

Year 3 – Corrective Action

The following requirements and recommendations apply to:

- Schools newly entering Year 3 based on 2006 AYP determinations using 2005-2006 assessment data; and
- Schools identified for Year 3 at the beginning of 2004-2005 that made AYP in 2005-2006 must continue to implement the Year 3 Corrective Action Plan in 2006-2007.

LEA Responsibilities

Continue to ensure that technical assistance is provided by the LEA or other entity with experience in helping schools improve academic achievement as the school develops and implements its SPSA.

- Provide timely and varied school and student data to site(s).
- Inform school site(s) of Program Improvement requirements and NCLB updates.
- Provide public notification regarding schools identified for improvement including:
 - What the school is doing to address the problem of low achievement; and
 - What the LEA or the SEA is doing to help the school address this problem.
- Disseminate the notification through broader means of communication, such as the Internet, the media, and through public agencies serving students and their families.
- Analyze assessment data to address what problems contributed to why the school progressed to the next year in program improvement in:
 - Instruction,
 - Parent Involvement, and
 - Professional Development.
- Identify and implement professional development, school improvement strategies, and methods of instruction that are research-based and address the reasons the school progressed to year three of Program Improvement.
- Assist with analysis and revision of the school budget so resources are allocated to activities most likely to increase student achievement.

Select and implement at least one of the following corrective actions for each PI Year 3 school:

- Replace the school staff relevant to the failure to make adequate yearly progress.
- Institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including providing appropriate professional development for all relevant staff, that is based on scientifically based research and offers substantial promise of improving educational achievement for low-achieving students and enabling the school to make adequate yearly progress.
- Significantly decrease management authority at the school level.

- Appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress.
- Extend the school year or school day for the school.
- Restructure the internal organizational structure of the school.

Provide technical assistance in revising the SPSA based upon selected corrective action(s).

- Once the appropriate corrective action(s) has been chosen, and LEA support has been aligned to meet the school's needs, it is recommended the DSLT assist in a revision of the existing SPSA to include the identified corrective action(s).

The SEA recommends the following protocol to select appropriate corrective action(s) and revise the SPSA:

Create a DSLT (if not previously done). In California, many of the roles outlined in NCLB regarding School Support Teams are accomplished by the DSLT.

- A DSLT should be composed of a wide variety of individuals with expertise in school reform strategies who are representative of the school community. Typical composition of a DSLT may include the supervisor of the principal, curriculum and instruction administrator, district grade span administrator, classroom teachers, the chair of the school's advisory council, parents, and other informed individuals.
- The DSLT will assist the LEA in making an informed decision regarding the appropriate corrective action(s) to be taken by leading the LEA and school through a strategic inquiry process.

With the DSLT, utilize DAS and other assessment tools in analyzing LEA support to the school.

- Through an analysis using the DAS tool as well as additional tools such as the APS, LRE, and ELSSA, the LEA will be able to gauge how effectively it is supporting its schools' improvement efforts.

With the DSLT, complete the Year 3 Corrective Action Protocol.

- The following protocol is designed to engage LEA and school staff in an honest, strategic analysis of the school's history of school improvement efforts to uncover those areas most probably responsible for the school's failure to meet AYP goals for the past four years. The LEA may then make an informed decision as to which corrective action(s) will best enable the LEA and school to successfully address the identified areas of need. The Year 3 Corrective Action Protocol worksheets are at the end of this tab.

Once the school plan [including corrective action(s)] is complete and the LEA has approved it, ensure the LEA plan is in alignment with school needs.

- When the LEA has thoughtfully chosen the appropriate corrective action(s) to be implemented at the PI school, the DSLT will identify areas where the LEA should increase or modify its support to the school to ensure successful implementation of the corrective action(s).

Amend LEA plan and LEA budget to reflect changes in LEA support to its schools.

- Given that the school will require specialized, targeted support to successfully implement its revised SPSA, it is recommended the LEA use the results of the DAS and Year 3 Corrective Action Protocol to make revisions to its LEA plan and LEA budget to ensure sustained support for schools.

Monitor and ensure implementation of revised SPSA, including corrective action(s).

- The LEA should regularly (at least quarterly) monitor implementation of the revised SPSA.
 - It is recommended that the LEA prepare mid- and end-of-year progress reports and discuss the results with its DSLT membership. These reports should include an analysis of progress in implementing the revised SPSA, and the ongoing needs of the school.

