

ESSA Improvement Plan Rubric

Comprehensive, Targeted, and Additional Targeted Support and Improvement



ESSA Improvement Plan Rubric

ESSA §1111(d): School Support and Improvement Activities for (1) Comprehensive, (2) Targeted, and (3) Additional Targeted Support and Improvement

In compliance with the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), section 1111(d), schools identified for support and improvement must develop and implement an improvement plan, in consultation with stakeholders. There are differences in the approval of plans for schools identified as comprehensive support (CS) and those identified for targeted support (TS) or additional targeted support (ATS).

Comprehensive Support (CS): Under ESSA section 1111(d)(1)(B)(v), the state, LEA and school are expected to approve the school's CS plan. In Colorado, these requirements are expected to be captured in the school's Unified Improvement Plan (UIP). CDE will review and provide feedback on submitted UIPs using this rubric. Schools and LEAs will be required to revise their UIPs and implement the required changes in the subsequent year.

Targeted (TS) and Additional Targeted Support (ATS): ESSA specifies that only the school and LEA need to approve TS and ATS plans. As support, LEAs may use this rubric to approve TS and ATS improvement plans (including TS or ATS requirements embedded within the school's UIP). LEAs may also develop their own criteria and rubric for approving TS and ATS plans that meet ESSA requirements in section 1111(d)(2) of ESSA. Support for meeting the TS or ATS requirements can be requested by contacting the district's assigned [ESEA Regional Contact](#), Support Coordinator, or the UIP Team.

This rubric has been designed to meet different purposes at various levels.

For school use: Checklist of requirements in Unified Improvement Plan (UIP), support in developing a plan that meets minimum requirements, and self-evaluation of the quality of the plan.

For district use: Tool for approving ESSA Improvement Plan before submitting to the state for CS Plans, providing support to schools in developing CS, TS, or ATS plans, providing feedback on school plans, and engaging in conversation, coaching and collaboration with schools to strengthen plans. CS plans need to be submitted to CDE for review and approval; however, TS and ATS plans do not need to be submitted to the SEA and are approved by the LEA.

For CDE use: Tool for reviewing and approving UIPs from schools identified for CS under ESSA.

Resources

For additional information about the [ESSA Planning Requirements](#), visit

www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements.

For additional information about the [ESSA methods and Criteria for the identification of Schools for Support and Improvement](#), visit

https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essa_csi_tsi.

To request assistance, please contact Karen Bixler at bixler_k@cde.state.co.us, Tammy Giessinger at giessinger_t@cde.state.co.us or Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson at mohajeri-nelson_n@cde.state.co.us



The letters in red in corresponding success criteria sections, CS, TS, and ATS indicate the requirements to be included in a plan depending on the type of support and improvement plan a school has identified under ESSA.

Stakeholder Involvement & Engagement

ESSA section 1111(d)(1)(B) requires that “...the local education agency shall, for each school identified by the State and in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teacher, and parents), locally develop and implement a comprehensive support and improvement plan...”

CDE interprets this requirement as the plan must be developed in partnership with stakeholders, meaning they had a significant role in the improvement plan development process, including but not limited to reviewing the reasons for the school’s identification for ESSA support and improvement, the school’s performance on each ESSA indicator, prioritization of indicators based on ESSA indicators and selection of interventions or strategies for improving identified needs.

Success Criteria	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets
Stakeholder Input and Involvement CS TS ATS	Does not include a description of stakeholder involvement in development of UIP.	Provides limited information about who was involved in development of UIP; some stakeholders have been consulted.	Describes how a variety of stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and school staff, parents and families, and the School Accountability Committee) were meaningfully involved in UIP development.
Opportunities for Stakeholder Engagement. CS TS ATS	Does not describe how required stakeholder groups had opportunities to partner in the development of the improvement plan.	Describes how required stakeholder groups had limited opportunities to partner in the development of the improvement plan.	Describes stakeholders as active partners in multiple aspects of plan development (e.g., collaborating on data review to identify trends, reviewing reasons for school improvement identification, helping use data trends to prioritize improvement strategies).
Stakeholders and Identification CS TS ATS	UIP does not describe how stakeholders are made aware of ESSA identification.	UIP provides a partial description of stakeholder engagement in the planning process related to ESSA identification.	UIP clearly demonstrates that stakeholders were made aware of reasons for ESSA identification, reviewed performance of related indicators, and provided input on strategies or interventions related to identification.

