

# Office of the State Superintendent of Education

## SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN RUBRIC



**Deborah A. Gist**  
**State Superintendent of Education**

**February 2008**

## **THE PROCESS**

As defined in NCLB, school restructuring is a two-step process. Under the first step, the LEA must prepare a restructuring plan and make arrangements to implement the plan if a school does not meet its AYP targets after one full year of corrective action (fifth year of not making AYP). The second step occurs if, during the school year in which the LEA is developing the restructuring plan, the school does not make AYP for a sixth year. In this case, the LEA must implement the restructuring plan no later than the beginning of the following school year.

When an LEA identifies a school for restructuring, it must:

- Provide both parents and teachers with prompt notice of the decision;
- Provide both groups with the opportunity to comment before it takes any restructuring action; and
- Invite both teachers and parents to participate in the development of the school's restructuring plan. §1116(b)(8)(C)

## **THE PLAN**

The process for developing a restructuring plan must be open and collaborative.

When a school is slated for restructuring, the LEA must promptly notify parents about both what is being done to improve the school and how parents can be involved in the development of any restructuring plan. The LEA must provide parents and teachers an opportunity to comment before the LEA develops the restructuring plan or takes any restructuring actions. Parents and teachers must also be provided the opportunity to participate in the development of any restructuring plan.

It is the OSSEs expectation that the LEA will designate a School Improvement Planning Team for each identified school composed of various school and community stakeholders. This interdisciplinary team may be comprised of parents, teachers, board members, community members, business leaders – any stakeholder that can inform and provide insight in the development of a relevant, substantial improvement plan.

The restructuring plan that an LEA prepares must include one of the following “alternative governance” arrangements for the school, consistent with State law:

- Reopen the school as a public charter school;
- Replace all or most of the school staff, which may include the principal, who are relevant to the school's inability to make AYP;
- Enter into a contract with an entity, such as a private management company, with a demonstrated record of effectiveness, to operate the school as a public school;
- Turn the operation of the school over to the SEA if this action is permitted under State law and the State agrees; or
- Implement any other major restructuring of the school's governance arrangement that is consistent with the NCLB principles of restructuring.

In choosing an alternative governance option, the LEA and school community must consider what has occurred in the school that resulted in its being identified for restructuring. Also, the restructuring plan should take into account the actions initiated in

prior years. In other words, the actions required under the restructuring plan might be seen as deeper, broader, or more targeted to meet identified needs.

### **OUR ROLE**

The Office of the State Superintendent of Education (OSSE) must ensure that the LEA is implementing a restructuring plan that contains fundamental reforms that have substantial promise to improve student academic achievement and enable a school to make AYP. This rubric is a measure designed to ensure restructuring plans are substantial enough to transform and sustain change.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) – now known as the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) – requires the OSSE assure, as a part of its consolidated State application, that each program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications. The OSSE is expected to monitor restructured schools through the State’s compliance monitoring process.

Since schools in restructuring are the schools in greatest need in an LEA, the OSSE is expected to include a review of these schools in its monitoring process to help ensure that these schools make substantial progress in meeting NCLB accountability requirements. Under specific circumstances, the OSSE must intervene and take appropriate actions to carry out its responsibilities under section 1116(b)(14) of the ESEA – “if the State educational agency determines that a local educational agency failed to carry out its responsibilities under this subsection, take such corrective actions as the State educational agency determines to be appropriate and in compliance with State law”.

## School Improvement Plan Summary SIP Components and Rating

### GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

The following documents must accompany the improvement plan:

- Master Schedule
- Professional Development Calendar/Plan
- Proposed Budget
- School Improvement Planning Team Signature Sheet

Scoring Components	Rating <i>Exemplary, Adequate, Limited, No Evidence</i>
<b>School Profile and Collaborative Process</b>	
1.1 School Improvement Plan (SIP) Development and Collaboration	
1.2 Collection of Academic and Nonacademic Data and Analysis/Synthesis	
<b>Academic and Non-Academic Data Analysis</b>	
1.3 Variety of Academic and Non-Academic Assessment Measures	
1.4 Data Collection & Analysis	
1.5 Report Card Data Disaggregation	
1.6 Narrative Synthesis of All Data	
1.7 Prioritized List of Targets	
<b>Beliefs, Mission and Vision/Culture and Climate</b>	
2.1 Beliefs, Mission and Shared Vision	
2.2 Achievement Oriented	
2.3 Culture of Collaboration	
2.4 Two-Way Contact Between Teachers and Families	
2.5 Mechanisms of Recognition	
<b>Curricular, Instructional, Assessment and Organizational Effectiveness</b>	
3.1 Curriculum Practices	
3.2 Curriculum Process	
3.3 Instructional Practices	
3.4 Instructional Process	
3.5 Assessment Practices	
3.6 Assessment Process	
3.7 Organizational and Professional Development Practices	
3.8 Organizational and Professional Development Process	
<b>Action Plan Development</b>	
4.1 Goals	
4.2 Action Steps	
4.3 Implementation Plan	
<b>School Improvement Plan and Process Evaluation</b>	
5.1 Process Evaluation	
5.2 Implementation Evaluation	
5.3 Monitoring and Adjusting Evaluation	

