenda. Identified grantees on Priority Improvement or Turnaround must complete the required Title III and the ESEA addenda. Note that specialized requirements are included for Title III in the Quality Criteria document. |
| **District with an Identified Focus School and/or School with a Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)** | District has at least one school that (1) has been identified as a Title I Focus School and/or (2) has a current TIG award. | [Yes/No] | [Customized Directions] Regardless of the district’s plan type, districts with a Focus school and/or a TIG school must address how the district is supporting the school(s) to make dramatic change. Note that specialized requirements are included for these school identifications in the Quality Criteria document. |

**Section II: Improvement Plan Information**

**Additional Information about the District**

|  |
| --- |
| Comprehensive Review and Selected Grant History |
| Related Grant Awards | Has the district received a grant that supports the district’s improvement efforts? When was the grant awarded?  |  |
| CADI | Has (or will) the district participated in a CADI review? If so, when? |  |
| External Evaluator | Has the district(s) partnered with an external evaluator to provide comprehensive evaluation? Indicate the year and the name of the provider/tool used. |  |
| Improvement Plan Information |
| The district/consortium is submitting this improvement plan to satisfy requirements for (check all that apply):🞎 State Accreditation 🞎 Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District) 🞎 Title IA 🞎 Title IIA🞎 Title III 🞎 Gifted Education 🞎 Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| **For districts with less than 1,000 students:** This plan is satisfying improvement plan requirements for: 🞎 District Only 🞎 District and School Level Plans (combined plan). If schools are included in this plan, attach their pre-populated reports and provide the names of the schools: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| District/Consortium Contact Information (Additional contacts may be added, if needed) |
| 1 | Name and Title |  |
| Email |  |
| Phone  |  |
| Mailing Address |  |
| 2 | Name and Title |  |
| Email |  |
| Phone  |  |
| Mailing Address |  |

**Section III: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification**



This section corresponds with the “Evaluate” portion of the continuous improvement cycle. The main outcome is to construct a narrative that describes the process and results of the analysis of the data for your district. The analysis should justify the performance targets and actions proposed in Section IV. Two worksheets have been provided to help organize your data analysis for your narrative. This analysis section includes: identifying where the district/consortium did not at least meet minimum state and federal accountability expectations; describing progress toward targets for the prior school year; describing what performance data were used in the analysis of trends; identifying trends and priority performance challenges (negative trends); describing how performance challenges were prioritized; identifying the root causes of performance challenges; describing how the root causes were identified and verified and what data were used; and describing stakeholder involvement in the analysis. Additional guidance on how to engage in the data analysis process is provided in Unified Improvement Planning Handbook.

***Implications of Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS) on Data Analysis:*** During the 2014-15 school year, Colorado transitioned from reading, writing and math TCAP assessments to CMAS PARCC English language arts and math assessments. These assessments measure related, but different content standards and are expected to have different proficiency levels. As a result, updating the data analysis this year (particularly the trend statements) may be more challenging. While the school’s data analysis is still expected to be updated, some modifications in typical practice may be needed. Refer to the UIP state assessment transition guidance document on the UIP website for options and considerations.

**Data Narrative for District/Consortium**

 **Directions:** In the narrative, describe the process and results of the data analysis for the district/consortium, including (1) a description of the district and the process for data analysis, (2) a review of current performance, (3) trend analysis, (4) priority performance challenges and (5) root cause analysis. A description of the expected narrative sections are included below. The narrative should not take more than five pages. Two worksheets (#1 *Progress Monitoring of Prior Year’s Performance* *Targets* and #2 *Data Analysis)* have been provided to organize the data referenced in the narrative.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description of District(s) Setting and Process for Data Analysis:** Provide a very brief description of the district(s) to set the context for readers (e.g., demographics). Include the general process for developing the UIP and participants (e.g., District Accountability Committee). |  | **Review Current Performance:** Review state and local data. Documentany areas where the district(s) did not at least meet state/ federal expectations. Consider the previous year’s progress toward the district’s targets. Identify the overall magnitude of the district’s performance challenges. |  | **Trend Analysis:** Provide a description of the trend analysis that includes at least three years of data (state and local data), if available. Trend statements should be provided in the four performance indicator areas and by disaggregated groups. Trend statements should include the direction of the trend and a comparison (e.g., state expectations, state average) to indicate why the trend is notable.  |  | **Priority Performance Challenges:** Identify notable trends (or a combination of trends) that are the highest priority to address (priority performance challenges). No more than 3-5 are recommended. Provide a rationale for why these challenges have been selected and address the magnitude of the district’s overall performance challenges. |  | **Root Cause Analysis:** Identify at least one root cause for every priority performance challenge. Root causes should address adult actions, be under the control of the district, and address the priority performance challenge(s). Provide evidence that the root cause was verified through the use of additional data. A description of the selection process for the corresponding major improvement strategy(s) is encouraged. |
| ***Narrative:*** |