Current Performance and Needs Assessment

ESSA section 1111(d)(1)(B)(i) and (iii) require that the comprehensive support and improvement plan “...(i) is informed by all indicators described in subsection (c)(4)(B), including student performance against State-determined long-term goals;” and “(iii) is based on a school-level needs assessment...”



CDE interprets this requirement to mean that the plan must include the results of a school-level needs assessment with a summary of the school’s performance on ESSA indicators for all students and student groups enrolled at the school, as applicable, which were used to identify and prioritize needs.

Success Criteria	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets
Current Performance CS TS ATS	Does not include a description of the school’s current performance as measured by applicable performance indicators.	Describes the school’s current performance as measured by some applicable performance indicators, but the description is incomplete.	Describes current school performance relative to local, state and federal metrics and expectations (e.g. SPF metrics, ESSA indicators). For TS/ATS only needs to be for student groups aligned to the school’s identification
Data and Disaggregation CS TS ATS	Does not provide a description of both whole group and disaggregated student group performance trends.	Provides limited description of performance trends for some, but not all, disaggregated student groups.	Describes performance trends for all students and for disaggregated groups of students (i.e., IEP, ELL, FRL, and minority status), when n-count allows for public reporting. (When the number of students (n) is too small for public reporting, an explanation for that student group is provided.) For TS/ATS only needs to be for student groups aligned to the school’s identification

Priority Performance Challenge(s)

The Priority Performance Challenge(s) should be aligned to needs identified as a result of the school-level needs assessment that included the school’s performance on each ESSA indicator.

Success Criteria	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets
Identification of PPCs CS	Does not identify PPCs or PPCs have significant issues. E.g., <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPCs focus on adult actions rather than student outcomes PPCs are listed as needs or next steps. 	Identifies PPCs focused on student performance, but (a) PPCs are not at the appropriate magnitude or (b) list of PPCs lacks focus (e.g., five PPCs).	Identifies a limited number (e.g., 3 or fewer) of student-centered Priority Performance Challenges of appropriate magnitude to focus the school’s improvement efforts.
Selection CS		Provides a vague or weak rationale for prioritizing the PPCs identified, or includes a plausible PPC but lacks supporting data.	Priority Performance Challenges align to the trend analysis by focusing on challenges that are logical and high leverage; plan includes strong rationale for the selected Priority Performance Challenges.



<p>Address Indicators</p> <p>CS</p>		<p>Includes indicators that partially address areas where the system is not meeting expectations.</p>	<p>Priority Performance Challenges address performance indicators or sub-indicators where system is not yet meeting expectations (i.e., local, state and/or federal indicators, as applicable).</p>
<p>Prioritization (PPCs)</p> <p>CS TS ATS</p>	<p>Does not use performance on ESSA indicators to select PPC(s).</p>	<p>Provides a PPC based on the needs assessment; however, there is not a direct and explicit alignment with the reason for ESSA identification.</p>	<p>UIP clearly and explicitly aligns at least one Priority Performance Challenge to indicators triggering ESSA identification (Low Graduation, Lowest 5%, Low Participation).</p>

Major Improvement Strategies

ESSA section 1111(d)(1)(B)(ii) requires that the plan “...includes evidence-based interventions...” CDE interprets this to mean that the research behind the selected strategies meet the definition and criteria for evidence-based interventions (EBI) under [ESSA Planning Requirements](#) and that the strategies and interventions in the plan consider and respond to the reasons the school was identified for improvement and support under ESSA.