## Component 1a. – School Profile and Collaborative Process

Indicator 1.1	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Team Collaboration</i>	<i>Adequate Team Collaboration</i>	<i>Limited Team Collaboration</i>	<i>No Team Collaboration</i>
<b>Improvement Plan Development and Collaboration</b>	There is evidence provided that the plan development team was composed of representatives of each of the relevant stakeholder groups of the school teachers, administrators, non-certified personnel, community, parents, and students (when appropriate). Evidence of outreach includes <u>all</u> of the following artifacts:	There is evidence provided that the plan development team was composed of representatives of <u>at least four</u> of the relevant stakeholder groups of the school teachers, administrators, non-certified personnel, community, parents, and students (when appropriate). Evidence of outreach includes <u>at least four</u> of the following artifacts:	There is evidence provided that the plan development team was composed of representatives of <u>at least two</u> of the relevant stakeholder groups of the school teachers, administrators, non-certified personnel, community, parents, and students (when appropriate). Evidence of outreach includes <u>no more than two</u> of the following artifacts:	There is no evidence of outreach provided that the plan development team was composed of representatives of the relevant stakeholder groups of the school teachers, administrators, non-certified personnel, community, parents, and students (when appropriate).
<input type="checkbox"/> Sign In Sheets <input type="checkbox"/> Flyers <input type="checkbox"/> Newsletters <input type="checkbox"/> Agendas <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting Notes <input type="checkbox"/> Draft Documents				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 1.2	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Demographic Data Collection and Analysis</i>	<i>Adequate Demographic Data Collection and Analysis</i>	<i>Limited Demographic Data Collection and Analysis</i>	<i>No Demographic Data Collection and Analysis</i>
<b>Collection of Academic and Nonacademic Data and Analysis/Synthesis</b>	There is evidence provided that data have been collected and analyzed regarding <u>all</u> of the following areas:	There is evidence provided that data have been collected and analyzed for <u>at least three</u> of the following areas:	There is evidence provided that data have been collected and analyzed in <u>at least one</u> of the following areas:	There is no evidence provided that data have been collected and analyzed in any of the following areas:
<input type="checkbox"/> Student characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Staff characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> School characteristics <input type="checkbox"/> Parent/guardian demographics <input type="checkbox"/> Community characteristics				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*

## Component 1b. – Academic and Non-Academic Data Analysis

Indicator 1.3	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Use of a Variety of Assessment Measures</i>	<i>Adequate Use of a Variety of Assessment Measures</i>	<i>Limited Use of a Variety of Assessment Measures</i>	<i>No Use of a Variety of Assessment Measures</i>
<b>Variety of Academic and Non-Academic Assessment Measures</b>	There is evidence provided that <u>at least ten</u> data measures were examined: academic and non-academic assessment components. (e.g., DCCAS, DCBAS, DIBELS, AP, SAT/ACT, ACCESS – as appropriate, local system assessments, PK-Grade 2 assessments – as appropriate, teacher-made tests, report cards, unit tests, dropout rates, attendance rates, graduation rates, formative assessments, suspensions, as appropriate).	There is evidence provided that <u>at least seven</u> data measures were examined: academic and non-academic assessment components. (e.g., DCCAS, DCBAS, DIBELS, AP, SAT/ACT, ACCESS – as appropriate, local system assessments, PK-Grade 2 assessments – as appropriate, teacher-made tests, report cards, unit tests, dropout rates, attendance rates, graduation rates, formative assessments, suspensions, as appropriate).	There is evidence provided that <u>no more than five</u> data measures were examined: academic and non-academic assessment components. (e.g., DCCAS, DCBAS, DIBELS, AP, SAT/ACT, ACCESS – as appropriate, local system assessments, PK-Grade 2 assessments – as appropriate, teacher-made tests, report cards, unit tests, dropout rates, attendance rates, graduation rates, formative assessments, suspensions, as appropriate).	There is evidence that <u>fewer than three</u> data measures were examined. (e.g., DCCAS, DCBAS, DIBELS, AP, SAT/ACT, ACCESS – as appropriate, local system assessments, PK-Grade 2 assessments – as appropriate, teacher-made tests, report cards, unit tests, dropout rates, attendance rates, graduation rates, formative assessments, suspensions, as appropriate).
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 1.4	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Data Collection &amp; Analysis</i>	<i>Adequate Data Collection &amp; Analysis</i>	<i>Limited Data Collection &amp; Analysis</i>	<i>No Data Collection &amp; Analysis</i>
<b>Data Collection &amp; Analysis</b>	A <i>thorough</i> data collection and consistent analysis are included with assessment methods described and strengths and needs identified.	An adequate data collection and consistent analysis are included with assessment methods described strengths and needs identified.	A limited data collection and analysis are included.	No data collection and analysis are included.
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*