Continue to Notify Parents about Public School Choice with Paid Transportation.

- Provide notification to the parents that the school is identified for year three of program improvement.
- Provide the parent notification letter directly to the parent(s) of each student before the beginning of the traditional school year.
- Write the letter in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, in a language or languages that the parent(s) can understand.
- The letter must:
 - Explain school PI status;
 - Describe what the school is doing to address the problem of low academic achievement;
 - Describe what the state, county, and the LEA are doing to help the school address the achievement problems;
 - Offer options to all enrolled students to transfer to non-PI school with paid transportation and, if possible, parents should be provided a choice of more than one school to transfer their student;
 - Include a list of available non-PI schools and descriptions of their academic achievement. Include at least two academic indicators, such as percent of students proficient in English language arts and mathematics, and the school's Academic Performance Index (API) score. Put these indicators in the context of the state targets; and
 - Explain that priority goes to lowest achieving students from low-income families, if request exceeds 20 percent set aside.

- Explain that transfer students may remain in the non-PI school until completing the highest grade; transportation will be paid until school of residence exits PI.
- Include the deadline and procedures for parents to respond.
- Explain that the LEA takes into consideration parent preference as it makes final decision about which non-PI school a student will transfer to.
- Indicate that the Single Plan for Student Achievement (SPSA) revision is required incorporating the NCLB requirements under Title I, Part A, Section 1116(b)(3)(A).
- Suggest how parents can assist their school to improve.
- Indicate that transportation will be provided subject to certain cost limitations.
- Provide other information to help parents decide which school(s) would be best for their student(s).

Continue Implementation of Public School Choice with Paid Transportation.

- If all schools served by the LEA to which a student may transfer are identified in PI, the LEA shall attempt to establish a cooperative transfer agreement with other LEAs in the area. Documentation (e.g., letters and/or meeting minutes) must be maintained to verify such efforts.

Notification and implementation of supplemental educational services (SES).

- Provide notification to the parents that the school is identified for year three of Program Improvement.
- Provide the parent notification letter directly to the parent(s) of each student as soon as possible after the first day of school.
- Write the letter in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, in a language or languages that the parent(s) can understand.
- Notice must:
 - Identify each approved SES provider who is willing to work with the LEA.
 - A brief description of the services, qualifications, and evidence of effectiveness of each provider.
 - A description of the procedures and timelines that parents must follow in selecting a provider (three to four weeks).
 - If the LEA anticipates it will not have sufficient funds to serve all eligible students, inform parents that the LEA will prioritize requests to serve low-achieving students from low-income families first.
 - If requested, help parents select a SES provider.
 - LEA enters into an agreement with SES providers which must contain:
 - Specific achievement goals for the student and the timeframe for completion developed in consultation with the student's parents and the provider;
 - Description of how the student's progress will be measured;
 - Description of how the student's parents and teachers will be regularly informed of the student's progress;
 - Provision for termination of the agreements;

- Method of payment for the services;
- Provision to protect the identity of any student eligible for, or receiving SES; and
- Assurance that SES will be provided consistent with applicable health, safety, and civil rights laws.
- Provisions of the agreement must be consistent with an individualized education program under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) or Section 504.

Continue to Set Aside Funds.

- Set aside an amount equal to 20 percent of the LEA's Title I, Part A for costs associated with the transfer option and SES.
- Set aside funds may come from Title I or other sources.
- These funds are to be used as follows:
 - 5 percent for Choice Paid Transportation;
 - 5 percent for SES; and
 - 10 percent for either or both.
- Upon meeting **all** requests for choice transportation and SES, the LEA may then reallocate any remaining set aside funds.

School Responsibilities

- Should continue to allocate 10 percent of the school's Title I funds to provide high-quality professional development to address the reasons the school is identified for improvement.
- School staff should take advantage of professional development opportunities offered by the LEA, which are targeted at assisting school staff in the successful implementation of the revised SPSA.
- Participate with the DSLT and LEA in completing the Year 3 Corrective Action Protocol.
- Revise and monitor the SPSA using results from the APS, DAS, LRE, ELSSA and current data based on the outcomes from the previous year incorporating the corrective action option.
- Continue to collaborate with LEA to improve student achievement.

