

## Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process Rubric

The planning process begins with the required comprehensive needs assessment (CNA). *[Section 1114(b)(1)(A) of Title I of ESEA]* The CNA is critical to developing a schoolwide program, as it reveals the priority areas on which the program will focus. The CNA guides the development of the comprehensive schoolwide plan and suggests benchmarks for its evaluation, and, as such, is closely linked to all aspects of schoolwide program implementation. The CNA is based on demographic, process, perception, and academic data that includes all students in the school, including economically disadvantaged students; students from major racial and ethnic groups, especially African American and Hispanic males; students with disabilities; limited English proficient students; homeless; migrant students; students achieving in the lowest thirty percent; and emerging groups; and others.

A school operating a schoolwide Title I program must conduct a comprehensive needs assessment that identifies the school's strengths and challenges in key areas that affect student achievement. The data collection and analysis process should include the identification of achievement gaps and possible causes for these gaps. An examination of how demographic, process and perception data impact student achievement should be continuous. At a minimum, these data should be collected, reviewed, analyzed and evaluated annually.

This rubric is designed to assist schools and districts as a "self-evaluation" of the quality of the school's needs assessment. It can also be used as a voluntary tool to help with the development of a quality comprehensive needs assessment to guide the schoolwide planning process. Data from the CNA should be used to write the school improvement plan and drive all decisions related to identifying goals, strategies, activities, staffing, professional development, and budget development.

It should also be noted that in Targeted Assistance schools, the needs assessment process is also critical to determine, based on data, which students are most in need of services and the types of services which will provide the greatest impact. The Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process Rubric can be used to acquire the appropriate data to identify students most in need and establish a priority list for services. This CNA tool, when conducted thoroughly, provides both targeted and schoolwide schools with identified strengths and weaknesses and specifies priorities for addressing student achievement and meeting challenging academic and performance standards.

## School Improvement Planning Team

### Establishing a School Improvement Planning Team

A school improvement planning team should consist of stakeholders who play an integral part in school improvement and lead the process of developing the schoolwide program. Primarily, this team should organize and oversee the needs assessment process; lead the staff in developing the schoolwide plan; and conduct or oversee the program's annual evaluation. [United States Department of Education. Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance, Part B, Step 1. Washington, DC, March 2006.]; Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance. Appendix IV: Schoolwide Planning Team Member/Roles

### RUBRIC

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
<p>The School Improvement Planning Team consists of representatives of the basic stakeholders group to include administration, instructional staff, parents and if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, non-instructional staff, and if the plan is for a secondary school, students from such the school.</p> <p>The Team may also include school and instructional leader/s including those who work directly with specific programs, teachers representing different grades and content areas, staff, parents, community members (business, service, faith-based organizations, alumni, and other concerned citizens),</p>	<p>The School Improvement Planning Team consists of representatives of the basic stakeholders group to include administration, instructional staff, parents and if appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, non-instructional staff, and if the plan is for a secondary school, students from the school.</p> <p>[ESEA Section 1114 (b) (2) (B)]</p>	<p>The School Improvement Planning Team does not include representation from all of the basic stakeholders group.</p>	<p>No School Improvement Planning Team exists.</p>

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
students (as appropriate), and representative/s from management company (if applicable).			
The School Improvement Planning Team possesses diverse skills and experience in school improvement, and training is in place to ensure the team is knowledgeable about Title I and other applicable supplementary programs along with their regulatory requirements.	The School Improvement Planning Team possesses diverse skills and experience in school improvement, and is knowledgeable about Title I and other applicable supplementary programs along with their regulatory requirements.	The School Improvement Planning Team possesses some skills and experience in school improvement but is not knowledgeable about Title I programs and their regulatory requirements. There are no plans for training the School Improvement Planning Team.	The School Improvement Planning Team is neither diverse in skills and experience in school improvement nor knowledgeable about Title I programs and their regulatory requirements.
The School Improvement Planning Team has established a meeting schedule that is flexible for attendance by all members; has a protocol for the process that includes agenda, minutes, meeting norms, sign-in sheets; and has active and meaningful participation among all team members in the planning process and implementation of the schoolwide program.	The School Improvement Planning Team has two of the three components in place (meeting schedule, protocol, and participation).	The School Improvement Planning Team has one of the three components in place (meeting schedule, protocol, and participation).	The School Improvement Planning Team has none of the three components in place.