Indicator 1.5	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Data Disaggregation by NCLB Sub-groups</i>	<i>Adequate Data Disaggregation by NCLB Sub-groups</i>	<i>Limited Data Disaggregation by NCLB Sub-groups</i>	<i>No Data Disaggregation by NCLB Sub-groups</i>
<b>Data Disaggregation by NCLB Sub-groups</b>	Data disaggregation analyses are included and used to establish priorities for student performance with respect to <u>all</u> listed areas:	Data disaggregation analyses are included and used to establish priorities for student performance with respect to <u>at least four (NCLB areas)</u> listed areas:	Data disaggregation analyses are included and used to establish priorities for student performance with respect to a <u>no more than two (NCLB areas)</u> listed areas:	Data disaggregation analyses are not included which establish priorities for student performance with respect to the listed areas:
<input type="checkbox"/> Race/ethnicity (5 areas) <input type="checkbox"/> Economically disadvantaged <input type="checkbox"/> Special education <input type="checkbox"/> LEP <input type="checkbox"/> Gender <input type="checkbox"/> Proficiency levels <input type="checkbox"/> Growth differences/Gaps between the following: below basic, basic, proficient and advance				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 1.6	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Narrative Synthesis of All Data</i>	<i>Adequate Narrative Synthesis of All Data</i>	<i>Limited Narrative Synthesis of All Data</i>	<i>No Narrative Synthesis of All Data</i>
<b>Narrative Synthesis of All Data</b>	A narrative synthesis of data/information is included that <u>specifically states</u> critical areas of strength and need based on the data/information presented.	A narrative synthesis of data/information is included that <u>implies</u> critical areas of strength and need based on the data/information presented.	A narrative synthesis of data/information is included without a list of areas of strength and need.	No narrative synthesis is provided.
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 1.7	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary List of Goal Targets</i>	<i>Adequate List of Goal Targets</i>	<i>Limited List of Goal Targets</i>	<i>No List of Goal Targets</i>
<b>Prioritized List of Goal Targets</b>	The list of goal targets matches data priorities and reference the NCLB benchmarks.	The list of goal targets matches the majority of data priorities.	Limited attempts have been made to prioritize goals matched to data.	Goal targets are not based on the data.
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.