COE Responsibilities

When requested, participate on DSLTs and provide technical assistance throughout the county or region.

- Technical assistance may include, but is not limited to:
 - Providing external experts to assist LEAs and schools in implementing NCLB requirements
 - Providing training and professional development in school reform initiatives and strategies

CDE Responsibilities

- Post student achievement data and PI designations on the CDE Web site.
- Disseminate information and provide training on state-developed tools and the PI process.
- Through the Statewide System of School Support (S4), train COEs, DSLTs, and other regional partners in the use of this protocol for assisting LEAs in making informed decisions regarding appropriate corrective action(s) and aligning LEA plans and LEA budgets with school plans to ensure seamless support for increased student achievement.
- Implement California State Title 5 Regulations that pertain to SES.
- Review applications and recommend eligible applicants for approval to the State Board of Education.
- Maintain approved SES providers' database and post approved SES provider list on CDE Web site.
- Monitor and evaluate approved SES providers.

YEAR 3 CORRECTIVE ACTION PROTOCOL

Corrective Action Options

Selecting one or more corrective action options should engage the LEA and school staff in an honest, strategic analysis of the school's history of school improvement efforts to uncover those areas most responsible for the school's failure to meet AYP goals. Careful consideration of the options should help guide strategic decisions as to which corrective action(s) will best enable the LEA and the school to successfully address the identified needs.

The CDE does not endorse or recommend any particular corrective action option(s). It is recognized that a particular LEA's options may be affected by existing contractual provisions or other factors.

1. Replace the school staff who are relevant to the failure to make AYP.

Although replacing school staff is a popular choice for corrective action, this option requires careful consideration and consultation with the Human Resources department regarding contractual issues and consultation with the local bargaining organization. NCLB specifically provides that corrective action shall not "alter or otherwise affect the rights, remedies, and procedures afforded school or school district employees under Federal, State, or local laws (including applicable regulations or court orders) or under the terms of collective bargaining agreements, memoranda of understanding, or other agreements between such employees and their employers" (Section 1116(d)).

The mere fact that staff have been working in a school identified for corrective action is not in and of itself sufficient cause for replacing those staff. A mechanism to determine that school staff are indeed the problem should be employed. This could include classroom observations, review of student achievement by grade or by teacher, etc. Site leadership should be assessed to determine if there has been a history of student academic deficiency that has been continually unaddressed. Data should be consulted to determine if students are failing to achieve throughout the school, in a particular grade level or subject, or under the instruction of an individual teacher. Issues of adequate support and professional development should be considered to ensure that all staff have had ample opportunity to obtain needed skills. Consider how long the principal has been at the school and the number of new teachers on site: have some staff recently been replaced without having a positive impact on student achievement? If this option is exercised, the LEA should be able to justify which staff were replaced, the means used to identify such staff, and the rationale used in selecting replacements.

2. Institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including providing appropriate professional development for all relevant staff.

This tends to be the most frequently utilized corrective action, and many LEAs pursue this option even for schools in PI Years 1 and 2. Often LEAs select this option because they are already in the process of implementing new curricula for all their schools. In the context of California's efforts to support standards-based

curriculum reform, this option makes the most sense for schools that do not already have the most recent State Board of Education (SBE)-adopted/aligned instructional materials in place or have not provided their staffs with the necessary professional development to fully and effectively implement these materials in their classrooms. This option should not be selected to move away from SBE-adopted/aligned curriculum resources to other curriculum resources. If this option is selected, the new curriculum, particularly in mathematics and reading/English language arts, should differ substantially from the old in content and/or delivery and be more likely to result in success by all students within the school. The LEA should be able to verify that the new curriculum incorporates scientifically based practices better matched to identified student needs.

3. Significantly decrease management authority at the school level.

This option assumes that the present level of management authority has not been effective. This option reduces the school-level leader's (usually the principal's) authority to act in an autonomous manner. In considering this option, it may be useful to review management structure at other more successful sites to determine, for example, if the number of administrators is consistent and if authority is exercised in a similar manner. Participation in professional development should be reviewed. The content of the professional development material should also be reviewed to ensure that it assists in the development of collaborative styles of site governance and leadership. In trying to determine whether or not the current management structure is effective, surveys of parents and teachers could be used to determine the level of engagement of the school community. Ways in which this option could be utilized include appointing members of the DSLT or other concerned individuals to assist in governing of the school, such as LEA or COE staff, or teacher union representation. Before selecting this option carefully consider what structures or procedures are in place to foster collaboration between the LEA and the school. Does the LEA have the capacity to assume more management responsibilities for this school?

4. Appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress toward making AYP, based on its revised school plan.

For this option, the advice and expertise of an outside expert with a demonstrated track record of improving student achievement at the school and/or system level is secured and utilized. The expert should be able to work effectively with people and be knowledgeable about program evaluation, data analysis, utilizing data to improve instruction, monitoring innovations, building professional learning communities and leading change. Before choosing an external expert, determine if the expert has worked in similar schools, what the level of satisfaction of recent clients was, and what the expert's record of success was with these schools. Carefully review not only the depth and breadth of expertise offered, but also achievement data from schools with whom the expert has worked. Once selected, the external expert may conduct a comprehensive analysis of school operations and LEA support and identify deficient areas critical to student success. From this, the LEA, school, and external expert may revise the school plan, and possibly LEA support strategies, to

address the needs. The external expert should also assist the LEA and school in the implementation of the revised plan, utilizing all available regional and statewide resources. Examples of such experts include COEs (including Regional System of District and School Support [RSDSS] offices), private organizations, and School Assistance and Intervention Team (SAIT) providers. Selection of an external expert may be accomplished through a variety of public processes, for example, through a public request-for-applications process in which experts are encouraged to submit their plan for managing the school to the LEA for consideration. Regardless of the process, the selection of an external expert should be open to many interested applicants as possible and should allow for input from as many interested stakeholders as possible.

5. Extend the school year or school day for the school.

This option is used to extend educational services and opportunities beyond the regular school year and/or school day. Such services should be designed and targeted to meet specific educational goals and should be of no cost to parents. Before choosing this option, review the actual time spent on instruction during the school year and the school day. Take into account minimum days and time spent on non-instructional activities, including professional development days, Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) testing days, and school assemblies. Review the pacing guides for each subject to determine if the appropriate time is being spent on each subject area. Review the school's master schedule to ensure maximum time is allowed for student learning. Using appropriate data, determine if all students or certain groups of students need additional time for learning. Consider the bus schedule and whether changing the length of the school day or year will negatively impact parents and their students. Determine whether existing before and after school programs are being utilized to extend and support the academic school day. Determine whether significantly increasing the school year and/or school day will require a modification or waiver of the current collective bargaining agreement. Although NCLB sets no minimum for the additional minutes or days for this option to be a valid form of corrective action, an addition to the current school master schedule of ten regular teaching days or the equivalent in teaching minutes is suggested.

6. Restructure the internal organizational structure of the school.

This option moves beyond curriculum to determine how the school actually functions to best meet student needs. Close examination of the school's internal organization can reveal ways to alter various decision-making strategies and operational procedures in order to significantly improve the instructional program. Examples of internal restructuring include but are not limited to adopting some form of block scheduling, formalized team teaching, alternative time scheduling, or dividing the school into smaller learning communities. This is an opportunity to develop a decision-making platform or structure that would provide for expanded leadership opportunities, collaborative decision making, and a stronger focus on instructional strategies to increase student achievement. Review how decisions are made at the school and who is authorized to make decisions. It may be necessary to adopt a

new internal administrative structure where responsibilities are shared among qualified staff. The use of a confidential survey of staff may be helpful in assessing ways to better organize the school to remove barriers to effective instruction.

Selecting the Most Appropriate Corrective Action(s): A Process of Inquiry

The following worksheets were designed to assist LEAs as they work with their schools in Year 3 of PI to determine which corrective action option(s) are most appropriate for their situation. These tools are not intended to guide LEAs and schools toward or away from a particular corrective action option, but rather as a process of inquiry, which if completed diligently and collaboratively, will better inform the critical decision of selecting the option(s) best matched to identified needs.

These worksheets represent the first critical step in the local corrective action process. Each sheet contains a set of guiding questions designed to assist in determining if the corrective action option is relevant to the school's current situation. The questions are open-ended to generate an honest, thoughtful discussion around many factors critical to student and school success from curriculum and instruction to governance and LEA support for school reform. A clearer picture of the true needs of the school should result from these discussions. An informed decision regarding appropriate corrective actions may be made.