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
High quality professional development and training was provided early in the process to the School Improvement Planning Team and is ongoing. The training is focused on successful practices for working together, with staff, and stakeholders; how to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment; how to lead the staff in developing the schoolwide plan; and how to conduct and oversee the program's annual evaluation.	High quality professional development and training was provided early in the process to the School Improvement Planning Team and is ongoing. The training is focused on successful practices for working together, with staff, and stakeholders; how to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment; how to lead the staff in developing the schoolwide plan; and how to conduct and oversee the program's annual evaluation.	Professional development was provided to the School Improvement Planning Team during the planning process, but is not ongoing.	Professional development was not provided to the School Improvement Planning Team to assist in schoolwide planning.
The School Improvement Planning Team has the autonomy and the commitment to stakeholder participation in major program development, to carry out the functions necessary, oversee the needs assessment process, lead the staff in developing the schoolwide plan and conduct or oversee the program's annual evaluation. The School Improvement Planning Team is a body with a demonstrated history of collaboration.	The School Improvement Planning Team has the autonomy and the commitment to stakeholder participation in major program development, to carry out the functions necessary, oversee the needs assessment process, lead the staff in developing the schoolwide plan and conduct or oversee the program's annual evaluation.	The School Improvement Planning Team has limited or inconsistent autonomy to accomplish its tasks.	The School Improvement Planning Team does not have the autonomy to carry out the functions necessary to complete the school program design nor does it provide the opportunity for stakeholder participation in major program development and implementation decisions.

## Vision

### Developing a Vision

A vision is an aspirational description of what a school would like to achieve or accomplish in the mid-term or long-term future. It is intended to serve as a clear guide for choosing current and future courses of action and reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs. A collective vision is the engine that drives school reform. [United States Department of Education. Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance, Part B, Step 2. Washington, DC, March 2006.]

### RUBRIC

Leading (Exceeds Expectations)	Developing (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
The vision states the purpose of the school, expectations for students, and responsibilities of the adults who work in the school and is developed collectively by all stakeholders.	The vision states the purpose of the school, expectations for students, and responsibilities of the adults who work in the school.	The vision is stated with a purpose for the school and includes student expectations or adult responsibilities but not both.	No vision statement, student expectations, or adult responsibilities are stated.
The vision stresses the importance of collaborations and partnerships and the school's commitment to continuous improvement. It stipulates aspirations for incremental attainment of future goals, and reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs.	The vision stresses the importance of collaborations and partnerships and the school's commitment to continuous improvement. It reflects the intents and purposes of schoolwide programs.	The vision states collaborations with partnerships or the school's commitment to continuous improvement, but not both.	Neither collaboration with partnerships nor commitment to continuous improvement is stated.
The vision is verifiable (can be measured), feasible (doable), inspiring, appealing, (makes you smile or nod your head), and concise (not overly long) for all stakeholders (not just educators). [Based on the work of Senge, Peter (1990, 2012).]	The vision contains three or four components listed in the Leading category.	The vision contains one or two components listed in the Leading category.	None of the components are present.

## School Profile

### Creating the School Profile

A school profile provides the picture. It is a data-driven description of the school's student, staff, community demographics, programs and mission. The school profile serves as a starting point for discussion by the School Improvement Planning Team, and provides useful information for each of the focus areas of the needs assessment that follows. It suggests critical areas that might be addressed in the schoolwide planning. Required data include: Demographic, process, achievement outcome to include gaps within and among subgroups, and perception including parent and staff data. [United States Department of Education Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance. Appendix Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance, Appendix VI: Indicators for the School Profile.]