## Component 2a – Beliefs, Mission and Vision

Indicator 2.1	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Collaboration</i>	<i>Adequate Collaboration</i>	<i>Limited Collaboration</i>	<i>No Collaboration</i>
<b>Understands the attributes of High Performing Schools’ Beliefs, Mission and Shared Vision</b>	An understanding of the purpose of beliefs, mission, and shared vision of high performing schools is evidenced by the inclusion of <b><u>all</u></b> of the attributes below:	An understanding of the purpose of beliefs, mission, and shared vision of high performing schools is evidenced by the inclusion of <b><u>at least four</u></b> of the attributes below:	An understanding of the purpose of beliefs, mission, and shared vision of high performing schools is evidenced by the inclusion of <b><u>at least one</u></b> of the attributes below:	An understanding of the purpose of beliefs, mission, and shared vision of high performing schools is evidenced by none of the attributes below:
	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Utilizes research-based information and data to drive decisions.    <input type="checkbox"/> Holds high expectations for all students.    <input type="checkbox"/> Provides a clear purpose and direction.    <input type="checkbox"/> Aligns policies and procedures to maintain a focus on achieving the school’s goals for student learning.  <input type="checkbox"/> Engages in adequate and appropriate internal and external communication.    <input type="checkbox"/> Fosters collaboration among staff and stakeholders*.  <input type="checkbox"/> Establishes a link between the beliefs, mission, and vision.                 </p> <p>*Stakeholders include such groups as parents, community representatives, and support personnel. When appropriate, students should also be included.</p>			
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 2.2	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Clarity of Beliefs, Mission, Shared Vision Statements</i>	<i>Adequate Clarity of Beliefs, Mission, Shared Vision Statements</i>	<i>Limited Clarity of Beliefs, Mission, Shared Vision Statements</i>	<i>No Clarity of Beliefs, Mission, Vision Shared Statements</i>
<b>The beliefs, mission and shared vision are achievement oriented</b>	The beliefs, mission, and shared vision reflect a commitment to academic achievement for all students by the inclusion of <b><u>all</u></b> elements below.	The beliefs, mission, and shared vision reflect a commitment to academic achievement for all students by the inclusion of <b><u>at least three</u></b> elements below.	The beliefs, mission, and shared vision reflect a commitment to academic achievement for all students by the inclusion of <b><u>at least one</u></b> element below.	The beliefs, mission, and shared vision do not reflect a commitment to academic achievement.
	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Promoting a high performing learning culture which includes all students and stakeholders.    <input type="checkbox"/> Promoting the use of data driven decision-making process    <input type="checkbox"/> Promoting the use of shared decision- making processes    <input type="checkbox"/> Meeting the individual needs of students by striving for a quality education for all students.    <input type="checkbox"/> Achieving proficiency and beyond for all students.                 </p>			
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*



## Component 2b – Culture and Climate

Indicator 2.3	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Culture of Collaboration</i>	<i>Adequate Culture of Collaboration</i>	<i>Limited Culture of Collaboration</i>	<i>No Culture of Collaboration</i>
<b>Culture of Collaboration</b>	The plan described clear strategies and outlined an action plan to establish a culture of collaboration among all stakeholders. (e.g. through organizations, organized events, and horizontal and vertical teaming and district connections)	The plan described clear strategies to establish of a culture of collaboration among all stakeholders. (e.g. through organizations, organized events, and horizontal and vertical teaming and district connections)	The plan listed vague strategies to establish of a culture of collaboration among some stakeholders.	There was no evidence that a culture of collaboration will be established among stakeholders.
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 2.4	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Two-Way Contact Between Teachers and Families</i>	<i>Adequate Two-Way Contact Between Teachers and Families</i>	<i>Limited Two-Way Contact Between Teachers and Families</i>	<i>No Two-Way Contact Between Teachers and Families</i>
<b>Two-Way Contact Between Teachers and Families</b>	Programs that promote two-way contact between teachers and families regarding student learning are fully described and an action plan of communicating the program is fully articulated.	Programs that promote contact between teachers and families regarding student learning are described.	Limited or one-way communication strategies were referenced (e.g. newsletter, use of school marquee).	No communication strategies were provided.
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 2.5	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Mechanisms of Recognition</i>	<i>Adequate Mechanisms of Recognition</i>	<i>Limited Mechanisms of Recognition</i>	<i>No Mechanisms of Recognition</i>
<b>Mechanisms of Recognition</b>	The plan described and outlined the mechanisms in place to actively recognize a wide variety of positive student and teacher behaviors.	The plan described the mechanisms in place to recognize a limited number of positive student and teacher behaviors.	The plan referenced limited or informal mechanisms in place to recognize positive student and teacher behaviors.	The plan did not address mechanisms of recognition.
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

