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**Overview of Colorado’s Accountability System**

**and Unified Improvement Plan**

The Colorado Achievement Plan for Kids Act of 2008 (CAP4K) aligns the public education system from preschool through postsecondary and workforce readiness. The intent of the alignment is to ensure that all students graduate high school ready for postsecondary and workforce success. The Education Accountability Act of 2009 aligns the state’s education accountability system to focus on the goals of CAP4K: hold the state, districts, and schools accountable on a set of consistent, objective measures and report performance in a manner that is highly transparent and builds public understanding.

The Colorado Department of Education will annually review each school district’s performance to determine the accreditation status of the district. The Department will assign the district to one of the following categories: *Accredited with Distinction, Accredited, Accredited with Improvement Plan, Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan, or Accredited with Turnaround Plan.*

If a district has been identified as *Accredited with Improvement Plan, Accredited with Priority Improvement Plan, or Accredited with Turnaround Plan,* it is required to adopt and implement an improvement plan, priority improvement plan, or turnaround plan respectively. In addition, the district must identify which schools are required to submit an improvement plan, priority improvement plan or turnaround plan, based on the school’s performance data.

The Colorado Department of Education has developed a Uniform Improvement Plan template for districts and schools to use in submitting any of the three required improvement plans. The required components of a **Title I Schoolwide Plan and a Title I Targeted Assisted Plan** are included in the Unified Improvement Plan template, thus requiring only one plan format for all schools. (CDE, *District Accountability Handbook*, Version 1.4, July 21, 2010, pp. 3 - 7)

The use of Title funds for an inquiry-based arts integration in Title I Schoolwide programs is allowable as a school reform model. These funds may be used to strategically invest in professional development centered on incorporating arts-based instructional practices into the classroom. They may also be used to develop collaborative partnerships with community resources to support an arts-based approach to the curriculum.

**Inquiry Based Arts Integration within Title parameters:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IS…..** | **IS NOT….** |
| Targeted and strategic use of arts practitioners and best practices within a school system to ensure academic growth for all students | Using Title funds to pay for an arts instructor or artist in residence opportunities |
| Connecting shared, conceptual learning throughout the school system such as but not limited to; patterning, cycles, systems, structures, time, space | Using Title funds to buy instruments, sheet music, art class materials etc. |
| Building a common understanding of strong instructional based practices in all content areas | Using Title funds to bring in assemblies or pay for arts-based events |
| Building a school-wide understanding that all school personnel share the goals of increasing achievement for all students | Disconnecting arts practitioners from the Schoolwide Title planning needs |
| Ensuring the creative process through inquiry, is embedded in learning experiences for all students | Removing students from arts programming for remediation needs |
| Monitoring and collecting growth data in all content areas |  |
| Adjusting instructional targets based on data in all content areas |  |
| Including arts practitioners and their collective expertise in school level problem solving teams |  |
| Providing a school-wide understanding that arts learning experiences provide context and connections for reading and math |  |

The following provides guidelines for schools that wish to utilize an inquiry based arts integration model for school reform that can be incorporated into the Colorado Unified Improvement Plan.

**Inquiry Based Arts Integration Model for School Improvement**

**Why Arts Learning?**

Providing a strong arts education to every child in every public school is no longer just an option. It is as integral to learning as reading, writing and math. For today’s students to succeed in school, work and life, they will require a well-rounded education. In a global economy, graduates with skills in imagination, creativity and innovation will be heavily sought after by employers. In addition, the creative industries-design, architecture and interactive media-are among the fastest growing workforce areas. Arts learning is a win-win investment that enhances quality of life and ensures the economic vitality necessary to enjoy it. In Colorado, success begins with a coalition of partners; state government, businesses, non-profit organizations dedicated to the understanding that arts learning is not an “either-or” conversation in relation to other disciplines but rather a “both-and” conversation.