Though NCLB mandates that the ultimate decision regarding the selection of corrective action options lies with the LEA, the decision must be made collaboratively with individuals who have a stake in the success of the school: LEA representatives, teachers, parents, local community members, students (when appropriate), and any other groups with a vested interest. It is recommended that a set of "outside eyes" be used to help facilitate this process. Use of these tools will undoubtedly require those involved to address and discuss difficult topics and a "dispassionate" third party can ameliorate situations that might threaten to derail the process. This "outside look" may come from COE staff, including RSDSS representatives, or another entity.

In engaging in the process, it might become apparent that more than one option should be selected to fully support student and school achievement. If this is the case, embrace it as an opportunity to initiate true schoolwide reform. Many options are interrelated. For example, the institution of a new curriculum may require that the school day or year is extended, or that fundamental decisions regarding teaching assignments and governance structures must be made. If the process leads to this conclusion, then engage staff and the school community to make it happen. In short, go where the data take you.

The mere selection of an appropriate corrective action option, however, will not ensure student and school success. In fact, the selection process may be the simplest step. Once agreed upon, the local educational agency, school, and community, with support from available regional or local resources, must once again collaborate to put the option(s) in action. Results from these tools may serve as a critical starting point in this process and should be considered as the school plan is created. Additionally, resources in this binder may prove very helpful as you plan to implement your corrective actions.

**Worksheet for Considering
Corrective Action Option 1
PI Year 3 Schools**

Option 1: Replace the school staff who are relevant to the failure to make AYP.

Instructions: Respond to the following questions regarding your school's staff, students, and current PI situation. For each question, review the necessary data and make a determination of how adequately it describes your school's situation. Data or sources you may wish to consider as you complete this worksheet include, but are not limited to, the following: results of the APS or a similar comprehensive needs assessment tool; classroom observations; discussions with teachers and students; an analysis of the master schedule; professional development schedule; student achievement data (Academic Performance Index (API), AYP, curriculum-embedded assessments, etc.); and staff, community, and parent input from various sources.

Work with the other members of your planning team to respond to each of the following questions. Discuss your responses and come to consensus over whether or not the option would be a relevant choice for your school.

How many school staff members have been replaced in the last 12 months? What noticeable change in student outcomes is evident?
--

How long has the principal been at the school? Considering the last two or three school years, how many new teachers have joined the school?
--

To what extent do data suggest that a deficiency in site leadership (principal and/or school site council) has contributed to a history of low student achievement?

What data show that students are failing across the curricula and/or across grade levels?

What data show that students are failing within a specific curriculum area and/or within a specific grade level?

Based on a variety of data, collected consistently with the local bargaining unit's evaluation agreements, can it be stated that an individual teacher or specific group of teachers has a preponderance of students failing to make their Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs)?

Does this school have a high proportion of teachers or instructional aides that are not highly qualified under NCLB requirements?

To what extent has adequate support and professional development been provided to the teachers identified as relevant to the failure of students to make AYP?

What evidence supports the conclusion that actions or lack thereof on the part of site leadership are relevant to the failure of students to make AYP?

How has the LEA provided adequate support for site leaders to enable them to improve student achievement at the school?

Other issue(s) to consider:

Concluding Question: What evidence supports the conclusion that this option **IS / IS NOT** a relevant option for this school?

**Worksheet for Considering
Corrective Action Option 2
PI Year 3 Schools**

Option 2: Institute and fully implement a new curriculum, including providing appropriate professional development for all relevant staff.

Instructions: Respond to the following questions regarding your school's curriculum. For each question, review the necessary data and make a determination of how adequately it describes your school's situation. Data or sources you may wish to consider as you complete this worksheet include, but are not limited to, the following: results of the APS or a similar comprehensive needs assessment tool; classroom observations; discussions with teachers and students; an analysis of the master schedule; professional development schedule; student achievement data (API, AYP, curriculum-embedded assessments, etc.); and staff, community, and parent input from various sources.

Work with the other members of your planning team to respond to each of the following questions. Discuss your responses and come to consensus on whether or not the option would be a relevant choice for your school.