### Component 3 – Curricular, Instructional, Assessment, and Organizational Effectiveness

Indicator 3.1	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Evidence</i>	<i>Adequate Evidence</i>	<i>Limited Evidence</i>	<i>No Evidence</i>
<b>Curriculum Practices</b>	In analyzing the curriculum practices, the plan analyzed practices and included <b><u>at least seven</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing the curriculum practices, the plan included <b><u>at least four</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing the curriculum practices, the plan included <b><u>no more than two</u></b> of the following activities:	The plan provides no evidence curriculum practices analysis.
<input type="checkbox"/> Description of the use of State approved standards and the training to staff in the use of the standards. <input type="checkbox"/> Prioritized and mapped out curriculum. <input type="checkbox"/> Established schoolwide student achievement benchmarks. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of the implementation of a grade appropriate cohesive standards based model for literacy. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of the implementation of a grade appropriate cohesive standards based model for mathematics. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of the implementation of formative assessment aligned with the school benchmarks. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of the support system in place for enhancing the quality of curriculum and instruction. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of the monitoring in place for enhancing the quality of curriculum and instruction. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of how teaching and learning materials are correlated to the State standards and distributed to the instructional staff. <input type="checkbox"/> Description of how the shared vision of what students should know and be able to do at each grade level will be communicated to stakeholders through a variety of media formats.				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 3.2	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Evidence</i>	<i>Adequate Evidence</i>	<i>Limited Evidence</i>	<i>No Evidence</i>
<b>Curriculum Process</b>	In analyzing the curriculum process, the plan analyses practices and included <b><u>all</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing the curriculum process, the plan included <b><u>at least four</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing the curriculum process, the plan included <b><u>no more than two</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing the curriculum process, the plan did not include the following activities:
<input type="checkbox"/> Listed current practices <input type="checkbox"/> Listed evidence of current practices <input type="checkbox"/> Determined alignment of current practices to the principles and practices of high-performing schools <input type="checkbox"/> Completed evaluation of the effectiveness of current practices based on the data <input type="checkbox"/> Identified strengths <input type="checkbox"/> Identified challenges <input type="checkbox"/> Identified steps to address challenges				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*

Indicator 3.3	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Evidence</i>	<i>Adequate Evidence</i>	<i>Limited Evidence</i>	<i>No Evidence</i>
<b>Instructional Practices</b>	In analyzing instructional practices, the plan included <b><u>all</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing instructional practices, the plan included <b><u>at least five</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing instructional practices, the plan included <b><u>no more than three</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing our instructional practices, we did not include the following activities:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Classroom instruction aligned with the standards based curriculum. <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom instruction aligned with the assessments. <input type="checkbox"/> Data-driven teaching process <input type="checkbox"/> Actively engaged students in high quality learning environments as supported by higher order thinking skills <input type="checkbox"/> Wide range of research based, student centered teaching strategies <input type="checkbox"/> Classroom organization and management techniques support the learning process <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple opportunities for students to receive additional assistance to improve their learning beyond the initial classroom instruction. <input type="checkbox"/> Students with diverse cultural & language backgrounds & with different learning needs & learning styles supported in the classroom. <input type="checkbox"/> Differentiated classroom instruction for varying levels of skills.			
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 3.4	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Evidence</i>	<i>Adequate Evidence</i>	<i>Limited Evidence</i>	<i>No Evidence</i>
<b>Instructional Process</b>	In analyzing instructional process, the plan included <b><u>all</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing instructional process, the plan included <b><u>at least five</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing instructional process, the plan included <b><u>no more than</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing instructional process, the plan did not include the following activities:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Listed current practices <input type="checkbox"/> Listed evidence of current practices <input type="checkbox"/> Determined alignment of current practices to the principles and practices of high-performing schools <input type="checkbox"/> Identified strengths <input type="checkbox"/> Identified challenges <input type="checkbox"/> Completed evaluation of the effectiveness of current practices based on the data <input type="checkbox"/> Identified steps to address challenges			
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*

Indicator 3.5	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Evidence</i>	<i>Adequate Evidence</i>	<i>Limited Evidence</i>	<i>No Evidence</i>
Assessment Practices	In analyzing assessment practices, the plan included <b><u>at least six</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing assessment practices, the plan included <b><u>at least four</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing assessment practices, the plan included <b><u>at least one</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing assessment practices, the plan did not include the following activities:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Student assessments aligned with the State standards <input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate assessments used to guide decisions relative to student achievement <input type="checkbox"/> A variety of data points used for decision making relative to student achievement <input type="checkbox"/> Assessed all student categories <input type="checkbox"/> A wide range of assessments, CRT, NRT, portfolio, curriculum based assessments, etc. were used <input type="checkbox"/> Provided professional development in the appropriate use of assessment <input type="checkbox"/> Provided support and technical assistance to teachers in developing and using assessments <input type="checkbox"/> Provided assessment information to communicate with students, parents and other appropriate stakeholders regarding student learning.			
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 3.6	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Evidence</i>	<i>Adequate Evidence</i>	<i>Limited Evidence</i>	<i>No Evidence</i>
Assessment Process	In analyzing assessment process, the plan included <b><u>all</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing assessment process, the plan included <b><u>at least five</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing assessment process, the plan included <b><u>no more than two</u></b> of the following activities:	In analyzing assessment process, the plan did not include the following activities:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Listed our current practices <input type="checkbox"/> Listed evidence of current practices <input type="checkbox"/> Determined alignment of current practices to the principles and practices of high-performing schools <input type="checkbox"/> Completed evaluation of the effectiveness of current practices based on the data <input type="checkbox"/> Identified strengths <input type="checkbox"/> Identified challenges <input type="checkbox"/> Identified steps to address challenges			
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*

