

Recommended District and School Data Analysis and Intervention Planning Process for Schools in Improvement or Corrective Action Status ¹

Howard M. Knoff, Ph.D.
Director, State Personnel Development Grant

August 15, 2010

Overview

Two of the primary goals of the Arkansas Department of Education (ADE) within the context of its Statewide System of Support (SSOS) include the following:

- To help all of Arkansas’s districts and schools meet the diverse academic and social, emotional, and behavioral learning needs of all students, while attaining and maintaining their “Achieving” status within the state’s differentiated SSOS process; and
- To help all students to graduate with the academic and social, emotional, and behavioral skills such that they can succeed in higher education and/or the work setting of their choice, positively contribute to their families and communities, and achieve a meaningful and satisfying life.

To support these goals, all public and charter schools engage in the annual Arkansas Comprehensive School Improvement Planning (ACSIP) process, defined by Ark. Code Ann. § 6-15-419, to coordinate the funding and formal execution of all continuous improvement efforts. When schools do not meet their state and federal (i.e., Elementary and Secondary Education Act—ESEA) goals, the ACSIP plan, for example, identifies the student subgroups that did not attain Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) and the instructional or intervention strategies needed for their success within the next year. When schools do not meet these goals over a specified number of years, they move formally into “Improvement” or “Corrective Action” status and receive consultative services from ADE-designated personnel through Smart Accountability.

¹ This document does not represent an official policy or requirement by or within the Arkansas Department of Education. Its contents entirely reflect the research, professional practice, and professional opinions of the author as Director of the ADE’s State Personnel Development Grant (SDPG). If there are any questions or comments about this document, please feel free to contact Dr. Howie Knoff at howard.knoff@arkansas.gov.

The goal of the Smart Accountability process is to help schools in Improvement and Corrective Action status:

- To use a data-based functional assessment process to determine why some students are not mastering academic material to the degree that they are scoring at the Basic or Below Basic levels on the Arkansas state standards assessments;
- To use the same functional assessment process to determine why other students are mastering academic material such that they are scoring at the Proficient or Above Proficient levels on the Arkansas state standards assessments;
- To complete a Needs Assessment of the school's (and district's) resources and capacity to address the instructional and/or intervention needs identified through the functional assessment; and
- To develop and implement a successful School Improvement process and plan that results in proficient students and an Achieving school.

In order to accomplish this, the school improvement process is guided by (a) a School Leadership/Improvement Team; that is supported by (b) a District Leadership Team or selected representatives from that team; and (c) an ADE Specialty Support Team, chaired by a School Improvement Advisor and consisting of content experts from the ADE and the district's Education Service Cooperative (ESC). The School Improvement Advisor is assigned to every school in Improvement or Corrective Action status by the ADE Smart Accountability Unit Director.

Initially, the School Improvement Advisor and Specialty Support Team's primary role is to train and support the District Leadership Team as it helps a school to complete a functional (root cause) analysis process, and write a sound School Improvement Plan that has a high probability of success. As the School Improvement Plan is written, however, specific areas of needed professional development, on-site consultation, and technical assistance may be identified, and the school or district may want ADE and/or ESC content experts to join the Specialty Support Team to deliver some of these services. As these needs become known, the school or district needs to coordinate with the ADE's Smart Accountability and Professional Development Unit Directors to determine the availability of these services. If needed services are not available through the ADE, the school or district are still responsible for funding, securing, and using outside consultants to deliver these services. Ultimately, all school, district, ESC, ADE, or other external professional development, on-site consultation, and technical assistance supports and services used by a school to guide its School Improvement process should be coordinated through the Specialty Support Team so that an effective and efficient delivery process results.

As a school's School Improvement Plan is implemented, it will be evaluated on a quarterly basis by the Smart Accountability Unit Director and School Improvement Advisor. These evaluations will occur in (a) October—when the Plan must be filed and approved by the ADE; (b) December; (c) March; and (d) June. The June evaluation will be a summative evaluation of the school's full-year improvement implementation and outcomes, and it will lay the foundation for the goals, activities, resources, and outcomes needed by the school relative to its next School Improvement Plan.

