#### ESSA Improvement Plan Rubric

**SSA §1111(d): School Support and Improvement Activities for (1) Comprehensive and (2) 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 schools identified for targeted support (TS) or additional targeted support (ATS).

**Comprehensive Support:** Per 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 required changes the subsequent year.

**Targeted Support:** ESSA specifies that only the school and LEA need to approve TS and ATS plans. As a support, LEAs may use this rubric to approve TS 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](https://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/regionalcontactspage), 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 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, providing support to schools in developing plans, providing feedback on school plans, and engaging in conversation, coaching and collaboration with schools to strengthen plans.

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

For additional information about the [ESSA Planning Requirements](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements), visit www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements. To request assistance, please contact Laura Meushaw at [meushaw\_l@cde.state.co.us](mailto:meushaw_l@cde.state.co.us), Tammy Giessinger at [giessinger\_t@cde.state.co.us](mailto:giessinger_t@cde.state.co.us), or Nazie Mohajeri-Nelson at [mohajeri-nelson\_n@cde.state.co.us](mailto:mohajeri-nelson_n@cde.state.co.us).

**Recommended Applicable Section of UIP: Data Narrative –Description of School Setting and Process for Data Analysis**

1. **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.**

**Guiding questions:**

* Which stakeholders partnered in the development of the school’s improvement plan?
  + At a minimum, stakeholders should include district partners, school leaders, teachers and other teaching staff, and parents. Local context should be used to identify the most appropriate stakeholder groups to invite to participate.
  + Outreach to engage and involve stakeholders should provide genuine opportunity for participation.
  + There should be evidence of district staff approval, but this should be evident through the district’s submission of the plan and can also be documented in the district level UIP.
* Did stakeholders have opportunity to partner in the plan development in an ongoing manner?
  + Outreach to invite stakeholders to partner in plan development should be frequent and provide ongoing opportunity for partnering on development.
  + Stakeholders should be invited to participate from the beginning of plan development.
  + Multiple opportunities should be provided across the plan development period to various stakeholders, including times, modalities, methods, and venues that work for the various stakeholders.
* Did stakeholders have a genuine opportunity to partner in the plan development?
  + Stakeholders should have a genuine opportunity to provide input on the improvement plan, including but not limited to participating in the school level needs assessment, reviewing the results of the needs analysis, reviewing student performance on all ESSA indicators, and helping identify which needs to prioritize, or giving input on the strategies to be used to address needs.

| **Success Criteria** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** | **Partially Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations at a High Level** | **Evidence and Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| A variety of stakeholders partnered in the development of the school’s improvement plant. | Does not include stakeholders in plan development. | Representatives from a few stakeholder groups partnered in the development (e.g., only 1 to 2 groups). | Includes evidence that all stakeholders (e.g., building leaders, teachers, parents, community members, district partners) were invited to participate and multiple representatives from various groups partnered in plan development. | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. | Stakeholders Who Partnered in Plan Development:   * District partners (DP) * School leaders (SL) * School personnel (SP) * Parents and families (P&F) * Students (middle and high level) * Other(s):\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Stakeholders had multiple and ongoing opportunities to partner in plan development | Does not include stakeholders in plan development. | Describes stakeholder involvement as a point in time opportunity for partnering in plan development. | Describes stakeholders as partners from beginning to the end of plan development, with multiple, ongoing opportunities across the planning period. | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. | Frequency of Opportunities Provided:   * Describe: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Stakeholders had a genuine opportunity to partner, including playing significant roles in the development process | Does not include stakeholders in plan development. | Describes minimal stakeholder roles in plan development. | Describes stakeholders as active partners in multiple aspects of plan development (e.g., collaborating on data review to identify trends, helping use data trends to prioritize improvement strategies). | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. | Types of Partnership Opportunities   * Help conduct the needs assessment * Review results of needs assessment * Help use the results of the needs assessment * Review performance on ESSA indicators * Help select indicators to prioritize * Review reasons for ESSA identification * Give input on strategies or interventions to be used in meeting identified needs * Writing, reviewing, editing or providing feedback on plan sections * Other(s): \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ |
| Section Feedback | | | | | |