Success Criteria	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets
<p>Evidence-Based Strategies</p> <p>CS TS ATS</p>	<p>Does not identify MIS or the MISs have significant issues. E.g.,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not include rationale for selection • Does not include evidence-based interventions 	<p>Provides some evidence or rationale for the effectiveness of the selected MIS, but it is incomplete.</p>	<p>Provides clear rationale for the selection of Major Improvement Strategies, including the evidence-base and explanation of why the strategy is a good fit for the school's need, student population and staff capacity.</p>
<p>Alignment to Root Causes</p> <p>CS TS ATS</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not align to Root Cause • The overall strategy is weak 	<p>Offers a loose or incomplete connection between MIS and root causes. May list the same MIS for multiple years without progress or re-examination.</p>	<p>Identifies clearly defined strategies that are likely to resolve root cause(s) and improve priority performance challenges.</p>
<p>Alignment to Identification</p> <p>CS TS ATS</p>	<p>UIP does not align at least one Major Improvement Strategy to ESSA identification.</p>	<p>At least one Major Improvement Strategy has the potential to be aligned with reasons for ESSA identification, but the connection is not clearly or explicitly described.</p>	<p>UIP clearly and explicitly aligns at least one major improvement strategy to indicators triggering ESSA identification (Low Graduation, Lowest 5%, Low Participation).</p>



Action Plan (Research, Monitoring and Impact)

ESSA section 1111(d)(1)(B) requires that the plan be developed “...to improve student outcomes.” CDE interprets this to mean that the implementation of plans should result in improved outcomes for students. One way to ensure the plans are resulting in intended outcomes is to include processes for monitoring and evaluating the impact of the selected evidence-based intervention and adjusting or modifying any strategies or interventions that are not producing desired improvements and outcomes for students.

Success Criteria	Does Not Meet	Partially Meets	Meets
Quality of Target CS TS ATS	Does not include annual performance targets, omits targets for key indicators (e.g., provides achievement but not graduation targets), or does not align to PPCs.	Lists targets that are loosely aligned to PPCs, overly general, and/or unlikely to be attainable. The school will likely not meet state and/or federal expectations in a reasonable timeframe.	Identifies ambitious, attainable targets that align to Priority Performance Challenges. Where possible, targets are set using the same measure as PPCs (e.g. if the PPC is focused on SAT mean scale score, target is focused on SAT mean scale score).
Interim Measures CS TS ATS	Does not include Interim Measures to monitor student performance progress or measures are off-mark (e.g., written as targets, Implementation Benchmarks, or action steps).	Lists Interim Measures with an inconsistent or unclear relationship to annual target.	Specifies Interim Measures that are aligned to an annual target and assess the impact of the Major Improvement Strategies on student outcomes multiple times per year.
Quality of Implementation Benchmarks CS TS ATS	Does not include Implementation Benchmarks to monitor implementation progress, or benchmarks are off-mark (e.g., written as targets, Interim Measures, or action steps).	Includes Implementation Benchmarks that measure completion, rather than assessing effectiveness (e.g., a checklist of actions). It may not be clear that implementation can be meaningfully evaluated or mid-course corrections made.	Provides Implementation Benchmarks for each Major Improvement Strategy that enable staff to determine whether implementation of strategies is occurring in an effective manner and articulates a plan for adjusting implementation, as needed.
Monitoring of Implementation CS TS ATS	Provides an evaluation plan for assessing the impact of intervention(s)/ strategy(s). Includes timeline and methods for determining if the school’s performance has increased on ESSA indicators that resulted in the school’s identification under ESSA	Shares an implementation plan but lacks some necessary components.	Shares a monitoring plan for tracking implementation and for determining if intervention(s)/ strategy(s) are being implemented with fidelity.
Evaluating Impact CS TS ATS	Does not include an evaluation plan.	Provides an evaluation plan but lacks some necessary components.	Provides an evaluation plan for assessing the impact of intervention(s)/ strategy(s). Includes timeline and methods for determining if the school’s performance has increased on ESSA indicators



			that resulted in the school's identification under ESSA
<p>Modification of Interventions or Strategies</p> <p>CS</p> <p>TS</p> <p>ATS</p>	Does not include a process for making adjustments or modifications after evaluations have been conducted.	Shares a vague or incomplete process using evaluation results to drive adjustments or modifications	Shares a process using evaluation results to make adjustments or modifications. Details include how any mid-course corrections will be made if desired outcomes are not reached.