A Step-by-Step Smart Accountability Implementation Process

The following step-by-step Smart Accountability protocol will be used with schools in Improvement or Corrective Action by ADE personnel. In carrying out school improvement efforts, it may be necessary and/or beneficial to hold one or more meetings to complete the focus of each outlined step in the process. It may also be necessary to repeat or return to a specific step as progress is evaluated and more specific or expanded needs, of schools and/or stakeholders, are determined.

Step 1: Validation of School's Improvement or Corrective Action Status and Completion of the School/District Information Portfolio

After a school's Improvement or Corrective Action status has been validated by the ADE and accepted by the district, the Smart Accountability Unit Director assigns a School Improvement Advisor to the school and district. At this point, one of the first steps in the formal Smart Accountability process is to assemble a **School/District Information Portfolio** of critical history, information, and data on the school (a) to develop an initial organizational, academic, and behavioral picture of the school and its strengths and weaknesses; (b) to identify the best ADE or ESC content experts to serve on the initial Specialty Support Team; and (c) to prepare for the first consultative interactions with the school (and its district) relative to developing an effective plan to address its academic (AYP) and/or behavioral needs.

In creating the School/District Information Portfolio, the School Improvement Advisor collects the following information/data (as available) ²:

School/District Descriptive Data and Information

1. All Policy, Procedure, and Practice documents from the school (hard copy or from the school's/district's website): Parent/Student Handbook; Discipline, Behavior Management, Code of Conduct procedures; RtI, Early Intervention, 504, Special Education procedures; Attendance, Truancy, Absenteeism procedures
2. ACSIP (school and district) plans from the past three years; as well as the school's Professional Development programs and outcomes for the past three years (if not evident in ACSIP plans)
3. Scholastic Audit Results and Reports
4. An organizational chart or map of the school along with a staff list or roster, and other lists detailing the members of the School Leadership Team, and other school-level committees, departments, grade-level teams, and support staff/personnel
5. ADE/State School Report Card from the past three years, or for the length of time that the school has been in Improvement or Corrective Action status—plus two years

² Most of this information is available from the ADE Beehive, or from either NORMES or Triand.

6. An analysis of the demographic and other descriptive characteristics of the school and district's student body from the past three (or more, if needed) years arranged in charts where the data are organized so that longitudinal changes can be easily seen.

These data should include:

- Enrollment by Grade, Race, Gender, 504/Special Education status
- Home Language/ELL
- Homeless

- Federal Free Lunch (Free/Reduced) status—Raw numbers and Percent Free/Reduced
- Number of Students in Special Education by Disability area
- Gifted and Talented enrollment—by Grade, Race, Gender status
- Average Daily Attendance—by Grade, Race, Gender, 504/Special Education Status

- Disciplinary Infractions/Actions (including In-School and Out-of-School Suspensions and Expulsion) by Grade, Race, Gender, 504/Special Education status—and Type of Infraction
- Corporal Punishment by Grade, Race, Gender, 504/Special Education status
- Students in Alternative Learning Environments—by Grade, Race, Gender, 504/Special Education status, and length of time in Program

- Graduates by Grade, Race, Gender, 504/Special Education status
- Dropouts and Withdrawals including Reasons— by Grade, Race, Gender, 504/Special Education status
- Retention by Grade, Race, Gender, 504/Special Education status

For Middle Schools in Improvement or Corrective Action status, these data should be collected from all of their elementary feeder schools. For High Schools in Improvement or Corrective Action status, these data should be collected from all of their middle feeder schools.

7. Status of District relative to Special Education Status: Disproportionality, Least Restrictive Environment, Special Education Drop-outs/Graduations, AYP

Staff Instructional Data and Information

1. An analysis of the demographic and other important characteristics of the school and district's instructional, consultative, related services, and other staff from the past three (or more, if needed) years arranged in charts where the data are organized so that longitudinal changes can be easily seen.