**Worksheet #1: Progress Monitoring of Prior Year’s Performance Targets**

**Directions:** This chart supports analysis of progress made towards performance targets set for the 2014-15 school year (last year’s plan). While this worksheet should be included in your UIP, ***the main intent is to record your district/consortium’s reflections to help build your data narrative.***

| Performance Indicators | Targets for 2014-15 school year (Targets set in last year’s plan) | Performance in 2014-15? Was the target met? How close was the district to meeting the target? | Brief reflection on why previous targets were met or not met. |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Achievement (Status) |  |  |  |
|  |  |
| Academic Growth |  |  |
|  |  |
| Academic Growth Gaps |  |  |
|  |  |
| Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness |  |  |
|  |  |
| Student Graduation and Completion Plan (For Designated Graduation Districts) |  |  |  |
|  |  |
| English Language Development and Attainment (AMAOs) |  |  |
|  |  |

**Worksheet #2: Data Analysis**

**Directions: *This chart supports planning teams in recording and organizing observations about district-level data in preparation for writing the required data narrative.*** Planning teams should describe positive and negative trends for all of the four performance indicators using at least three years of data and then prioritize the performance challenges (based on notable trends) that the district/consortium will focus its efforts on improving. The root cause analysis and improvement planning efforts in the remainder of the plan should be aimed at addressing the identified priority performance challenge(s). A limited number of priority performance challenges is recommended (no more than 3-5); a performance challenge may apply to multiple performance indicators. At a minimum, priority performance challenges must be identified in any of the four performance indicator areas where minimum state and federal expectations were not met for accountability purposes. In most cases, this should just be an update to the plan from 2014 since the DPF has not changed for 2015. Finally, provide a brief description of the root cause analysis for any priority performance challenges. Root causes may apply to multiple priority performance challenges. You may add rows, as needed.

| Performance Indicators | Description of Notable Trends (3 years of past state and local data) | Priority Performance Challenges  | Root Causes |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Academic Achievement (Status) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Academic Growth |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Academic Growth Gaps |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Student Graduation and Completion Plan (For Designated Graduation Districts) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| English Language Development and Attainment (AMAOs) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**Section IV: Action Plan(s)**



This section addresses the “Plan” portion of the continuous improvement cycle. First, identify annual performance targets and the interim measures. This will be documented in the required *District/Consortium Target Setting Form* on the next page. Then move into action planning, which should be captured in the *Action Planning Form*.

**District/Consortium Target Setting Form**

**Directions:** Complete the worksheet below. Districts/consortia are expected to set their own annual targets for the performance indicators (i.e. academic achievement, academic growth, academic growth gaps, and postsecondary and workforce readiness). At a minimum, districts/consortia should set targets for each of the performance indicators where state expectations are not met; targets should also be connected to prioritized performance challenges identified in the data narrative (Section III). Consider last year’s targets (see Worksheet #1) and whether adjustments need to be made. For each annual performance target, identify interim measures that will be used to monitor progress toward the annual targets at least quarterly during the school year.

***Implications of Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS) on Target Setting:*** During the 2014-15 school year, Colorado transitioned from reading, writing and math TCAP assessments to CMAS PARCC English language arts and math assessments. These assessments measure related, but different content standards and are expected to have different proficiency levels. As a result, setting targets based on the percent of students scoring proficient and advanced is not appropriate. Furthermore, CDE does not yet know if student growth percentiles and median student growth percentiles will be available for accountability, planning or reporting use. It is known that adequate growth percentiles will not be available this year for 2014-15 results. Target setting is still expected to occur in the UIP process during this transition period. However, some modifications in typical practice may be needed. Refer to the UIP state assessment transition guidance document on the UIP website for options and considerations.