Addressing Resource Inequities in ESSA Support and Improvement Plans (CS and ATS)

As a part of the comprehensive needs assessment, resource inequities must be considered and prioritized during the planning process. Reflection and identification of resource allocation and any inequities that may have contributed to the CS or ATS identification must be considered and addressed as a part of a CS or ATS plan. The inequities addressed within a plan must be actionable. As part of the resource allocation review, it might be necessary to consider school-level budgets.

The following table demonstrates examples of possible key resources that should be considered as a part of a plan that could relate to possible resource inequities. This list represents a few examples and is not exhaustive of all possible resource inequities a school may experience.

Resource	Identifying Possible Resource Inequities
Instructional Time	Instructional time is prioritized for identified areas of need. Additional instructional opportunities are provided outside of a regular schedule. School schedules are maximized to ensure attention to instructional time is a focus and priority.
Early Intervention	Students have access to early support and intervention. Systems are in place to determine which students participate in interventions and decisions are data-driven. Regular collaboration should take place between interventionists and teachers ensuring supports and services are aligned with core instruction and designed to meet students' needs.
Teacher Quality	<p>Students have access to effective, in-field, and experienced teachers. ESSA requires state education agencies to evaluate whether low-income and minority students are taught disproportionately by ineffective, out-of-field, or inexperienced teachers as compared to their higher-income non-minority peers. Equitable distribution of teachers ensures low-income and minority students have access to teachers that are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effective: Teacher's evaluation rating, based on Colorado's Educator Quality Standards, effective or highly effective. Half of this rating is based on professional practices; half is based on measures of student learning/outcomes.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In-Field: Teachers without at least one of the following, in the subject they teach: Endorsement on a Colorado teaching license, Degree (bachelor’s or higher), 36 semester hours (24 hours grandfathered in for 2017-18), Passing a State Board of Education-approved content exam (currently the ETS Praxis Series). • Experience: Teachers with three or more full years of K-12 teaching experience (regardless of the state of licensure). <p>Schools have a system in place to measure teacher effectiveness.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When the SEA or CDE has identified gaps within an LEA, the LEA must have a plan for addressing any EDT gaps, particularly for schools that are identified for Comprehensive or Additional Targeted support and improvement.
School Leadership Quality	Schools are led by qualified school leadership staff members. Leadership staff ensures professional development priorities and resources align with the needs of students.
Family Involvement and Engagement	Barriers to parent engagement such as emotional, linguistic, physical, and/or cultural differences are identified, and the school implements strategies to overcome these barriers. Ongoing efforts to partner with parents of low-performing students are evident. School communication is provided to parents in their native language or communicated through interpreters. Ongoing efforts are prioritized to partner with parents of underperforming students.
School Funding	Funds are allocated with consideration given to low-performing students and the allocation of funds is directed at identified areas of need.
Facilities	School offers safe and appropriate physical spaces as well as provides appropriate space for rigorous instruction to occur.
Rigorous Content /Courses	All student groups have access to curricula that are aligned with grade-level standards. Student assessment outcomes demonstrate all students are held to a high standard. In LEAs with advanced placement, International Baccalaureate programs, and other advanced courses and opportunities, LEAs must ensure that all students have equitable access to such courses.
Comparability in State and Local Services	<p>State and local funded services in schools receiving support under Title I, Part A that, taken as a whole, are at least comparable to services provided in schools that do not receive support under Title I, Part A.</p> <p>If the SEA or CDE has identified comparability concerns or issues within an LEA, the LEA must take corrective action to address such findings.</p>