**Applicable section of UIP: Data Narrative – Current Performance; Trend Statements; Priority Performance Challenges; Root Cause Analysis**

1. **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 students groups enrolled at the school, as applicable, which were used to identify and prioritize needs.**

**Guiding questions:**

* How were the results of the school’s performance on each ESSA indicator considered as part of the school-level needs assessment?
  + Performance of all students and each of the referenced student groups, on each of the referenced indicators should be evaluated as part of the school-level needs assessment to identify areas of need for the school.
* How was the school’s performance on ESSA indicators for all students and each of the referenced disaggregated groups used to prioritize the strategies and interventions to be implemented?
  + UIP priority performance challenges should be aligned to needs identified as a result of the school-level needs assessment that included the school’s performance on each ESSSA indicator.

Take into consideration the reasons that school was identified under ESSA and ensure that priority performance challenges address the reason for identification.

| **Success Criteria** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** | **Partially Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations at a High Level** | **Evidence and Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All ESSA indicators – the schools’ performance on each ESSA indicator was considered as part of the school-level needs assessment. | Does not address ESSA indicators. | Addresses performance on some but not all ESSA indicators. | Includes an explanation of the school’s current performance on each ESSA indicator (i.e., ELA and math achievement, ELA and math growth, English language proficiency for ELs, graduation rates for high schools, school quality and student success indicator) within school level needs assessment (e.g., trend statements). | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. | **ESSA Indicators:**   * Academic achievement on English language arts and math * Academic growth on English language arts and math * English language proficiency for English learners * Graduation rates for high schools * School quality and student success indicator   + Science achievement   + Dropout rate for high schools   + Chronic absenteeism for elementary and middle schools |
| Student Performance –  The performance of all students was considered as part of the school-level needs assessment. | Does not disaggregate performance of all students and each of the disaggregated groups. | Provides analysis of some student groups. | Includes an explanation of the performance of all students and each disaggregated group (i.e., All students, English learners, Students who qualify for free or reduced meals, Students with disabilities, Students from major race and ethnic groups) within school level needs assessment (e.g., trend statements). | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. | **Student Groups whose performance should be considered separately for the above-referenced indicators:**   * All students * English learners * Economically disadvantaged students (in Colorado, students who qualify for free or reduced meals) * Students with disabilities * Students from major race and ethnic groups |
| Prioritized needs based on reasons for identification –  Performance on ESSA indicators which resulted in the school being identified under ESSA were used to identify UIP priority performance challenges | Does not use performance on ESSA indicators to select priority performance challenges (PPCs). | Uses performance on some ESSA indicators to select priority performance challenges (PPCs). | Uses performance on all ESSA indicators to select priority performance challenges (PPCs) aligned to the reasons for identification under ESSA (i.e., for CS-Lowest 5% uses overall performance of all students and relevant disaggregated groups; and for CS-low Grad Rate, uses graduation rates). | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. |  |
| Section Feedback | | | | | |

**Applicable section of UIP: Major Improvement Strategy and Action plans, as well as Research Supporting the Use of the Strategy**

1. **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**](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements) **(for additional information see www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements) 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.**

**Guiding questions:**

* Do the intervention(s) and strategies being used address the reasons for identification for ESSA support and improvement?
  + Descriptions should explain which and how identified needs and priority performance challenges, tied back to ESSA indicators, are being addressed with intervention(s) and strategies (should align with the ESSA indicators on which the school had low performance).
  + How well do the intervention(s) and strategies align with the reasons the school was identified for support and improvement?
    - Interventions and strategies should have a direct and clear connection to the reasons the school was identified for ESSA support and improvement.
* Do intervention(s) and strategies meet the [ESSA Planning Requirements definition](http://www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements)) (found under Evidence-based Interventions on www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements) and criteria for EBI (Tiers I through III)? Is information included that details the research supporting the strategy?
  + Selected strategies and/or interventions should have a strong research-base and/or demonstrated record of effectiveness for addressing the school’s identified needs.
* Do intervention(s) and strategies demonstrate a contextual fit aligned to the reasons the school was identified for support and improvement (be applicable for the population being served, fit the needs identified, have a reasonable adoption period, are sustainable, are sufficiently resourced for implementation, have cultural relevance, etc.)?