These data should include:

- Gender, race, highest degree earned, years of educational experience, areas of certification/licensure, special areas of expertise
- Grade levels taught (or consultation/support services provided)
- Number of years served in the school

2. Classroom Walk-through Data

3. Analyses of the student proficiency test results in all academic areas organized by the teacher(s) who taught them in each respective academic area across years, subpopulations, and relative to individual student standard score change when contrasted with the previous year's teachers.

Student-Specific Data and Information

1. Analyses of the AYP status/performance of all the students in the school organized longitudinally by: Academic Area, Proficiency Status, Total Student Population, Grade, Gender, and Sub-Population.

These data need to be organized in cross-sectional, longitudinal tables so that data from the same cohort can be tracked and analyzed over years, as well data for a specific grade level across different student cohorts. The tables need to look separately at literacy and mathematics proficiency scores, highlighting the grades and subpopulations that are not making AYP. The tables need to include all years where the school, grade, or subpopulation has not reached the AYP criterion—plus two years earlier (presumably when the school, grade, or subpopulation did reach the AYP criterion).

For High Schools in Improvement status, similar tables are needed for the same period of time for students in the Middle Schools feeding into the High School.

For Middle Schools in Improvement status, similar tables are needed for the same period of time for Grade 3 to 5 students in the Elementary Schools feeding into the Middle School.

2. Analyses of the proficiency test strand or content area results for all the students in the school organized longitudinally by grade and by cohort (as in #1 above) by: Academic Area, Proficiency Status, Total Student Population, Grade, Gender, and Sub-Population.

The goal of these analyses is to determine what strands or content areas the different student groups score high or low on relative to their overall proficiency statuses.

3. Analyses of the proficiency test results in all academic areas for all individual students in the school scoring at the Basic or Below Basic levels or 0.5 standard deviations or less at the Proficient level, organized longitudinally on year-to-year basis by (a) standard score and proficiency status, (b) growth, and (c) strengths and weaknesses relative to the different proficiency test strands in each academic area.
4. Analyses of the proficiency test results in all academic areas for all individual students in the school scoring at the Basic or Below Basic levels or 0.5 standard deviations or less at the Proficient level in the following areas, as relevant, on a year-to-year basis:
 - Attendance and Tardy data (all years of education)
 - Grades/GPA (all years of education)
 - Number of Schools Attended and Dates of Moves
 - School Retentions
 - State Proficiency; other State/Group Achievement; district or school academic achievement, interim, criterion-referenced or progress monitoring test data (all years of education)
 - General Education, 504, Special Education status (and data of initial designation for the latter two statuses)
 - Discipline Referrals to the Office, Suspensions, Expulsions, Alternative School or Learning Environment placements (number of incidents and/or dates for each)

As the information and data noted above are collected and analyzed, some of the issues or questions that should be considered during this Step 1 analysis include:

- ✓ Based on the District's organizational map, who should be on the District Leadership Team?
- ✓ How many schools are in Improvement status in the District, and at what level of Smart Accountability are they?
- ✓ If there are high schools involved, are the feeder middle schools contributing to the problem, and should they be involved in the functional assessment and school improvement planning process?
- ✓ If there are middle schools involved, are the feeder elementary schools contributing to the problem, and should they be involved in the functional assessment and school improvement planning process?
- ✓ What schools ultimately should be involved in the Smart Accountability process, and who should be on their respective School Leadership Teams?
- ✓ Across the schools in the district being considered, are there "shared" areas of AYP problems (academic area, subpopulations, etc.), and do these areas reflect district-level issues that would involve further district-level analysis and intervention, or do they reflect school- or student-level issues that would involve further school-level analysis and intervention, or both?
- ✓ What additional district- and school-level data and information are needed to facilitate the data-based functional assessment process?

Step 2: Superintendent Contact and Coordination of the Plan for Planning Meeting

After Step 1 has been completed, the Smart Accountability Unit Director and the School Improvement Advisor call the District Superintendent for the school(s) in Improvement or Corrective Action status to (a) explain the Smart Accountability process; (b) briefly discuss the school or schools' Improvement or Corrective Action status, mandates, and responsibilities; and (c) specify the District and School Leadership Team individuals/members that must attend the first scheduled "Plan for Planning" meeting at their ESC. During this conversation (or others that follow but precede the Plan for Planning meeting), the information, data, or analyses that the district or school(s) must send to the School Improvement Advisor or must bring to the meeting is specified.