### RUBRIC

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Based on current trend data, the School Improvement Planning Team decides on which focus areas are most essential to reform the school. These areas may include student needs; curriculum and instruction; professional development, family and community involvement; and school context and organization. All required data are included. Student, stakeholder/community perception data are provided.	Based on current trend data, the School Improvement Planning Team decides on focus areas to reform the school. These areas may include student needs; curriculum and instruction; professional development, family and community involvement; and school context and organization. All required data are included. [United States Department of Education. Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance, Part B, Step 3. Washington, DC, March 2006.]	The School Improvement Planning Team develops the school profile but does not include all required types of data.	The School Improvement Planning Team creates a school profile based on on-existent, incorrect, or obsolete data.

## Student Demographic Data

### Demographic Data

Demographic Data provide descriptive information about teachers, school leaders, the school community, and students. This data include information such as enrollment, attendance, grade levels, race/ethnicity, gender, students with disabilities, English learners, Migrant students, highly mobile students, socio-economic status, homeless, graduation rate, and suspensions/expulsions. Demographic data are more meaningful with analyses. [United States Department of Education. Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance, Part B, Steps 3 and 4. Washington, DC, March 2006.]

### RUBRIC

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Data include descriptions, analyses, and courses for trends of the needs of all students in the school, but particularly the needs of low-achieving students and those at risk of not meeting the State's student academic achievement standards. These may include at-risk sub-groups for three years, (if data are available), based on socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity to include African American and Hispanic males, migrant students, highly mobile students, homeless students, English Learners, students with special needs and students performing in the bottom 30%.) Data are included for emerging subgroups with enrollment of 10-29 students.	Data include descriptions, analyses, and causes for trends of the needs of all students in the school, but particularly the needs of low-achieving students and those at risk of not meeting the Stat's student academic achievement standards. These may include at-risk sub-groups for three years, (if data are available), based on socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity to include African American and Hispanic males, migrant students, highly mobile students, homeless students, English Learners, students with special needs and students performing in the bottom 30%.)	Descriptions are provided to explain enrollment data for some subgroups. Analyses or causes for trends are incomplete.	There is incomplete information related to enrollment.

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Data are disaggregated by entry data of students for impact upon student achievement.	Data are included for emerging subgroups with enrollment of 10-29 students. [ESEA Section 1114 (b) (1) (iii) (I)] and [ESEA Section 1309 (2)]		
Descriptions and analyses are provided reflecting attendance data including tardiness by sub-groups for three years if available. These may include subgroups based on socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity to include African American and Hispanic males, migrant students, mobility, homeless students, English Learners, students with special needs and students performing in the bottom 30%. Data are included for emerging subgroups with enrollment of 10-29 students. Data are disaggregated based on entry date for students to determine if mobility has an impact upon student achievement.	Descriptions and analyses are provided reflecting attendance data including tardiness by sub-groups for three years if available. These may include subgroups based on socioeconomic status, gender, ethnicity to include African American and Hispanic males, migrant students, mobility, homeless students, English Learners, students with special needs and students performing in the bottom 30%.	Descriptions are provided to explain attendance data minus tardiness, for some subgroups. Less than three years of data are presented (if the data are available). Incomplete analyses are provided.	There is incomplete information related to attendance and tardiness.
A detailed description is provided for student behavior data trends for three years (if available) including discipline referrals, suspensions, and expulsions.	A detailed description is provided for student behavior data trends for three years (if available) including discipline referrals, suspensions, and expulsions. Analyses and causes for behavior infractions are considered and	A general description is provided for student behavior data trends for less than three years (or less than the available years of data) but lacks sufficient analyses.	There is incomplete information related to student behavior.

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Analyses are provided detailing with infractions are more likely to occur in various settings such as time of day, building location, and circumstances. Causes for behavior infractions are considered and included in the description.	included in the description.		