The body of research within the last ten years has shown the correlations between the arts, student engagement and success. *(see Appendix A)* Colorado Council on the Arts and Colorado Department of Education jointly sponsored a study in 2008 to establish a baseline outlining the current state of arts education in Colorado’s public schools. Researchers created an arts index to measure the breadth and depth of arts education in Colorado’s public schools to capture what programming is available throughout the state. This study was conducted on a quantitative basis and did not include a measure for gauging the quality of the arts experiences. The study did show a mismatch between a decline in arts participation in high school vs. an increase in demand for skills and abilities in the workforce such as innovation, perseverance and creativity that are intrinsic in arts learning. The current statistics indicating a 50% drop-out rate also uncovers what is known as the Colorado Paradox; Colorado has the most educated workforce but a very high drop-out percentage indicating the need to import the Colorado workforce. Through quality arts learning programs that engage and deliver highly motivating, differentiated, 21st century opportunities, it is the fervent hope that Colorado can decrease drop-out rates and begin filling the growing creative industry job market with Colorado students. (CDE, Colorado Council on the Arts, “*Arts Learning in Colorado Strategic Plan Proposal*”)

The tenets of Arts Integration and 21st Century Skills identified in Colorado standards are closely aligned:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Tenets of Arts Integration** | **21st Century Skills** |
| Discipline | * Self – Direction |
| * Engaging Community * Cultural resonance | * Collaboration |
| * Skills and readiness competencies in the Arts provides context for building powerful connections between multiple resources and content | * Information Literacy |
| * Building Inquiry – Problem solving * Differentiation to meet diverse learning styles | * Critical Thinking & Reasoning |
| * Creative Process * Engagement * Enrichment | * Invention/Creative Process |

With the high need for improvement in student achievement in Colorado, it makes sense to consider an Inquiry Based Arts Integration Model for school reform.

Schools that choose to use Title funds to support an Inquiry Based Arts Integration Reform Model must include strategies that comply with Federal requirements of the Title Schoolwide Plan. The components of an arts education reform plan, the requirements of a schoolwide plan, and the requirements of the Colorado Unified Improvement Plan are similar:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Colorado Unified Improvement Plan** | **Title I Schoolwide Plan** | **Arts Education Reform Plan**  *(Whole School Reform & Artful Teaching and Learning, p.13)* |
| Comprehensive needs assessment | Comprehensive needs assessment | Provides research based-framework |
| Establish annual targets and interim measures | Set measurable goals and benchmarks. | Uses measurable goals and benchmarks. |
| Identify major improvement strategies and implementation benchmarks  Monitor progress | Identify research based reform strategies and instructional approach.  Assessment and identification of interventions for students | Cohesively takes into account and fully aligns standards with curriculum, instruction, assessment, professional development, classroom management and technology.  Explicitly connects effective research-based instructional practice in all content areas. |
|  | Professional development.  Teacher qualification. | Provides for ongoing professional development. |
|  | Schoolwide Plan Development  Transition Plans | Requires support for all school staff.  Creates a school culture that encourages teamwork, leadership and communication and utilizes arts specialists in a strategic manner. |
|  | Parent involvement | Thrives on parent and community involvement. |
|  | Other Federal, State, and Local Services Coordination | Enlists external technical assistance and support.  Coordinates and reallocates existing resources to support reform efforts. |
| Annual evaluation of plan. | Annual evaluation of plan. | Asks participants to annually evaluate the efficacy of its strategies through application and transfer of skills through performance.  Demonstrates research-driven evidence of effectiveness. |

# Knowing there is a high correlation among all three plans, the guidelines below follow *Uniform Improvement Plan Guidelines* developed by the Colorado Center for Teaching and Learning (2010) and the *Unified Improvement Plan* *Template* developed by the Colorado Department of Education to serve as the basic structure for an integrated arts plan. Suggestions for incorporation of an inquiry-based arts integration model are noted in red.

# Basic Steps in the Improvement Planning Process

# Step 1: Clarify Overall Purpose or Desired Result

During the planning process, planning teams have in mind (consciously or unconsciously) some overall purpose or result that the plan is to achieve. Because of the *Colorado Achievement Plan for Kids* (SB212-08), for districts in Colorado, the purpose of improvement planning must include: ***Ensuring all students exit the K-12 education system ready for postsecondary education, and/or to be successful in the workforce, earning a living wage immediately upon graduation***. Because of the federal No Child Left Behind (NCLB) statute, the purpose of improvement planning must also include: ensuring all students are at least partially proficient by 2014. Districts may have additional purposes in mind for their improvement planning.