**District/Consortium Target Setting Form**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Performance Indicators | Measures/ Metrics | Priority Performance Challenges | Annual Performance Targets | Interim Measures for 2015-16 | Major Improvement Strategy |
|  | 2015-16 | 2016-17 |
| Academic Achievement (Status) | CMAS, CoAlt, K-3 literacy measure (READ Act), local measures | ELA |  |  |  |  |  |
| READ |  |  |  |  |  |
| M |  |  |  |  |  |
| S |  |  |  |  |  |
| Academic Growth | Median Growth Percentile (TCAP & ACCESS), local measures | ELA |  |  |  |  |  |
| M |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELP |  |  |  |  |  |
| Academic Growth Gaps | Median Growth Percentile, local measures | ELA |  |  |  |  |  |
| M |  |  |  |  |  |
| Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness | Graduation Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disag. Grad Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Dropout Rate |  |  |  |  |  |
| Mean CO ACT |  |  |  |  |  |
| Other PWR Measures |  |  |  |  |  |
| English Language Development & Attainment | ACCESS Growth (AMAO 1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| ACCESS Proficiency (AMAO 2) |  |  |  |  |  |

**Action Planning Form for 2015-16 and 2016-17**

**Directions:** Identify the major improvement strategy(s) for 2015-16 and 2016-17 that will address the root causes determined in Section III. For each major improvement strategy, identify the root cause(s) that the action steps will help to dissolve. Then, indicate which accountability provision or grant opportunity it will address. In the chart below, provide details about key action steps necessary to implement the major improvement strategy. Details should include the action steps that will be taken to implement the major improvement strategy, a general timeline, resources that will be used to implement the actions, and implementation benchmarks. Additional rows for action steps may be added. While the template provides space for three major improvement strategies, additional major improvement strategies may also be added. To keep the work manageable, however, it is recommended that districts focus on no more than 3 to 5 major improvement strategies.

**Major Improvement Strategy #1:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Root Cause(s) Addressed:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy** (check all that apply):

🞎 State Accreditation 🞎 Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District) 🞎 Title IA 🞎 Title IIA
🞎 Title III 🞎 Gifted Program 🞎 Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy** | **Timeline** | **Key Personnel\*** | **Resources** (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local) | **Implementation Benchmarks** | **Status of Action Step\*** (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun) |
| **2015-16** | **2016-17** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. “Status of Action Step” may be required for certain grants.

**Major Improvement Strategy #2:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Root Cause(s) Addressed:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy** (check all that apply):

🞎 State Accreditation 🞎 Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District) 🞎 Title IA 🞎 Title IIA
🞎 Title III 🞎 Gifted Program 🞎 Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy** | **Timeline** | **Key Personnel\*** | **Resources** (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local) | **Implementation Benchmarks** | **Status of Action Step\*** (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun) |
| **2015-16** | **2016-17** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. “Status of Action Step” may be required for certain grants.

**Major Improvement Strategy #3:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ **Root Cause(s) Addressed:** \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy** (check all that apply):

🞎 State Accreditation 🞎 Student Graduation and Completion Plan (Designated Graduation District) 🞎 Title IA 🞎 Title IIA
🞎 Title III 🞎 Gifted Program 🞎 Other: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy** | **Timeline** | **Key Personnel\*** | **Resources** (Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local) | **Implementation Benchmarks** | **Status of Action Step\*** (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun) |
| **2015-16** | **2016-17** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. “Status of Action Step” may be required for certain grants.

**Section V: Appendices**

Some districts/consortia will need to provide additional forms to document accountability or grant requirements:

* Additional Requirements for Turnaround Status Under State Accountability (Required for identified districts)
* Districts designated as a Graduation District (Required for identified districts)
* ESEA Programs, including Titles IA, IIA and III (Required for districts accepting ESEA funds with a Turnaround or Priority Improvement plan type)
* Title III (Required for all grantees identified for Improvement under Title III, regardless of plan type)
* Additional Requirements for Administrative Units with a Gifted Program (Required for all districts)