### Teacher/School Leader(s) Demographic Data

#### RUBRIC

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
A detailed description is provided including the number of years of teaching experience and degrees held by teachers and the number of years of administrative experience and degrees held by school leaders. An assurance statement is included stating all teachers and instructional paraprofessionals are highly qualified. A statement describing what impact this may have on student achievement is included. Data identifying the number and the percentage of	A detailed description is provided including the number of years of teaching experience and degrees held by teachers and the number of years of administrative experience and degrees held by school leaders. An assurance statement is included stating all teachers and instructional paraprofessionals are highly qualified. A statement describing what impact this may have on student achievement is included.	A general description is provided identifying the experience level of teachers and administrator but no statement of impact is included.	Incomplete data are provided.

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
<p>teachers certified through traditional certification methods, and/or the number and percentage of teachers certified through alternative certification methods are provided. Information describing the school leader's preparation for the principalship and leadership capabilities is included. A statement describing what impact this may have on student achievement is included.</p>	<p>[United States Department of Education. Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance, Part B, Step 3; Part C. Washington, DC, March 2006.], [ESEA Section 114 (b) (1) (C),] and [ESEA Section 1119]</p>		
<p>Data are provided for three years (if available), detailing the ethnicity, gender, cultural, and linguistic background of the staff and leadership team compared to the makeup of the student body. A statement describing what impact this may have on student achievement and performance is included. Performance may include attendance, behavior, and engagement.</p>	<p>Data are provided for three years (if available), detailing the ethnicity, gender, cultural, and linguistic background of the staff and leadership team compared to the makeup of the student body. A statement describing what impact this may have on student achievement and performance is included.</p>	<p>Data are provided for less than three years (if available), detailing the racial and gender makeup of the staff and student body. No statement of impact is included.</p>	<p>Incomplete data are provided.</p>
<p>Detailed attendance data including absences and tardiness are provided for staff and school leaders for three years (if available).</p>	<p>Detailed attendance data including absences and tardiness are provided for staff and school leaders for three years (if available).</p>	<p>Attendance and tardiness data are provided for staff and school leaders for less than three years (if available) and no impact statement is provided.</p>	<p>Incomplete data are provided.</p>

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Absences due to professional learning opportunities are included. A statement describing what impact this may have on student achievement is included. An analysis is included describing preparedness and the impact of substitute teachers on student performance.	Absences due to professional learning opportunities are included. A statement describing what impact this may have on student achievement is included.		

### Community Demographic Data

#### RUBRIC

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
If the LEA has been in existence for at least three years, three years of data are provided for the community including: family income levels and percentages, family education levels and percentages, home owners vs. renters vs. vacant properties percentages, economic levels and percentages for various types of assistance, crime rates, police, emergency and fire department responsiveness, cultural organizations, entertainment venues, recreation centers and	If the LEA has been in existence for at least three years, three years of data are provided for the community which may include: family income levels and percentages, family education levels and percentages, home owners vs. renters vs. vacant properties percentages for various types of assistance, crime rates, police, emergency and fire department responsiveness, cultural organizations, entertainment venues, recreation centers and community centers and	If the LEA has been in existence for at least three years, less than three years of data are provided and the impact statement is not provided.	Data are incomplete and the impact statement is not provided.