1. Adopted SBE curriculum
When did the LEA/school adopt current SBE-adopted (K-8) or aligned instructional materials? If not, why not?
2. Effectively implemented SBE-adopted or aligned curricula
Do all students at all grade levels have and use the most recent SBE-adopted/aligned instructional materials? What are they? When were these materials adopted?
Do all classrooms have the appropriate time allocations for students in the adopted/aligned instructional program? When is extended time provided for those in need of more instruction and practice? How is instructional time made a priority and protected from interruptions?

To what extent are curriculum-embedded assessments administered regularly at the school? How are the data from these assessments used to determine student progress and modify instruction?

What are the intervention strategies and programs in place that foster effective teaching and learning for those students most in need? Are the intervention strategies research based and proven to be effective?

To what extent is a pacing schedule in use in all grade levels offered at the school? If it is not, why not?

To what extent does the school/LEA use its general and categorical funds to support the school's instructional program goals?

To what extent has the school effectively implemented SBE-adopted or aligned instructional materials especially in reading/language arts and mathematics?

Other issue(s) to consider:

3. Appropriate professional development in the SBE-adopted, standards-based instructional materials for all relevant staff

When did all teachers complete AB 466 training in language arts and mathematics? What appropriate ongoing follow-up has occurred since that time?

To what extent is appropriate, ongoing professional development provided in all core content areas? How often? By whom?

To what extent does the school district provide appropriate ongoing instructional assistance (e.g., content experts, instructional coaches, specialists, or other teacher support personnel) to support teachers in delivering instruction? How often? What format (e.g., in-classroom coaching, small group discussions, grade-level professional development)?

To what extent does the school/LEA provide opportunities on a regular and frequent basis for teachers to collaborate by grade or program level around issues of curriculum-embedded assessments, data review and instructional planning in the adopted/aligned materials?

Other issue(s) to consider:

4. Current curriculum meets the needs of all students at the school

What appropriate instructional strategies are in place for all student groups, particularly those that are low achieving? Are the instructional strategies research based and proven to be effective?

How effectively are students assessed and assigned to appropriate interventions targeted to their identified needs to, ultimately, fully access the core curriculum?

How is professional development aligned to intervention support?

How is student progress monitored? Does monitoring occur at least once a month for all students including significant subgroups? How is instruction modified based on these results? How often?

To what extent do all students receive the additional time allocation needed for interventions?

To what extent have appropriate adjustments been made to the school schedule to allow for thorough delivery of curriculum?

To what extent does the current curriculum meet the needs of all students at the school (special education, English language learners, Socioeconomically disadvantaged, etc)?

Other issue(s) to consider:

Concluding Question: What evidence supports the conclusion that this option **IS / IS NOT** a relevant option for this school?

**Worksheet for Considering
Corrective Action Option 3
PI Year 3 Schools**

Option 3: Significantly decrease management authority at the school level.

Instructions: Respond to the following questions regarding your school's level of management authority. For each question, review the necessary data and make a determination of how adequately they describe your school's situation. Data or sources you may wish to consider as you complete this worksheet include, but are not limited to, the following: results of the APS or a similar comprehensive needs assessment tool; classroom observations; discussions with teachers and students; an analysis of the master schedule; professional development schedule; student achievement data (API, AYP, curriculum-embedded assessments, etc.); and staff, community, and parent input from various sources.

Work with the other members of your planning team to respond to each of the following questions. Discuss your responses and come to consensus over whether or not the option would be a relevant choice for your school.

Is the number of administrators at this school consistent with the number of administrators in similar schools in the LEA that are doing well? How do you know? If not, why not?
--

To what extent do school staff members have the opportunity to seek and participate in professional development?
--

To what extent has professional development been provided to administrators to assist in the development of collaborative styles of site governance/leadership?

Have all school administrators attended AB 75 training? If not, why not?

What mechanisms are in place to foster collaboration between the LEA and the school?

How much need is there for greater LEA leadership at this school site to ensure implementation of needed changes to improve student achievement?

To what extent have school administrators provided effective leadership in the selection, hiring, and training of school staff?

If this option is selected, what capacity does the LEA have to assume more management responsibilities for this school?

Other issue(s) to consider:

Concluding Question: What evidence supports the conclusion that this option **IS / IS NOT** a relevant option for this school?

**Worksheet for Considering
Corrective Action Option 4
PI Year 3 Schools**

Option 4: Appoint an outside expert to advise the school on its progress toward making AYP, based on its revised school plan.