The following individuals will be required to attend the Plan for Planning meeting:

From the District (constituting the District Leadership Team):

- District Superintendent and Deputy/Associate/Assistant Superintendents (or the equivalent) responsible for school (principal) administration and supervision, curriculum and instruction, student services/special education, assessment and school improvement, etc.
- Coordinators for Special Education, ELL, Federal/Title Programs, Professional Development, and other relevant areas not represented at the superintendent levels above
- Any outside or external Smart Accountability or School Improvement consultant hired by the district

From the School(s) in Improvement or Corrective Action [constituting the School Leadership Team(s)]:

- Principal and other administrators from the involved schools and, as required by the School Improvement Advisor, principals and other administrators from their feeder schools
- The School Leadership Team members from each school to include the Chair or Co-Chairs of each school-level committee (e.g., Curriculum and Instruction, School Discipline/Climate, SPRINT or Early Intervention/Rtl/Student Assistance Team, Professional Development, Family and Community Outreach, etc.)
- Any Smart Accountability outside consultants hired by the school

The following individuals, as suggested by the School Improvement Advisor, the Superintendent, or others in the district and/or involved schools, may attend the Plan for Planning meeting. For example:

- District- and/or school ELL, Title 1, or other specialists
- District- and/or school-level academic coaches or instructional consultants
- District- and/or school special education or related services staff (counselors, school psychologists, etc.)

Among the information, data, or analyses that the district or school(s) may be asked to bring to the meeting are the following:

1. Any information, data, or analyses that could not be found or completed by the School Improvement Advisor during Step 1.
2. What the district has done to support the school's efforts to improve students' academic outcomes and proficiencies, and the school's AYP status.
3. Detailed Staff list, and lists of School Leadership Team, School-level committees, Departments/Grade/Support staff
4. The school's Master Schedule.
5. A list with documentation of any current and/or previously contracted consultants or organizations that are/have helping/helped the school's efforts to improve students' academic outcomes and proficiencies, and the school's AYP status; and their respective recommendations, activities, and /or outcomes.
6. The results of any Needs or Resource Assessments for the district and/or school over the past three to five years.

After the phone call, a follow-up letter or e-mail is sent by the School Improvement Advisor summarizing the call, and additional e-mails or communications continue to assist and ensure that the district and school(s) are prepared for the Plan for Planning meeting.

During the time before the actual Plan for Planning meeting and in preparation for it, the following actions will occur:

- ❖ Using any new information/data sent by the districts or their respective schools, the School Improvement Advisors will re-organize and finalize the Phase I School/District Information Portfolios, and prepare them as powerpoints or handouts for the actual Plan for Planning meeting
- ❖ All of the School Improvement Advisors and the ADE or ESC content experts chosen to serve on one or more initial Specialty Support Teams will meet as a group to discuss the Plan for Planning meeting process, desired outcomes, and best ways to coordinate and facilitate their individual Plan for Planning meetings
- ❖ Each School Improvement Advisor and his/her specific initial Specialty Support Team members will meet together to specifically plan and coordinate their Plan for Planning meeting given the specific districts and schools that will be attending
- ❖ In completing the final meeting preparations, the School Improvement Advisor will make sure that (a) the right district and school leaders are present, on-time, prepared, and ready to participate; (b) the needed information/data are available, analyzed, prepared, and duplicated; (c) all meeting presenters are prepared and ready; (d) all other meeting participants know (in advance) the agenda, meeting goals, and their/others' likely roles and responsibilities; (e) enough time has been allocated for the meeting; and (f) any needed audio-visual, technological (including internet access), material, and other (e.g., food, support personnel, etc.) supports/resources are available prior to the start of the meeting

- ❖ Reminder phone calls/e-mails are sent by the Advisor to the Superintendent, School Principals, and others who be attending the Plan for Planning meeting with all final arrangements and reminders

Step 3: The Plan for Planning Meeting

The Plan for Planning meeting will be held at the Education Service Cooperatives (ESCs) across the state with the districts and schools in Improvement or Corrective Action status attending at their own, respective ESC. Unless it makes strategic sense to involve a district in its own Plan for Planning meeting, this first meeting will involve all of the districts/schools together at one time.