Indicator 3.7	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Evidence</i>	<i>Adequate Evidence</i>	<i>Limited Evidence</i>	<i>No Evidence</i>
<b>Organizational and Professional Development Practices</b>	In analyzing organizational practices, the plan included <u>at least four</u> of the following activities:	In analyzing organizational practices, the plan included <u>no more than three</u> of the following activities:	In analyzing organizational practices, the plan included <u>at least one</u> of the following activities:	In analyzing organizational practices, the plan did not include the following activities:
	<input type="checkbox"/> The purpose and direction for the school defined by the beliefs, mission and shared vision of the school. <input type="checkbox"/> Promoted time-on-task for all students. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous professional development for school leaders. <input type="checkbox"/> Organized school to be proactive in addressing issues that might impede teaching and learning. <input type="checkbox"/> Organized school to support a diverse learning community through its programs and practices. <input type="checkbox"/> Organized school to engage the parents and community in providing extended learning opportunities for children.			
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 3.8	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Evidence</i>	<i>Adequate Evidence</i>	<i>Limited Evidence</i>	<i>No Evidence</i>
<b>Organizational and Professional Development Process</b>	In analyzing organizational process, the plan included <u>all</u> of the following activities:	In analyzing organizational process, the plan included at least <u>five</u> of the following activities:	In analyzing organizational process, the plan included at least <u>two</u> of the following activities:	In analyzing organizational process, the plan did not include the following activities:
	<input type="checkbox"/> Listed our current practices <input type="checkbox"/> Listed evidence of current practices <input type="checkbox"/> Determined alignment of current practices to the principles and practices of high-performing schools <input type="checkbox"/> Completed evaluation of the effectiveness of current practices based on the data <input type="checkbox"/> Identified strengths <input type="checkbox"/> Identified challenges <input type="checkbox"/> Identified steps to address challenges			
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*

## Component 4 – Action Plan Development

Indicator 4.1	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Goals</i>	<i>Adequate Goals</i>	<i>Limited Goals</i>	<i>Inadequate Goals</i>
<b>Goals</b>	The goals stated addressed <b><i>all</i></b> of the following. The goals are:	Developed goals, addressed at least <b><i>five</i></b> of the following. The goals are:	Developed goals, addressed <b><i>no more than two</i></b> of the following. The goals are:	Developed goals did not address any of the following.
<input type="checkbox"/> Based on desired student performance with defined performance standard <input type="checkbox"/> Linked to a reasonable timeline <input type="checkbox"/> Measurable <input type="checkbox"/> Designed to address No Child Left Behind (NCLB) benchmark requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Address the needs identified by the data <input type="checkbox"/> Linked to the professional development activities <input type="checkbox"/> Representative of a comprehensive planning process				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 4.2	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Action Steps</i>	<i>Adequate Action Steps</i>	<i>Limited Action Steps</i>	<i>No Action Steps</i>
<b>Action Steps</b>	The stated action steps addressed <b><i>all</i></b> of the following. The action steps:	The stated action steps addressed <b><i>no more than five</i></b> of the following. The action steps:	Developed action steps addressed <b><i>no more than two</i></b> of the following. The action steps:	Developed action steps did not address the following.
<input type="checkbox"/> Are aligned to identified needs/stated goals <input type="checkbox"/> Are clearly linked to specific student behaviors <input type="checkbox"/> Include specific implementing and evaluating steps <input type="checkbox"/> Detail how frequently the action occurs <input type="checkbox"/> Define professional development activities for addressing identified diverse needs of instructional staff and administrators <input type="checkbox"/> Describe how the school will promote parent and community involvement <input type="checkbox"/> State how technology will address varied needs of teachers, administrators and paraprofessionals <input type="checkbox"/> Provide for effective communication between and among school personnel and all stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> Are student-centered, teacher-centered, and school organization-centered				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*