# Step 2: Review Performance Indicators, Measures, and Targets *(These will be provided in Section I: Summary Information about the School in the Unified Improvement Plan Template)*

Performance indicators define the general dimensions of quality that help to focus district improvement planning, on an annual basis, as planning teams keep the long-term purpose of planning in mind. Both state (SB09-163) and federal (NCLB) statutes define performance indicators that should be included in district improvement plans. Performance indicators are further defined by the means by which performance on the indicator will be assessed, or associated *measures*, and how that measure will be quantified; or the associated *metrics*. Then *targets* for each metric specify what will constitute success, on a particular measure, within a certain period of time. Together, performance indicator areas, measures, metrics, and targets provide a sharp focus for district improvement planning.

1. **Performance Indicators.** The *Colorado Accountability Alignment Act* (SB 09-163) which became law in 2009, identified four performance indicator areas that districts (and schools) must include in their improvement planning: student academic growth, student achievement, gaps by student groups in achievement and growth, and post-secondary/workforce readiness. To a great degree, the state performance indicator areas incorporate those required by NCLB.  NCLB also requires districts to monitor performance with regard to *student achievement* and *gaps in achievement by student groups.* Additional indicator areas required by NCLB, but not SB 09-163 include: English language acquisition and teacher quality.
2. **Measures and Metrics**. For each performance indicator required by SB 09-163, the state has also defined required measures and metrics. NCLB also specifies measures and metrics for each required performance indicator area. However, NCLB and SB 09-163 specify different metrics to use when evaluating progress towards student achievement and reducing gaps in achievement by student groups. NCLB uses the percent of students reaching the partially proficient performance level, whereas SB163 uses the percent of students reaching the proficient performance level. The other measures and metrics required for SB 09-163 are indicated in Table 1.
3. **Targets.** Both SB 09-163 and NCLB require districts to meet certain targets, each year, in each performance indicator area. Annual NCLB targets have been established federally and are based on districts reaching the target of all students (and students by group) partially proficient by the year 2014. The SB 09-163 targets are based on a different end point—all students proficient by the time they graduate from the K-12 educational system. During this transition year, districts will set their own targets for each performance indicator area required by SB 09-163. Then, CDE will establish targets for improvement plans that will be in effect for the 2011-12 school year.

*Table 1. Performance Indicators, Measures, Metrics and Example Targets (SB 09-163 only)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Indicator** | **Measure** | **Metrics** | **Example Targets** |
| **Student Academic Growth** | The Colorado Growth Model | Median Student Growth Percentile  Percent of students making adequate growth (for students scoring unsatisfactory or partially proficient, this is *catch-up growth;* for students scoring proficient or advanced that is *keep-up growth*) | By the end of the 2010-2011 school year, the district median student growth percentile in mathematics will be 65.  The percent of unsatisfactory or partially proficient students making catch-up growth in reading will be 50 by the end of the 2010-2011 school year. |
| **Student Academic Achievement** | CSAP in Math, Reading, and Writing | Percent of students scoring advanced, proficient, partially proficient, and unsatisfactory in mathematics, reading, and writing. | By the end of the 2010-2011 school year, 80% of elementary students in the district will score proficient or advanced on the reading CSAP. |
| **Achievement Gaps**    **Growth Gaps** | CSAP    The Colorado Growth Model | Percent of students scoring at each performance level disaggregated by student groups  Median student growth percentile (disaggregated by student groups)  Percentage of students making adequate growth (disaggregated by student groups) | By the end of the 2010-2011 school year, the difference in the percent of students scoring proficient and advanced on CSAP reading assessment, between students qualifying for free/reduced lunch and those who do not, will be less than 10 percent.  By the end of the 2010-2011 school year, the median student growth percentile for students qualifying for free/reduced lunch and those who do not will be within 15 percentile points. |
| **Post-secondary/ workforce readiness** | Graduation rate  Drop-out rate  ACT | Percentage of students graduating on time.  Percentage of students dropping our  Average ACT Composite score | By the end of the 2010-2011 school year, the average ACT composite score for students in the district will exceed the state average. |
| **English Language Development and Attainment** | CELA and CSAP | % of ELL students categorized as “making progress” in Learning English on CELA  % of ELL students categorized as attaining English Proficiency on CELA  % of ELL students designated as partially proficient or higher on CSAP | 25% of ELL students who meet federal criteria will obtain English Language Proficiency as determined by CELA.  60% of ELL students who meet federal criteria will be categorized as attaining English proficiency on the CELA.  (See AYP targets) |
| **Educator Qualification** |  | % of core content teachers meeting the “highly qualified” designation. | 100% of core content teachers meet the “highly qualified” designation by the end of the 2010-2011 school year. |

## Deconstructing SMART Goals

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| * + **SMART Goals** | * + **Performance Management** |
| * + Strategic | * + Performance Indicators |
| * + Measurable | * + Measures and Metrics (What will you use and how will you measure progress?) |
| * + Attainable | * + Targets |
| * + Research Based | * + Performance Indicators |
| * + Time-bound | * + Targets (How good is good enough? By when?) |

* + Consider your district summary information:
* Did you fail to meet any ’08-’09 targets? In which performance indicator areas?