As in the broader Smart Accountability process, the primary goals of the Plan for Planning meeting are to train the district and its schools in a process so that they:

- Use a data-based functional assessment process to determine why some students are not mastering academic material to the degree that they are scoring at the Basic or Below Basic levels on the Arkansas state standards assessments;
- Use the same functional assessment process to determine why other students are mastering academic material such that they are scoring at the Proficient or Above Proficient levels on the Arkansas state standards assessments;
- Complete a Needs Assessment of the school's (and district's) resources and capacity to address the instructional and/or intervention needs identified through the functional assessment; and
- Develop a successful School Improvement process and plan that will be implemented during the school year and result in higher numbers of proficient students and Achieving school status.

To accomplish these goals, the School Improvement Advisor and Specialty Support Team's primary role is to teach and support the District Leadership Team as it helps its school(s) to complete the needs assessment and functional (root cause) analysis processes, and write sound School Improvement Plans that have a high probability of success.

In general, the Agenda for the meeting should be:

- Introductions of ADE and ESC Plan for Planning leaders/facilitators/Introductions of the Districts and Schools present/Introductions of all Participants (if desired)
- Overview of Agenda/Meeting Goals
- Discussion of Smart Accountability Program and Process
- Identification of each District/School's Smart Accountability Status, History, and Areas of Concern
- Training in the Actions/Steps that Schools need to take relative to their own: Plan for Planning, Data Collection/Analysis, and Smart Accountability/ACSIP Improvement Plan Development and Finalization processes

- Training in the ADE’s Effective School and Schooling Model. Briefly, this includes the following components:
 - ❖ Strategic Planning and Organizational Development
 - ❖ Data-driven Leadership
 - ❖ Professional Development and Capacity Building
 - ❖ Core Curricula
 - ❖ Positive Academic Supports and Services
 - ❖ Positive Behavioral Support Systems
 - ❖ Mentoring, Support, Coaching, Consultation, Co-Teaching
 - ❖ Parent and Community Outreach
 - ❖ Academic Instruction, Assessment, and Intervention
 - ❖ Behavioral Instruction, Assessment, and Intervention
 - ❖ Data-based, Functional Assessment Problem-Solving through the School Prevention, Review, and Intervention Team (SPRINT) process
- Training in the Data-based Functional Assessment process and how the Root Cause Analysis, the ADE BeeHive, NORMES, and Triand fit into this process
- Discussion the District’s Role and Responsibilities to support these school-level processes
- Presentation and Discussion, by the School Improvement Advisors and Specialty Support Team, of the District/School Information Portfolio data, analyses, and outcomes
- Analysis of the Existing and Needed effective school and schooling data and information by each School Leadership Team relative to student achievement, curriculum and instruction, assessment and intervention, and professional development and school committee/team support

Part of this discussion should address:

- ✚ The Organizational and Committee (Leadership) Structure of the school
 - ✚ The Impact of Feeder Schools and Student Achievement at earlier grade levels on later Student Achievement and School Improvement status
 - ✚ Currently Planned School Improvement Interventions and their Relationship to Student Achievement and Curriculum and Instruction
 - ✚ Previous School Improvement Interventions, Implementation Integrity, and Results
 - ✚ The Need for Cross-School or District-wide Analyses and (Potential) Intervention
 - ✚ The Need and Use of Existing School and District Resources
- Planning and Preparation, by the District and School Leadership Teams (and others) present, for the school-level Plan for Planning, Data Collection/Analysis, and Smart Accountability/ACSIP Improvement Plan Development and Finalization processes
 - Identification of the current support and consultation needed from the School Improvement Advisors and Specialty Support Team by the District and schools
 - Summary and Close

Two products that should result from the Plan for Planning meeting are: (a) a document explicitly listing the roles and responsibilities of the District Leadership Team (and other district personnel) and the School Leadership Team (and other school personnel) in the Smart Accountability and School Improvement Plan process; and (b) an Action Plan, outlining the school's individual Plan for Planning, Data Collection/Analysis, and Smart Accountability/ACSIP Improvement Plan Development and Finalization processes that will result in a sound and effective school improvement plan by October 1.