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
<p>community centers and venues, community and business partnerships, and levels of involvement with the school. A statement describing the level of community support through the passage of millages to support the school is included. A statement describing the impact this may have upon student achievement is included. The planning team uses qualitative data that reveal attitudes and perceptions within the community.</p>	<p>venues, community and business partnerships, and levels of involvement with the school. A statement describing the level of community support through the passage of millages to support the school is not included. A statement describing the impact this may have upon student achievement is included. The planning team uses qualitative data that reveal attitudes and perceptions within the community.</p>		
<p>A detailed description is provided articulating the results of their process data. Process data can include (but are not limited to) the results of the School Systems Review or the Interim Assessment/Self-assessment, Special Education Site Visits, Office of Field Services On Site Review Results, Classroom Walk-throughs. The school has identified which strands, standards, indicators stand-out as strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>A detailed description is provided articulating the results of their process data. Process data can included (but are not limited to) the results of the School Systems Review or the Interim Assessment/Self-assessment, Special Education Site Visits, Office of Field Services On Site Review Results, Classroom Walk-throughs. The school has identified which strands, standards, indicators stand-out as strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>A vague statement is included addressing the number and types of schools in the community. A statement describing the impact this may have upon student achievement is not included.</p>	<p>School choice is not described. A statement describing the impact this may have upon student achievement is not included.</p>

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
An analysis is included explaining how these strengths contribute to the achievement of all students and the acceleration of the at-risk population.			

### **Process Data**

Process data are information about the practices and procedures schools use to plan, deliver and monitor curriculum, instruction and assessment. [United States Department of Education. Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance, Part B, Steps 3 and 4; Washington, DC, March 2006.]

### **RUBRIC**

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
<p>A detailed description is provided articulating how the school reviewed the results of the School Systems Review, the Interim Assessment/Self-Assessment, Special Education Site Visits, State and Federal Program On-site Reviews, Survey of Enacted Curriculum, Walk-throughs, and/or other types of Process Data. The school has identified which strands/standards/indicators stand out as strengths and weaknesses.</p> <p>An analysis is included explaining how these strengths contribute to the</p>	<p>A detailed description is provided articulating how the school reviewed the results of the School Systems Review, the Interim Assessment/Self-Assessment, Special Education Site Visits, State and Federal Program On-site Reviews, Survey of Enacted Curriculum, Walk-throughs, and/or other types of Process Data. The school has identified which strands/standards/indicators stand out as strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>A description is provided articulating how the school reviewed the results of the School Systems Review or the Interim Assessment/Self-Assessment.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>The school has identified which strands/standards/indicators stand-out as strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>Incomplete data are provided.</p>

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
achievement of all students and the acceleration of the at-risk population.			

## Reading, Writing, Math, Science and Social Studies (May Include Expanded Core)

### Achievement/Outcome Data

Achievement/outcome data tell what students have learned. These include classroom-level, benchmark, interim and formative assessment data as well as summative data such as standardized test scores from annual district and state assessments. A review of the achievement/outcome data should include a separate analysis of each content area. [United States Department of Education. Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance, Part B, Steps 4 and 5; Washington, DC, March 2006.]

### **RUBRIC**

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Student Achievement data from multiple sources to include State and current local data are analyzed for all students represented in the school's population. These include whole group, subgroups, and emerging subgroups (containing fewer than thirty students) to determine achievement gaps. For Migrant students, disaggregation by priority for services status is included. A summary of the data includes trends and gap analysis.	State and current local data are analyzed for all students represented in the school's population. These include whole group, subgroups, and emerging subgroups (containing fewer than thirty students) to determine achievement gaps. For Migrant students, disaggregation by priority for services status is included. A summary of the data includes trends and gap analysis. [ESEA Title I, Part C Section 13069a)(1)]	Incomplete or inconsistent analysis of State and current local data are used referenced to determine student achievement gaps. Subgroups are not considered.	No State data are analyzed or referenced to determine achievement gaps.

