

District Plan Review Tool

Minimum Requirements for District Plans

1. Planning Team

The district planning team represents all required stakeholders, including teachers, principals, administrators (including administrators of Title I programs), other appropriate school personnel, charter school leaders (in districts that have charter schools), and parents of students. Districts with English learner populations should also ensure that the team includes one member who can address English Learner needs. The plan includes each participants' title and describes how all required stakeholders were engaged in plan development and its continuous review and update.

2. Priority Needs

Identify and prioritize 3-5 areas for improvement based on a thorough data review. For the identified areas of improvement, the plan should provide:

- a description of prior strategies that may or may not have contributed to your outcomes
- identification of root causes of the identified areas of improvement

3. Additional Areas

The plan should answer all required questions, including those related to:

- well-rounded education
- safe, supportive, and healthy environments
- integration and effective use of technology in the classroom

Table 1 Plan Component: Reviewing Data to Identify Areas of Priority

Does Not Meet Expectations for Submission	Meets Expectations for Submission	Characteristics of a Well-Developed Plan
<p>The district has reviewed the data and identified areas of improvement, but identified too few, too many or too narrowly to meet expectations for 3-year planning or has not properly reviewed required areas of data.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The district has provided <i>minimal to no reflection</i> on progress and challenges that may or may not have contributed to the outcomes for the identified areas of improvement.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The district's description of prior strategies that may or may not have contributed to the outcomes includes <i>minimal to no reflection</i> on prior year strategies that may or may not have contributed (positively or negatively) to district outcomes.</p> <p>The district has provided a description that identifies <i>minimal to no root causes</i> to explain the reasons for the challenges faced, or the root causes identified are <i>outside of the district's control</i>, or the root causes identified contain <i>no variation</i> in the data.</p>	<p>The district has reviewed the data that includes but is not limited to student achievement and growth, graduation rates, college career readiness and/or ACT/ SAT scores, and student attendance, identified needs, and prioritized areas of improvement for focus for the next 3 years (<i>ideally 3-5</i>).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district has reflected on progress and challenges that may or may not have contributed to the outcomes for the identified areas of improvement.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district has provided a description of prior strategies that may or may not have contributed to the outcomes, included <i>some reflection</i> on prior year strategies that may or may not have contributed (positively or negatively) to district outcomes.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district has provided a description that identifies <i>some root causes</i> to explain the reasons for the challenges faced that are <i>within the district's control to act on and vary appropriately based on the district's data</i>.</p>	<p>The district engaged in a meaningful review of multiple sources of data, including those that are required and local data, to identify areas of improvement.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district <i>ensures the areas of improvement include specific attention to the greatest challenges (i.e. grade bands, subgroups, etc.)</i>. The district has reviewed the data and identified a reasonable number of areas of improvement (<i>ideally 3-5</i>).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district has <i>thoroughly reflected</i> on progress and challenges that may or may not have contributed to the outcomes for the identified areas of improvement.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district has provided a description of prior strategies that may or may not have contributed to the outcomes which include <i>in depth and thorough reflection</i> on prior year strategies that may or may not have contributed (positively or negatively) to district outcomes.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district has provided an in -depth description that identifies <i>ample and sufficient root causes</i> to explain the reasons for challenges faced that are <i>within the district's control to act on and vary adequately and appropriately based on the district's data</i>.</p>

Table 2 Plan Component: Developing Goals

Does Not Meet Expectations for Submission	Meets Expectations for Submission	Characteristics of a Well-Developed Plan
<p>Little evidence the district has identified goals based on areas of improvement, or identified goals are not 3-year, or too many goals (<i>typically more than 5</i>).</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The goals are not <i>SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound)</i> and do not include components that address what is to be improved, for whom, the amount of expected improvement, and by when.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The district provides <i>minimal or weak goal statements</i>.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The goal statements are not accompanied by ambitious but attainable annual targets that lead to the three-year goal.</p>	<p>Based on the areas of improvement, the district has identified <i>a reasonable number of 3-year goals (ideally 3-5)</i>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The goals <i>adequately align</i> to the identified areas of improvement.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The goals are <i>SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound)</i> and include components that address what is to be improved, for whom, the amount of expected improvement, and by when.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district provides <i>adequate and mostly high-quality goal statements</i>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The goal statements are accompanied by ambitious but attainable annual targets leading to the three-year goal.</p>	<p>Based on the areas of improvement, the district has identified <i>a reasonable number of high impact 3-year goals (ideally 3-5)</i>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The goals <i>directly align</i> to the areas of improvement.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The goals are <i>SMART (specific, measurable, attainable, relevant, and time-bound)</i> and include components that address what is to be improved, for whom, the amount of expected improvement, and by when.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The district provides <i>detailed</i> goal statements which are accompanied by ambitious but attainable annual targets leading to the three-year goal.</p>

Table 3 Plan Component: Developing Strategies

Does Not Meet Expectations for Submission	Meets Expectations for Submission	Characteristics of a Well-Developed Plan
<p>Strategies have been identified but show <i>minimal to no logical connection to the identified goal(s)</i>.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Strategy descriptions are <i>vague or lack details</i> and don't set districtwide expectations for implementation.</p>	<p>All strategies show a <i>logical connection to the identified goal(s)</i> building to the district theory of action.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Strategy descriptions <i>clearly and concisely</i> define what the strategy is and establish areas of consistent, districtwide expectations for implementation.</p>	<p>All strategies show an <i>extremely logical connection to the identified goal(s)</i> building to a strong district theory of action.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Descriptions of the strategies <i>are explicit in providing details</i>, defining what the strategy is and establishing areas of consistent districtwide expectations for implementation.</p>

Table 4 Plan Component: Developing Benchmark Indicators

Needs Improvement	Meets Expectations for Submission	Characteristics of a Well-Developed Plan
<p>The benchmark indicators identified are generally <i>not leading (predictive) indicators</i> of the goal and/or are generally <i>input measures</i> such as sign-in sheets.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The benchmark indicators identified are generally <i>insufficient for showing progress</i> of the associated strategy's implementation and improvement toward meeting the goal using data and evidence.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The benchmark indicators identified are collected <i>too infrequently</i> to serve as leading measures (e.g., annual measures).</p>	<p><i>Well-developed benchmark indicators exist</i> for most strategies. AND</p> <p>The benchmark indicators identified are generally <i>leading (predictive) indicators</i> of the goal and/or include <i>some output measures</i> such as observed change in practice.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The benchmark indicators identified are generally <i>sufficient for showing progress</i> of the associated strategy's implementation and improvement toward meeting the goal using data and evidence.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The benchmark indicators identified are collected <i>frequently enough</i> to serve as leading measures (e.g., more than once a year).</p>	<p><i>Well-developed benchmark indicator(s) exist</i> for each strategy.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The benchmark indicators identified are all clear <i>leading (predictive) indicators</i> of the goal and are mostly output and/or outcome measures.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The benchmark indicators identified are <i>directly aligned to show progress</i> of the associated strategy's implementation and improvement toward meeting the goal using data and evidence.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>The benchmark indicators identified are collected <i>regularly</i> to serve as leading measures (e.g., multiple times a year). AND</p> <p>The district clearly articulates <i>how</i> the benchmark indicators will be utilized and by whom to inform continuous improvement throughout the school year.</p>