Step 4: Supporting the School's Individual Plan for Planning, Data Collection/Analysis, and Smart Accountability/ACSIP Improvement Plan Development and Finalization Processes and Meetings

Up until October 1, the School Improvement Advisors and the Specialty Support Teams should continue to support the District Leadership Teams as they support their School Leadership Team(s) through their school-level Plan for Planning (if still needed), Data Collection/Analysis, and Smart Accountability/ACSIP Improvement Plan Development and Finalization processes and meetings. At the district level, the District Leadership Team may hold a series of formal meetings to guide their schools through these processes. Relative to School Improvement Advisor and Specialty Support Teams, their support may involve e-mails, telephone conference calls, or on-site consultations.

At the school level, Plan for Planning meeting and process will involve the School Leadership Team (and others) as it (a) evaluates the existing data, information, and status of the school, relative to student achievement, curriculum and instruction, assessment and intervention, and professional development and school committee/team support; and (b) plans how, when, and who will collect and analyze incomplete, unanalyzed, or needed missing data and information in the same areas. Relative to the first area, the school should use the ADE's effective school and schooling model to guide its process, as well as the BeeHive, NORMES, and Triand to analyze its data.

In the latter area, the School Leadership Team should look at the information and data described in Step 1 above to identify information or data analysis gaps and needs. It may also need to consider the following additional information or data:

- ✓ Scholastic Audit (other Improvement assessment) Results
- ✓ Classroom Walk-Through Results
- ✓ The Academic/Instructional Texts/Materials used at each grade level for Literacy, Mathematics, and Science—and their quality, difficulty level, and the degree that they cover content areas assessed on the state's state standards test(s)
- ✓ The effectiveness, timing, and outcomes of all school- and grade-level academic assessments
- ✓ The specificity, quality, and outcomes of previous student Academic Improvement Plans (AIPs)
- ✓ The effectiveness, timing, and outcomes of the literacy, math, and/or science instruction and/or interventions (including pull-out, pull-in, co-teaching, and computer-based) used or available for students in who are identified as at-risk, Underachieving, or unsuccessful

At the school (and/or district) level, the Data Collection/Analysis process will likely involve a series of School Leadership Team, school-level committee, and grade- or instructional team meetings where the:

- Data-based functional assessment process to determine why some students are not mastering academic material to the degree that they are scoring at the Basic or Below Basic levels on previous state standards assessments is completed;
- Same functional assessment process to determine why other students are mastering academic material such that they are scoring at the Proficient or Above Proficient levels on state standards assessments is completed; and
- The results of the functional assessment process are translated into specific multi-level (as needed) instructional and/or intervention processes, supports, strategies, and programs that will be written in the school's Smart Accountability/ACSIP Plan.

Finally, at the school and then district levels (both levels are strongly suggested), the Smart Accountability/ACSIP Improvement Plan Development and Finalization process, will likely also involve a series of School Leadership Team meetings, and separate and joint District Leadership Team meetings. Ultimately, at the district level, these meetings should involve both District Leadership Team members and representatives from the involved School Leadership Teams, where the following should occur:

- ✓ School Leadership Team representatives should share and review all relevant student achievement, curriculum and instruction, assessment and intervention, and professional development and school committee/team data, information, data-based analyses, and results as related to the reasons for their students' academic successful and lack of success, respectfully
- ✓ School Leadership Team representatives should share their specific multi-level (as needed) instructional and/or intervention processes, supports, strategies, and programs at the student, staff, school, and district levels; and needed resources, professional development, etc.
- ✓ Recommendation areas that need to be coordinated by the district, across the district, and/or across multiple schools (horizontally or in a vertical feeder pattern) should be identified
- ✓ Based on all of the above, the District and School Leadership Teams will develop and implement a final plan on how to write and finalize their respective district and school ACSIP and Smart Accountability Improvement Plans

Once the each district and school's ACSIP and Smart Accountability Improvement Plan is written, each district will generate a single list of professional development, on-site consultation, and technical assistance that is wanted from the School Improvement Advisor, the existing Specialty Support Team, or an expanded Specialty Support Team (where other ADE and/or ESC content experts are added). This list will be sent to the School Improvement Advisor at the same time that the district's ACSIP plan is filed with the ADE.