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
<p>The School Improvement Planning Team identifies all impediments to student achievement. Achievement data from a variety of sources, including State data, are analyzed for patterns and common errors in understanding. The team reviews interventions that are specific to the learning obstacles based on research and best practices. Interventions are selected for best results and positive impact in addressing students' needs.</p>	<p>The School Improvement Planning Team identifies all impediments to student achievement. State achievement data are analyzed for patterns and common errors in understanding. The team reviews interventions that are specific to the learning obstacles based on research and best practices. Interventions are selected for best results and positive impact in addressing students' needs.</p>	<p>The School Improvement Planning Team identifies learning trends for the entire school but does not disaggregate data for subgroups and does not review sufficient research to select effective instructional strategies to address students' needs.</p>	<p>The School Improvement Planning Team does not use data to identify students' learning difficulties and does not review the efficacy of strategies before recommending them for the School Improvement Plan.</p>
<p>The School Improvement Planning Team reviews the disaggregated achievement results from multiple sources, including State data that are attributable to the current intervention program/s. The team reviews the trend data to determine if the program provides a high level of achievement for all students including subgroups. Interventions are evaluated and adjusted as needed based upon their impact on student achievement.</p>	<p>The School Improvement Planning Team reviews the disaggregated achievement results from State data that are attributable to the current intervention program/s. The team reviews the trend data to determine if the program provides a high level of achievement for all students including subgroups. Interventions are evaluated and adjusted as needed based upon their impact on student achievement.</p>	<p>The School Improvement Planning Team has reviewed the current intervention program/s, but has not analyzed data to determine its level of success for student growth.</p>	<p>The School Improvement Planning Team has not reviewed the current intervention strategies being used. There is no data on the success of the current program.</p>

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
The School Improvement Planning Team reviews the current SIP/DIP/SBDIP quarterly for effective use of resources, personnel and strategies relative to the expected success of students and the program interventions. After student achievement data are analyzed, decisions are made to either revise or maintain the school intervention program(s).	The School Improvement Planning Team reviews the current plan and the results have been studied for possible changes to the program. Subgroups results were analyzed to determine success of the program.	The School Improvement Planning Team has reviewed the current plan but has not looked at data to determine its success over time.	The School Improvement Planning Team has not reviewed the plan, has not made an effort to determine the success of the program, and does not have direction for the improvement of the program.

### Student Perception Data

#### Perception Data

Perception data are information collected that reflect the opinions, views and the perceived needs by stakeholders to make informed decisions about students and the learning environment; to measure stakeholders' perceptions of the learning community because perception shapes reality; to measure the school's self-perception against the community's image of the school; and to identify program effectiveness. [United States Department of Education. Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance, Part B, Step 3. Washington, DC, March 2006.]; Michigan Department of Education. MI-MAP – Moving Decisively Toward Data: Perception Data. [http://mi.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-28753\\_38959\\_33424---,00.html](http://mi.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-28753_38959_33424---,00.html)

#### **RUBRIC**

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Multiple data collection methods (e.g., surveys, interviews, and other feedback) were used to collect student opinions identifying the highest areas of satisfaction and results documented.	Survey data was used to collect student opinion information identifying the highest areas of student satisfaction.	[Minimal/limited] student opinion data was collected reflecting areas of student satisfaction.	Incomplete data are provided.

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Multiple data collection methods (e.g. surveys, interviews, and other feedback) are used to collect student opinions identifying the lowest areas of student Satisfaction and results documented. Data are analyzed and summarized.	Survey data are used to collect student opinion information identifying the lowest areas of student satisfaction. Data are analyzed and summarized.	Minimal/limited student opinion data are collected reflecting the lowest areas of satisfaction.	Incomplete data are provided.

### Parent/Guardian Perception Data

#### RUBRIC

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Multiple data collection methods (e.g., surveys, interviews, and other feedback) were used to collect Parent/Guardian opinions identifying the highest areas of satisfaction and results documented. Data are analyzed and summarized.	Survey data was used to collect Parent/Guardian opinion information identifying the highest areas of Parent/Guardian satisfaction. Data are analyzed and summarized.	Minimal/limited Parent/Guardian opinion data was collected reflecting areas of Parent/Guardian satisfaction.	Incomplete date are provided.
Multiple data collection methods (e.g., surveys, interviews, and other feedback) were used to collect Parent/Guardian opinions identifying the lowest areas of satisfaction and results documented. Data are analyzed and summarized.	Survey data was used to collect Parent/Guardian satisfaction opinion identifying the lowest areas of Parent/Guardian satisfaction. Data are analyzed and summarized.	Minimal/limited Parent/Guardian opinion data was collected reflecting the lowest areas of satisfaction.	Incomplete data are provided.