Indicator 4.3	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Implementation Plan</i>	<i>Adequate Implementation Plan</i>	<i>Limited Implementation Plan</i>	<i>No Implementation Plan</i>
<b>Implementation Plan</b>	The implementation plan addressed <b><i>all</i></b> of the following. The school implementation plan:	The implementation plan addressed <b><i>no more than three</i></b> of the following. The school implementation plan:	The implementation plan addressed <b><i>no more than one</i></b> of the following. The school implementation plan:	The implementation plan did not address the following.
<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Had varied timelines which give specific beginning and ending dates for each action timely and complete work scheduled for each action  <input type="checkbox"/> Listed projected costs/required resources required to address and support action activities to successful completion*  <input type="checkbox"/> Identified funding sources for each activity relating to student achievement         </p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Clearly identifies person who is responsible for  <input type="checkbox"/> Specified well-defined evaluation strategies for         </p> <p>* Money and personnel time are included as resources</p>				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*

## Component 5 – The School Improvement Plan and Process Evaluation

Indicator 5.1	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Evaluation of the SIP Process</i>	<i>Adequate Evaluation of the SIP Process</i>	<i>Limited Evaluation of the SIP Process</i>	<i>No Evaluation of the SIP Process</i>
<b>Process Evaluation</b>	The plan's evaluation of the SIP process included <b><u>all</u></b> of the following:	Our evaluation of the SIP process included <b><u>no more than four</u></b> of the following:	Our evaluation of the SIP process included <b><u>no more than two</u></b> of the following:	Our evaluation of the SIP process does not include the following:
<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of an ongoing collaborative process <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence that multiple sources of data align with plan goals <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of ongoing communication of the SIP process with all stakeholders <input type="checkbox"/> Specific steps for adjusting/improving the SIP process <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of alignment between beliefs, shared vision, mission in Component 2 and goals in Component 4 <input type="checkbox"/> Evidence of alignment between action steps in Component 4 and analyses of areas of curriculum, instruction, assessment and organization in Component 3				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

Indicator 5.2	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary System of Implementation</i>	<i>Adequate System of Implementation</i>	<i>Limited System of Implementation</i>	<i>No System of Implementation</i>
<b>Implementation Evaluation</b>	The implementation plan included <b><u>all</u></b> of the following:	The implementation plan included <b><u>no more than three</u></b> of the following:	The implementation plan included <b><u>one</u></b> of the following:	The implementation plan does not include the following:
<input type="checkbox"/> Clear and detailed process to begin implementation of the action steps <input type="checkbox"/> The formative assessments that will be used with projected dates for administration <input type="checkbox"/> Multiple examples of formative data* to be collected to monitor the progress of the plan <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed process for gathering and analyzing the formative data  *Formative Assessment is designed and used to improve an object, event, or program, especially when it is still being developed.				
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*



Indicator 5.3	Performance Levels			
	<i>Exemplary Process for Sustaining SIP</i>	<i>Adequate Process for Sustaining SIP</i>	<i>Limited Process for Sustaining SIP</i>	<i>No Process for Sustaining SIP</i>
<b>Monitoring and Adjusting Evaluation</b>	The process to sustain the SIP included <b><i>all</i></b> of the following:	The process to sustain the SIP included <b><i>no more than three</i></b> of the following:	The process to sustain the SIP included <b><i>one</i></b> of the following:	The process to sustain the SIP does not include the following:
	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Calendar dates the SIP planning team will meet    <input type="checkbox"/> Name or title of the person responsible for communicating the time and location of the meetings    <input type="checkbox"/> Process for communicating the progress of the SIP to all stakeholders and for soliciting ongoing input from stakeholders</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and detailed process to review summative** data to determine if adjustments need to be made in the plan    <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed process for making adjustments to the action steps</p> <p>**Summative Assessment is designed to present conclusions about the merit or worth of an object, event, or program and recommendations about whether it should be retained, altered, or eliminated.</p>			
Rationale for Performance Level Decision:				

*NOTE: The School Improvement Plan artifacts, areas and “look fors” do not constitute an exhaustive list of strategies and activities targeted to achieve the school improvement.*

(Sources: The Department of Education for the following states: AL, AZ, IL, MD, NJ, OH, TN, VA; Learning Point Associates; Center for Comprehensive School Reform and Improvement; Center on Innovation & Improvement)