Step 5: Approval of the School and District Smart Accountability/ACSIP Plans and Continued or Expanded Involvement of the School Improvement Advisor and Specialty Support Team

As the ADE evaluates and certifies each district and school's ACSIP and Smart Accountability Improvement Plan, the lists of professional development, on-site consultation, and technical assistance wanted, across the state, from the School Improvement Advisors, the existing Specialty Support Teams, or expanded Specialty Support Teams (using ADE and/or ESC content experts) will be evaluated by the ADE's Smart Accountability and Professional Development Unit Directors. These evaluations will be guided by the number, length of time, and availability of the requested services; the availability of district, school, or contracted resources; the potential short- and long-term student achievement impact of the requested services; and the professional development history and use of ADE and ESC resources in the past.

By November 1st, the professional development, on-site consultation, and technical assistance services that can be provided by a district or school's School Improvement Advisor, existing Specialty Support Team, or expanded Specialty Support Team will be identified by the ADE's Smart Accountability and Professional Development Unit Directors, and will be communicated to the district or school by the School Improvement Advisor. By November 15th, an implementation plan will be developed and approved by the existing or new Specialty Support Team and the District and School Leadership Teams involved, and the planned services will begin.

If the desired services are not available through the ADE, the district or school will be notified as soon as possible (but not later than November 1). The district or school will still be responsible for meeting all Smart Accountability/ACSIP plan goals. That is, the district or school will be responsible for funding, securing, and using school, district, or outside consultants to deliver the services that could not be provided through the ADE or ESC.

Ultimately, all school, district, ESC, ADE, or other external professional development, on-site consultation, and technical assistance supports and services used by a school to guide its School Improvement process should be communicated and/or coordinated through the School Improvement Advisor and Specialty Support Team so that an effective and efficient delivery process results.

Step 6: Quarterly Smart Accountability/ACSIP Plan Evaluation Meetings by the School Improvement Advisor and Specialty Support Team

Once a district or school's Smart Accountability/ASCIP Improvement Plan is approved and the implementation process begins (technically, at the beginning of the school year, but certainly by November 1st), it will be evaluated on a quarterly basis by the Smart Accountability Unit Director and School Improvement Advisor. These evaluations will occur in December, March, and June (see Step 7 below).

Unless altered by the Smart Accountability Unit Director, the evaluation of the Smart Accountability/ACSIP Plan will be guided by the goals, activities, timelines, evaluation processes, and short- and long-term outcomes specified in the actual plan. A conference call will occur prior to each evaluation meeting between at least the School Improvement Advisor

and the chairs of both the District Leadership and School Leadership teams (selected others may be asked to participate) to identify the information and data that should be presented and reported at the meeting. If possible, it is strongly recommended that the District and School Leadership teams meet as part of a self-evaluation process prior to the evaluation meeting with the School Improvement Advisor. The ultimate goal of the evaluation meetings is to validate that the Smart Accountability/ACSIP plan is being implemented progressively, with integrity, and with the desired outcomes and impact.

Step 7: Year-End Smart Accountability/ACSIP Plan Evaluation Meetings by the School Improvement Advisor and Specialty Support Team

The June Smart Accountability/ACSIP evaluation meeting will be a summative evaluation of the school's full-year improvement implementation and outcomes. As with the previous meetings, the goal of the meeting is to complete a final evaluation regarding the full implementation of the district and/or school's Smart Accountability/ACSIP activities. This meeting also will lay the foundation for the goals, activities, resources, and outcomes needed by the school relative to its next School Improvement Plan.