## Stakeholder/Community Perception Data

### RUBRIC

Leading (Exemplary)	Developing/Embedded (Meets Expectations)	Emerging (Partially Meets Expectations)	Lacking (Does Not Meet Expectations)
Multiple data collection methods (e.g. surveys, interviews, and other Feedback) were used to collect stakeholder/Community opinions identifying the highest areas of satisfaction and results documented. Five or more stakeholder groups are represented in the data. Data are analyzed and summarized.	Survey data was used to collect Stakeholder/Community satisfaction information identifying the highest areas of stakeholder/community satisfaction. Two to four stakeholder groups are represented in the data. Data are analyzed and summarized.	Minimal/limited stakeholder/community opinion data were collected reflecting areas of stakeholder/community satisfaction. One stakeholder/community group represented.	Incomplete data are provided.

### Questions for Consideration

- Has the school identified and summarized the school's strengths and challenges in the key areas that affect student achievement?
- What needs or areas should be elevated to priority status?
- Are the needs prioritized based on a solid root cause analysis?
- Is the data consistent or in conflict with these needs?
- Did the planning process involve those stakeholders who can provide deep insight into the needs of students?
- Have representatives of those who can provide deep insight in the needs been involved in the planning process?
- What gaps in student achievement have been identified and what are the possible causes for these gaps?
- What gaps in professional capacity of staff have been identified?
- Have representatives of those who will be impacted by the plan and those who are needed to implement the plan been brought into the planning process?

## Thinking About the School Improvement Plan

- Will the School Improvement Plan directly address the prioritized needs identified in the Comprehensive Needs Assessment?
- Will full implementation of the School Improvement Plan aligned with the Comprehensive Needs Assessment, positively impact student achievement?

## General Resources

Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance. (March 2006). US Department of Education

Designing Schoolwide Programs, Non-Regulatory Guidance. Appendix I: Additional Questions and Answers; Appendix II: Bibliographic References; Appendix III: Web-Based Resources. (March 2006). US Department of Education

Kozol, Jonathan. (2012). Fire in the Ashes: Twenty-Five Years Among the Poorest Children in America.

Kozol, Jonathan. (1991). Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools.

Kozol, Jonathan. (2005). The Shame of the Nation: The Restoration of Apartheid Schooling in America.

Michigan Department of Education. MI-MAP. [http://mi.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-28753\\_38959\\_33424---,00.html](http://mi.gov/mde/0,4615,7-140-28753_38959_33424---,00.html)

Michigan Department of Education. MIschooldata. <http://MIschooldata.org>.

Payne, Ruby. (2005). A Framework for Understanding Poverty. Fourth revised edition.

Senge, Peter. (1990). The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization.

Senge, Peter. (2012). Schools That Learn.

Wellman, Bruce and Lipton, Laura. (2012). Got Data? Now What?

Web sites that can assist with data collection include: [www.michigan.gov/meap](http://www.michigan.gov/meap), [www.michigan.gov/mepr](http://www.michigan.gov/mepr), [www.michigan.gov/cepi](http://www.michigan.gov/cepi), [www.micis.org](http://www.micis.org), and [www.data4ss.org](http://www.data4ss.org).

Learn about implementing Restorative Justice approaches in your school or district [restorativesolutions.us/schools](http://restorativesolutions.us/schools):

<http://www.restorativejustice.org/programme-place/02practiceissues/schools-1>, [www.safersanerschools.org](http://www.safersanerschools.org).