| **Success Criteria** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** | **Partially Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations at a High Level** | **Evidence and Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alignment of Intervention(s) and Strategies –  the description of the improvement intervention(s) and strategies being used to address the reasons for identification for support and improvement are clearly and explicitly connected to the reasons for identification | Does not select Intervention(s) and strategies aligned with reasons for ESSA identification. | Identifies intervention(s) and/or strategies that may be aligned to reasons for ESSA identification, but plan does not provide an explicit connection. | Provides clear and explicit rationale for selecting the intervention(s) and/or strategy(s) aligned with reasons for identification. | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. |  |
| Evidence-based intervention(s) and strategies –  the improvement intervention(s) and strategies being used to address the reasons for identification for support and improvement meet the ESSA definition and criteria for EBI | Does not provide evidence for selected intervention(s)/ strategies that meets the ESSA definition or criteria of EBI. | Provides evidence that meets some components of ESSA definition and criteria for EBI for selected intervention(s)/ strategy(s). | Provides evidence that meets definition and all criteria for EBI for selected intervention(s)/strategy(s). | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. |  |
| Contextual fit –  the improvement intervention(s) and strategies being used to address the reasons for identification for support and improvement demonstrate strong contextual fit (are applicable to the population being served, meet identified needs, have precision, and efficiency, and the school has the skills, resources and organizational support for implementation) | Does not address the contextual fit of selected intervention(s)/ strategy(s). | Describes some of the contextual fit, but further evidence is necessary to ensure that the selected intervention(s)/ strategy(s) fit. | Describes the contextual fit of the selected intervention(s)/strategy(s). | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. |  |
| Section Feedback | | | | | |

**Applicable section of UIP: Implementation Benchmarks; Reflection on Prior Year Targets; and Student Performance Targets and Interim Measures**

1. **ESSA section 1111(d)(1)(B) requires that the plan be developed “…to improve student outcomes.” Subsection (iv) of this section goes on to require that once approved and being implemented, plans are “monitored and periodically reviewed by the State educational agency.”**

**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 EBI and adjusting or modifying any strategies or interventions that are not producing desired improvements and outcomes for students.**

**Guiding questions:**

* What are the plans, including timeline, for monitoring and evaluating the impact of the EBI selected to ensure that desired outcomes are being reached?
  + Schools and LEAs should collaborate on monitoring and evaluating the impact that selected intervention(s) and strategies are having on the reasons the school has been identified for support and improvement. The plan should include a timeline for conducting such analyses.
* What are the plans, including timeline, for modifying strategies or interventions that are not improving the indicators that resulted in the school being identified for ESSA support and improvement?

The plan should include actions that the school and district will take if desired outcomes are not being reached.

| **Success Criteria** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** | **Partially Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations at a High Level** | **Evidence and Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Monitoring of implementation –  A monitoring plan has been developed to track implementation of the intervention(s) and strategies to ensure that they are implemented as intended (with fidelity) | Does not include an implementation monitoring plan. | 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. | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. |  |
| Evaluating Impact –  An evaluation plan has been designed to assess the impact of the intervention(s) and strategies on increasing the school’s performance on the ESSA indicators that resulted in the school’s identification for ESSA support and improvement and includes a timeline for conducting the evaluation | 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. | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. |  |
| Modification of intervention(s) or strategies –  Time has been reserved and a plan has been established for using the monitoring and evaluation results to ensure that student outcomes are improving or modifying/adjusting intervention(s) or strategies that are not having desired outcomes | 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. | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. |  |
| Section Feedback | | | | | |

**Applicable section of UIP: Data Narrative/Current Performance or Brief Description and Major Improvement Strategies**

1. **ESSA section 1111(d)(1)(B)(iv) requires that the plan “identifies resource inequities, which may include a review of local educational agency and school-level budgeting, to be addressed through implementation of such comprehensive support and improvement plan.”**

**CDE interprets this to mean that the plan must include a process for identifying resource inequities (including consideration of any of the processes listed below), describes any inequities that have been identified and how the school and district will address any identified inequities.**