*(Section II of the UIP template: Improvement Plan Information should be completed by the school)*

**Step 3: Gather and organize relevant data. *(Section III of UIP: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification; Step One)***

After the focus of improvement planning has been clarified, planning teams must collect data generated from a variety of sources that can inform the planning process. Data must be gathered to measure district performance in the required performance indicator areas, including: CSAP status data (disaggregated by student groups) to measure student achievement and achievement gaps; The Colorado Growth Model reports (disaggregated by student groups) to measure student growth and growth gaps; graduation rates, drop-out rates and ACT scores to measure post-secondary/workforce readiness; CELA results to measure English language attainment; and highly qualified teacher designations for core content teachers to measure teacher quality. Local performance data also should be gathered to better understand performance including: district interim/benchmark assessment results, results from commonly administered assessments, etc.

Additional local data should be gathered to help *explain* the performance data. Districts should consider including student and teacher demographic data, perception data, and data that captures the educational processes in place in the district. For districts that have/or will have participated in a Comprehensive Assessment of District Improvement (CADI) review, district accreditation site review, or external assessment, the data generated through these review processes becomes important as well. As part of the initial data-gathering process, districts should clarify the questions that each data source will help to answer.

Collect data in the following categories:

**Demographics**: Enrollment, Attendance, Drop-out Rate, Ethnicity, Gender, Grade Level

**Perceptions:** Perceptions of Learning Environment, Values and Beliefs, Attitudes, (include values, beliefs, and attitudes about Inquiry-based Arts Education), Observations.

**Student Learning:** Standardized Tests, Norm/Criterion-Referenced Tests, Teacher Observations of Abilities, Authentic Assessments

**School Processes:** Discipline Plan, District Curriculum, Student Services, G/T Plan, Observation and Monitoring of Classroom Practices

Include any other data that you may have that relates to Inquiry-based Arts Education.

**Step 4: Analyze trends and identify needs. *(Section III of UIP: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification; Step Two)***

This step involves collaboratively analyzing and interpreting the data to determine the districts’ status quo. CDE has pre-populated a summary table in each district-specific, unified planning template which provides an overview of each performance indicator area and identifies where each district met or did not meet the targets the district set last year. Data analysis must consider each key performance indicator area: student academic growth, student achievement (status), gaps by group in student achievement and growth, postsecondary/ workforce readiness, English language acquisition, and teacher quality. First, teams will look for patterns, trends, and things that “pop out” in their data; making declarative statements or observations about what they see in their data. Next, teams will consider which of their observations represent strengths upon which they can build and which represent problems or areas of **need**. Finally, areas of **need** must be prioritized so that the next steps in the analysis can focus on where improvement is needed the most.

**Step 5: Determine Root Causes** ***(Section III of UIP: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification; Step Three)***

This step involves identifying the underlying causes behind the need areas identified in the prior analysis step. A cause is a “root” cause if: the problem would not have occurred if the cause had not been present, the problem would not reoccur if the cause was corrected or dissolved, and correction or dissolution of the cause would not lead to the same or similar problems (Preuss, 2003). Identifying root causes is a critical precursor to determining improvement strategies and action steps. In general, the process for determining root causes can be thought of as a funnel, starting with the widest thinking possible about causes related to each prioritized need (brainstorming, thinking outside of the box), narrowing to actionable causes (applying criteria), and then deepening the thinking to ensure the identified causes are “root” causes. Once the team believes they have identified a *root cause*, they should verify their root cause with other data sources. This step is critical, because improvement strategies and action steps, that respond directly to root causes of low performance, result in improvements in performance.

**Root Cause Questions**

* Would the problem have occurred if the cause had not been present?
* Will the problem reoccur if the cause is corrected or dissolved?
* Will correction of dissolution of the cause lead to similar events?