Instructions: Respond to the first two of the following questions regarding the selection of an external expert you might consider working with. If this is an option for the school, continue with the remaining questions. For each question, review the necessary data and make a determination of how adequately it describes the expert you are considering. Data or sources you may wish to consider as you complete this worksheet include, but are not limited to, the following: conversations with other LEAs or schools that have worked with the entity in question; achievement data for schools that have worked with the entity; and other information related to the efficacy of the entity.

Work with the other members of your planning team to respond to each of the following questions. Discuss your responses and come to consensus over whether or not the option would be a relevant choice for your school.

What evidence is there to support the conclusion that an outside expert is needed to advise the school?

What other major reform efforts been attempted by the school? What were the results?
--

Does the expert(s) under consideration have a knowledge and understanding of the issues facing a school like yours? How do you know?
--

Have other schools or LEAs worked with this expert? How do you know? What evidence shows that the expert has provided high-quality technical assistance and support that resulted in significant gains in student achievement?

What expertise does this expert have, or can secure through other persons with expertise, to provide ongoing instructional support, utilize data to improve instruction, evaluate programs, build professional learning communities, and lead change?

Other issue(s) to consider:

Concluding Question: What evidence supports the conclusion that this option **IS / IS NOT** a relevant option for this school?

**Worksheet for Considering
Corrective Action Option 5
PI Year 3 Schools**

Option 5: Extend the school year or school day for the school.

Instructions: Respond to the following questions regarding your school's master schedule and instructional time. For each question, review the necessary data and make a determination of how adequately it describes your school's situation. Data or sources you may wish to consider as you complete this worksheet include, but are not limited to, the following: results of the APS or a similar comprehensive needs assessment tool; classroom observations; discussions with teachers and students; an analysis of the master schedule; professional development schedule; student achievement data (API, AYP, curriculum-embedded assessments, etc.); and staff, community, and parent input from various sources.

Work with the other members of your planning team to respond to each of the following questions. Discuss your responses and come to consensus over whether or not the option would be a relevant choice for your school.

What system is in place to determine the actual amount of classroom time spent on instruction?
--

To what extent do current pacing guides enable all teachers to thoroughly deliver the curriculum?

How does a review of the master schedule help you to determine that instructional time is adequate for all students to succeed in the curriculum?

How many more days in the school year and/or minutes in the school day would be required to provide sufficient educational opportunity to significantly improve student achievement?
--

How many days are used for assemblies? Minimum days?
How are collective bargaining groups involved in reviewing teacher contracts and provisions for extending time? What consideration is given to contractual issues related to teachers' workday and/or work year?
How may bus schedules have to be revised to avoid negatively affecting students and their parents if the school day were extended?
Are before and after school programs in place and used to extend the school day? What are they? How often do they take place?
Other issue(s) to consider:

Concluding Question: What evidence supports the conclusion that this option **IS / IS NOT** a relevant option for this school?

**Worksheet for Considering
Corrective Action Option 6
PI Year 3 Schools**

Option 6: Restructure the internal organizational structure of the school.

Instructions: Respond to the following questions regarding your school's internal organizational structure. For each question, review the necessary data and make a determination of how adequately it describes your school's situation. Data or sources you may wish to consider as you complete this worksheet include, but are not limited to, the following: results of the APS or a similar comprehensive needs assessment tool; classroom observations; discussions with teachers and students; an analysis of the master schedule; professional development schedule; student achievement data (API, AYP, curriculum-embedded assessments, etc.); and staff, community, and parent input from various sources.

Work with the other members of your planning team to respond to each of the following questions. Discuss your responses and come to consensus over whether or not the option would be a relevant choice for your school.

How well does the day-to-day operation of the school appear to support the day-to-day business of educating students?

What staff, beyond the principal, have leadership roles regarding teaching and learning at the school?

What data support the conclusion that the current organizational structure of the school is contributing to the academic failure of students?

How have other schools in your area significantly increased student achievement by restructuring their internal organization (e.g., block scheduling, team teaching, flexible time scheduling, smaller learning communities)? Have these efforts been successful in helping to increase students' academic performance? How do you know?

Other issue(s) to consider:

Concluding Question: What evidence supports the conclusion that this option **IS / IS NOT** a relevant option for this school?