**Resource Inequity:** In addition to the descriptions provided in the ESSA improvement plan (or UIP), CDE will be monitoring resource equity through the following processes and will notify the district of any identified gaps, which must also be addressed by the school and district in the subsequent year’s plan:

* Comparability
* Maintenance of Effort
* Supplement, Not Supplant
* Analyses of the number of economically disadvantaged or minority students being taught by inexperienced, ineffective, or out-of-field teachers

**Guiding questions:**

* Does the identified school have equitable access to the same funding as non-identified schools?
* Are the same percentage of effective, teaching in-field and experienced teachers teaching in identified schools, compared to non-identified schools?
* Do the students in identified schools have the same access to rigorous courses, such as advanced placement courses, as students in non-identified schools?

| **Success Criteria** | **Does Not Meet Expectations** | **Partially Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations** | **Meets Expectations at a High Level** | **Evidence and Notes** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| The improvement plan describes the process for assessing and identifying resource inequities, including such analyses as   * Disparities in per pupil expenditures * Inequitable distribution of teachers * Inequitable access to rigorous courses   OR  For the inequitable distribution of teachers, the improvement plan references the equitable distribution of teachers analyses conducted by CDE | Does not describe how resource inequities are identified or the plan has significant issues. | Provides a partial plan for identifying resources inequities (e.g., addresses equity in resource distribution, but not equitable access to high quality teachers or rigorous content). | Describes a process for assessing and identifying resource inequities (e.g., disparities in per pupil expenditures, inequitable distribution of teachers, inequitable access to rigorous courses), including how inequities will be defined and measured. | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. |  |
| The improvement plan addresses any disparities in per pupil expenditures and/or the plan includes a strategy for identifying and addressing disparities in per pupil expenditures between identified and non-identified schools in the district, or the state if the district only has one school per level | Does not Identify strategies to address identified resource inequities. | Selects some activities that address any identified resource inequities. | Selects actions that address all identified resource inequities (e.g., disparities in per pupil expenditures, inequitable distribution of teachers, inequitable access to rigorous courses). | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. | Note: If the identified school is receiving its equitable share of the local, state, and federal per pupil expenditures in comparison to non-identified schools, this item will be rated as “Meets Expectations at a High Level” on this rubric.  Note: CDE is developing guidance on how to assess and identify disparities in per pupil expenditures and determine when disparities warrant action. |
| **Note**: If the LEA has been identified as having a medium or large gap in the distribution of teachers in high poverty and/or high minority schools compared to other schools (or state average), the LEA is required to address this resource inequity in its Consolidated Application and the LEA’s plan will be reviewed and approved as part of the Consolidated Application approval process. | Identified disparities are not addressed in the Consolidated Application. | Disparities have been identified but improvement strategies do not address them. | Disparities have been identified and improvement strategies have been developed to address them. | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. | Note: If economically disadvantaged and minority students in identified school are being taught by similar percentages of effective, in-field, and experienced teachers as students in non-identified schools, this item will be rated as “Meets Expectations at a High Level” on this rubric.  Note: CDE conducts analyses of equitable distribution of teachers and shares those results with districts. EDT Analysis results are shared separately with the LEA via Syncplicity. |
| Under development and to be reviewed in future years:  The improvement plan addresses any inequitable access to rigorous courses and/or the plan includes strategies for identifying and addressing any inequitable access to rigorous courses for students in identified schools compared to students in non-identified schools in the district, or the state if the district only has one school per level. | Identified disparities are not addressed in the plan. | Disparities have been identified but improvement strategies do not address them. | Disparities have been identified and improvement strategies have been developed to address them. | Provides a thorough response to the program requirement that can be used as a model for other schools. | Note: If students in identified school have similar access to rigorous courses as students in non-identified schools, this item will be rated as “Meets Expectations at a High Level” on this rubric.  Note: CDE is developing guidance on how to locally assess and identify disparities in equitable access to courses and determine when disparities warrant action. |
| Section Feedback | | | | | |

**Where can I learn more?**

ESSA Planning Requirements: www.cde.state.co.us/fedprograms/essaplanningrequirements