In an Inquiry Based Arts Integration Model, research showing how the arts impacts student learning and the possible lack thereof in your school could be considered a “root cause.” This will justify your improvement strategies that revolve around inquiry based arts strategies. *(See Appendix B)*

***(Upon completion of Step 5, you will be asked to complete the Data Narrative blending the work that you have done in the previous three steps: see Section III of UIP: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification; Step 4: Create the Data Narrative)***

## Step 6: Establish Targets and Interim Measures (Section IV Action Plan(s): School Goals Worksheet)

Based on the data analysis and identification of priority needs (step 4), district should clarify the targets that will focus their improvement efforts for the coming year. For the performance indicator areas established by NCLB, annual targets have already been set. During this transition year (2009-2010 school year), districts will need to set their own annual targets for the performance indicator areas identified by SB 09-163. These annual targets need to move districts aggressively towards ensuring all students exit the district ready for postsecondary education, and/or to be successful in the workforce, while at the same time considering what is possible in one year, given the districts’ current status. In every performance indicator area, where improvement is needed, districts should also identify interim measures or what they will measure during the year to determine if progress is being made towards the annual targets.

## Step 7: Identify Major Improvement Strategies and Implementation Benchmarks (Section IV Action Plan(s): Action Planning Worksheet)

Major improvement strategies identified by districts and the specific action steps required to carry out each major improvement strategy should respond to and should eliminate or correct the root causes (step 5) of each of the district’s prioritized needs (step 4). Major improvement strategies should also be research-based; in that, there should be evidence that using these strategies has previously led to improvements in student performance. Within each major improvement strategy, the corresponding resources (federal, state or local) that will be brought to bear, to complete the action steps, should also be identified. For each improvement strategy, the team should also determine what data will be reviewed to determine if the improvement strategies are being implemented as intended. These measures are called Implementation benchmarks.

In an Inquiry Based Arts Model, identify research-based strategies *(See Appendix A)* in art education that will lead to student achievement of the identified targets. These should be related to the identified “root causes.”

## Step 8: Monitor Progress

Both Implementation benchmarks and Interim Measures should be monitored throughout the year to determine if improvement strategies are being implemented with fidelity and having the desired effects. Implementation benchmarks can be organized in terms of what will happen in 3 months, 6, months, 9 months. Interim measures should be based on local performance data that will be available at least twice during the school year. A baseline should be established for both implementation of major action strategies and district progress towards targets (based on interim measures) and both should be reviewed regularly during the year. A calendar should be developed, at the beginning of the year, for when the planning team will monitor progress during the school year. Reviewing progress involves analyzing and interpreting data about the metrics that have been chosen. If progress is not being made, that may mean that the planned strategies and action steps have not been implemented fully, or it may mean that adjustments need to be made to the plan. Both should be considered and monitored.

[**Title I Schoolwide Checklist**](http://www.schoolview.org/documents/SWChecklist5-11-10.pdf)**:**  Schools that are designated as Title I Schoolwide must complete the checklist provided and add as an addendum to the Unified Improvement Plan. (*See Appendix C)*

# Planning Terminology Resource- *See Appendix D*

**Developers of *Guidelines for the Colorado Unified Improvement Plan, 2010,***

**Center for Transforming Learning and Teaching**

Julie Oxenford O’Brian – julie@ctlt.org

Mary Beth Romke – mary@ctlt.org

Kathy Dyer

**APPENDIX A**

Research Resources:

* Case Study of Piano Lessons and student achievement in math, ([Shaw and Rauscher, 1997](http://www.springspianolessons.com/Benefits-Newsweek.html))
* [Study by Howard Gardner (1996)](http://www.pz.harvard.edu/PIs/HG.htm) showing higher student achievement in visual arts enriched classrooms
* [Case study in Seattle, Washington](http://pqasb.pqarchiver.com/chicagotribune/access/45702949.html?FMT=ABS&FMTS=ABS:FT&type=current&date=Oct+21%2C+1999&author=Charles+Leroux+and+Ron+Grossman%2C+Tribune+Staff+Writers&pub=Chicago+Tribune&edition=&startpage=1&desc=ARTS+IN+THE+SCHOOLS+PAINT+MAS) of increased 3rd grade language arts achievement through using dance activities to reinforce language arts concepts (Leroux & Grossman, 1999)
* [Correlation of higher college entrance](http://www.collegeboard.com/) scores to students who participated in dramatic arts (College Board, 2001)
* [Study by the National Center for Urban School Transformation](http://www.ncust.org/) citing most high-performing Title I schools teach a well-rounded curriculum that includes substantial offerings in art, music, physical education, and elective courses
* [2007-2008 Study of Florida public schools](http://www.flmusiced.org/dnn/Advocacy/12GradeCohortFineArtsEnrollmentComparison/tabid/113/Default.aspx) identifying higher cumulative GPAs, SAT Verbal Mean Scores, and lower drop-out rates for students enrolled in arts programming
* [Study of multi-state A+ Arts Reform](http://aplus-schools.uncg.edu/overviewofkeyfindings.pdf) programs that are known as the most sustainable school reform models due to their high level of adaptability to unique circumstances of individual school needs. Oklahoma's A+ school-network nurtures creativity in every student--and a recent evaluation shows not just that the program increases student achievement but boosts attendance and decreases discipline problems as well.
* [James Catterall's longitudinal study, Doing Well and Doing Good by Doing Art,](http://www.aep-arts.org/files/AEPWireDoingWell.pdf) low-income students at arts-rich high schools were more than twice as likely to earn a B.A. as low-income students at arts-poor high schools.
* Research also reports that music can help bridge the socioeconomic gap.

CASE STUDY 4:

Second graders in inner-city Los Angeles were compared to fourth and fifth graders in more affluent Orange County, CA, the second graders who received twice-a-week piano training scored as well as the fourth graders who did not receive piano training. Half of the second graders scored as well as fifth graders. Begley, “Music on the Mind,” [Newsweek](http://www.newsweek.com/), July 24, 2000, pg. 51

* **Researchers find arts training not only raises scholastic performance, but also improves student behavior and attitude**

In Rhode Island, researchers studied eight public school first grade classes. Half of the classes became “test arts” groups, receiving ongoing music and visual arts training. In kindergarten, this group had lagged behind in scholastic performance. After seven months, the students were given a standardized test. The “test arts” group had caught up to their fellow students in reading and surpassed their classmates in math by 22%. In the second year of the project, the arts students widened this margin even further. Students were also evaluated on attitude and behavior. Classroom teachers noted improvement in these areas also.

*Reference:* [*Nature May 23, 1996*](http://www.nature.com/nature/journal/v381/n6580/pdf/381284a0.pdf)

* **In both verbal and math scores, high school student-musicians outpace peers**

The College Entrance Examination Board reports, “Students of the arts continue to outperform their non-arts peers on the SAT®. In 2001, SAT takers with coursework/experience in music performance scored 57 points higher on the verbal portion of the test and 41 points higher on the math portion than students with no coursework/experience in the arts.”

Longer arts study proved to parlay into even higher test scores. The 1996 report observed, “Those who studied the arts four or more years scored 59 points higher and 41 points higher on the verbal and math portions respectively than students with no coursework or experience in the arts.”

*Reference*[*: Profile of SAT and Achievement Test Takers*](http://www.menc.org/news/view/press-release-new-harris-poll-links-music-education-to-advanced-studies-and-higher-incomes/)*,*

*The College Board, compiled by Music Educators*

*National Conference, 1997*

* **Hungary, Netherlands and Japan top worldwide science achievement and have strong commitment to music education**

The top-performing students on the [1988 International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IAEEA)](http://sbo.nn.k12.va.us/music/A-comparingprograms.pdf) Test in science were the eighth and ninth graders from Hungary, followed by those from the Netherlands and Japan.

All three countries have required music training at the elementary and middle school levels, both instrumental and vocal, for several decades.

**APPENDIX B**



**APPENDIX C**

Colorado Department of Education (Last Updated: May 2010)

**TITLE IA SCHOOLWIDE PLAN CHECKLIST**

The following indicators are required components in a Title IA Schoolwide Plan. Schools are expected to review and adjust the plan on an annual basis. To update the plan, the school should use the Unified Improvement Planning (UIP) Template to document those amendments.

**Comprehensive Needs Assessment.** Schools need to multiple data points for this analysis, such as student achievement, student mobility, attendance, discipline, and teacher perceptual data. This can be updated in your UIP in *section III: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification*.

The plan includes a trend analysis of CSAP data (e.g., status, growth)

There is trend analysis of other measures of student progress (body of evidence)

Other data indicators are considered in the analysis, such as student demographics and staffing considerations

**Reform Strategies and Instructional Approach.** This can be updated in the UIP in *section IV: Action Plan(s)*. Remember that identified strategies must be connected to prioritized needs and root causes identified in section III of the UIP.

The reform strategies address the needs of all students to meet the state’s proficient and advanced achievement levels.

There is evidence that the methods and instructional strategies to be implemented are scientifically research based.

There is a description of how methods and instructional strategies strengthen the core academic programs.

The plan demonstrates how the methods and instructional strategies increase the amount and quality of learning.

The plan details how the methods and instructional strategies provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum.

There is explanation of how the reform strategies meet the needs of historically underserved populations.

The plan addresses how the reform strategies address the needs of all students.

The plan describes how attention is given to low-achieving students who are at risk of not meeting state academic standards.

The plan includes strategies to support the needs of all students, especially low-achieving students, and includes counseling, pupil services, mentoring (if appropriate).

The plan includes strategies to support the needs of all students at the secondary level, especially low-achieving student s. It also includes college and career awareness, personal finance education, integration of vocation and technical education programs (if appropriate).

A method to determine that all students’ needs have been met is described, including on-going evaluation for effectiveness and a method to make adjustments.Colorado Department of Education (Last Updated: May 2010) 2

**Teacher Qualification.** If this is identified as an area that needs improvement, make sure to include staffing data to your needs assessment and then address the strategies in your school’s action planning. In the UIP, this would include sections III and IV.

A description of the qualification of all teachers and classroom/instructional paraprofessionals is included.

Strategies to attract and maintain high-quality highly qualified teachers are described.

**Professional Development.** This component should be woven into the major improvement strategies listed in the action plan of the UIP.

High quality and on-going professional development for teachers, principals, paraprofessionals and other staff (as appropriate) that is based on the needs assessment is described.

**Parent Involvement.** If this is identified as an area that needs improvement, you can include strategies woven into other major improvement strategies or listed separately as its own major improvement strategy. In the UIP, the action plans are in section IV.

There is description of how programs such as Head Start, Reading First, Early Reading Fist, Even Start, Parents as Teachers, etc. are integrated into the schoolwide plan for parent involvement

The school level parent involvement policy is included with and aligns with the plan.

There is indication that parents are involved in the planning, review and improvement of programs, such as the schoolwide plan.

There is evidence of a school-parent compact that outlines how parents, the entire school staff, and students share the responsibility for improved student achievement.

**Transition plans.** If this is identified as an area that needs improvement, make sure to address it in the data narrative and then address the strategies in your school’s action planning. In the UIP, this would include sections III and IV.

There is a plan for transition students from preschool to the elementary level.

**Assessment and Identification of Interventions for Students.** This can be updated in the UIP in your action plan(s) in section IV. Remember that identified strategies must be connected to prioritized needs and root causes identified in section III of the UIP.

There is a description of how teachers are involved with the analysis of academic assessment (especially CSAP) to improve the achievement of individual students and impact the overall classroom instruction.

There is a description of how timely assistance will be given to students who have difficulty mastering proficient and advanced levels

There is a description of how these students will be early identified and the potential interventionsColorado Department of Education (Last Updated: May 2010) 3

**Other Federal, State, and Local Services Coordination.** This may identified as a root cause (e.g., lack of alignment between strategies and funding sources) in section III of the UIP. It may also be discussed in the action plans in section IV.

There is a description of how other NCLB Title Programs (Title I, Parts B, C, and F; Title II, Parts A, B and D; Title IV, Parts A & B; and Title V) are integrated and coordinated with the schoolwide plan, if applicable.

There is evidence other programs (such as violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start, adult education, vocational and technical education, job training, etc.) are integrated into the schoolwide plan.

**Schoolwide Plan Development.** If this is identified as an area that needs improvement, then address the strategies in your school’s action planning (section IV of the UIP). In particular, the effectiveness of the proposed major improvement strategies discussed in section IV should be addressed in the UIP.

There is indication the plan was developed with the involvement of parents, other community members and school staff, including teachers, principal, program administrators (such as Even Start, Homeless Education, Early Reading First), pupil services personnel, and students (if appropriate).

There is a description of evaluating the effectiveness of the plan: how the plan will be reviewed and revised.

There is a description of how the plan will be available to the district, parents and the general public in an understandable, uniform format – and in a language parents can understand.

**APPENDIX D**

# Planning Terminology

| **Planning Terms** | | **Definition** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Action Step | | Something that is done to make progress towards goals. Action steps are created for each strategy and identify resources (people, time, and money) that will be brought to bear to reach goals and targets. |
| Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) | | Colorado’s determination of incremental progress towards meeting the goal of all students being PROFICIENT in reading and math, as noted by CSAP, Lectura, or CSAPA, by 2014.  Note: For AYP purposes, Partially Proficient, Proficient and Advanced are considered PROFICIENT. |
| AMAOs | | Annual Measurable Achievement Objectives. The NCLB, Title III Accountability measures. |
| Baseline | | The initial value of a metric against which future values will be compared to determine if progress is being made towards targets. |
| Catch Up | | For a student who scores at the Achievement Level of Unsatisfactory or Partially Proficient on Statewide Assessments, the amount of academic growth the student must attain to score at the Proficient Achievement Level on Statewide Assessments within three years or by tenth grade, whichever is sooner. |
| CELA Proficience (CELA Pro) | | Colorado English Language Assessment for Proficiency: standards based language proficiency assessment given annually to ELLs and used for Title III accountability and to calculate Title III AMAOs. |
| CSAP | | Colorado Student Assessment Program. |
| CSAPA | | Colorado Student Assessment Program Alternate: the standards based assessment used to measure content knowledge for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities. |
| ELD Standards | | English Language Development Standards |
| ELLs | | English Language Learners |
| FEP | | Fluent English Proficient |
| Fluent English Proficient | | Students at this level are able to understand and communicate effectively with various audiences on a wide range of familiar and new topics to meet social and academic demands. They are able to achieve in content areas comparable to native speakers, but may still need limited linguistic support. [CELA Level 5] |
| Goal | | A projected state of affairs that a school or district plans or intends to achieve—a desired end-point following intentional effort. Goals are set within performance indicator areas. |
| Interim Measure | | A measure (and associated metric) used to assess performance for a given performance indicator at various time intervals during a school year. |
| Implementation Benchmark | | A measure (with associated metric) used to assess the degree to which action steps have been implemented. (See also measure and metric.) |
| Keep Up | For a student who scores at the Achievement Level of Proficient or Advanced on Statewide Assessments, the amount of academic growth the student must attain to score at the Proficient Achievement Level or higher on Statewide Assessments for the succeeding three years or until tenth grade, whichever is sooner. | |
| Lectura | State 3rd and 4th grade reading assessment in Spanish; similar to CSAP reading assessment. Lectura is administered to those students who receive their primary Reading instruction in Spanish. | |
| LEA | Local Educational Agency; this can be a School District, BOCES or the lead school district in a multi- school district consortium. | |
| Limited English Proficient | Students at this level are able to understand and be understood in many to most social communication situations. They are gaining increasing competence in the more cognitively demanding requirements of content areas; however, they are not yet ready to fully participate in academic content areas without linguistic support. [CELA Levels 3 and 4] | |
| Measure | Instruments or means to assess the performance in an area identified by an indicator, or what will be measured for a given performance indicator. | |
| Metric | A quantification for a given measure or performance indicator. | |
| Move Up | For a student who scores at the Achievement Level of Proficient on Statewide Assessments, the amount of academic growth the student must attain to score at the Advanced performance level on Statewide Assessments within three years or by tenth grade, whichever is sooner. | |
| NCLB | No Child Left Behind, federal statute 2001 | |
| Non-English Proficient (NEP) | This level includes students who are just beginning to understand and respond to simple routine communication through those who can respond with more ease to a variety of social communication tasks. [CELA Levels 1 and 2] | |
| Participation Rate | Percentage of students in a school or district taking a state assessment, including: CSAP, CSAP-A, Lectura, or CELA\* | |
| Performance Indicator | A general dimension of school or district quality. Colorado has identified four performance indicators: student academic growth, student achievement, achievement and growth gaps, and postsecondary/workforce readiness. | |
| Root Cause | The deepest underlying cause or causes of positive or negative symptoms within any process that, if dissolved, would result in elimination or substantial reduction, of the symptom. | |
| SASID | State Assigned student identifier number | |
| SEA | State Education Agency | |
| Strategy | Methods to reach goals. Which strategies are chosen depends on coherence, affordability, practicality and efficiency and should be research-based. | |
| Target | Specific, quantifiable outcomes that set expectations or define what will constitute success on particular measures within a certain period of time. | |