## School and District Improvement Framework Research and Resources - MDE Office of OEII

### General Resources

- AdvancED Michigan: <http://www.advanc-ed.org/partnership/mde>

- Fullan, Michael. Choosing the wrong drivers for whole system reform. Summary of seminar series paper No. 204. Center for Strategic Education, April 2011.
- Hattie, John. Visible Learning: A Synthesis of Over 800 Meta-analyses Relating to Achievement. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2009.
- Hawley Miles, Karen and Frank, Stephen. The Strategic School: Making the Most of People, Time and Money. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 2008.
- Mooney, Nancy, & Mausbach, Ann. Align the Design: A Blueprint for School Improvement. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development (ASCD), 2008.
- O'Neill, Jan, et al. (2006). The Power of Smart Goals: Using Goals to Improve Student Learning. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree:

### **Strands I: Teaching for Learning**

- Curriculum
- Career and College Ready Standards for Michigan – <http://www.michigan.gov/mde/0,1607,7-140--232021--,00.html>
- Common Core State Standards (CCSS):
- [www.commoncore.org](http://www.commoncore.org) (Materials, background)
- [www.corestandards.org](http://www.corestandards.org) (The standards and applying them)
- Survey of Enacted Curriculum – a tool for teachers in understanding/improving their usage of classroom time – <https://secure.wceruw.org/seconline>
- Jacobs, Heidi. Curriculum 21: Essential Education for a Changing World. Alexandria, VA: ASCS, 2014.
- Reeves, Anne. Where Great Teaching Begins: Planning for Student Thinking and Learning. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2011.

### **Instruction**

- Michigan's Teaching for Learning Framework – [www.teachingforlearning.org](http://www.teachingforlearning.org)
- National Center on Response to Intervention – [www.rti4success.org](http://www.rti4success.org)
- World Class Instructional Design and Assessment – a comprehensive set of language learning standards – [www.wida.us](http://www.wida.us)
- Danielson, Charlotte, Enhancing Professional Practice: A Framework for Teaching (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2007.
- Dean, Ceri, et al. Classroom Instruction That Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2012.
- Hattie, John. Visible Learning for Teachers: Maximizing Impact on Learning. Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2011.
- Jackson, Robyn. How to Plan Rigorous Instruction. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2011.
- Marzano, Robert. The Art and Science of Teaching: A Comprehensive Framework for Effective Instruction. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2007.

- Marzano, Robert, et al. *The Highly Engaged Classroom*. Bloomington, IN: Marzano Research Laboratory, 2010. Perini, Matthew.

## Assessment

- Assessment Training Institute, an institute devoted to improving fidelity in classroom assessments – <http://ati.pearson.com/about-ati/index.html>
- Black, Paul & William, Dylan (1998). *Inside the black box: Raising standards through classroom assessments*. Retrieved from <http://weaeducation.typepad.co.us/files/blackbox-1.pdf>
- Common Assessment Module Series – Michigan Assessment Consortium – <http://michiganassessmentconsortium.org/common-assessment-module-series>
- Bernhardt, Victoria. *Data Analysis for Continuous School Improvement* (3<sup>rd</sup> edition). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2013.
- Brookhart, Susan. *How to Assess Higher-Order Thinking Skills in Your Classroom*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2010.
- ---. *How to Create and Use Rubrics for Formative Assessment and Grading*. Alexandria, VA: ASCD, 2013.
- Chappuis, Jan, et al. *Classroom Assessment for Student Learning: Doing It Right – Using It Well* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Portland, OR: Pearson, 2011.
- Moss, Connie, et al. "Knowing Your Learning Target." *Educational Leadership*, Volume 68 (Number 6), 2011: Pages 66-69.

## Strand II: Leadership for Learning

- Center for Social for Social and Emotional Education. *School Climate Research Summary*, 2010.
- Core Competencies of Turn Around Leaders. Research brief, 2008. Retrieved from [www.publicimpact.com](http://www.publicimpact.com).
- *Failure is Not an Option 2: How High Achieving Districts Succeed*, 2011 (video).
- Wallace Foundation. *The School Principal as Leader: Guiding Schools to Better Teaching and Learning*, 2013.
- Davidovich, Robert, et al. *Beyond School Improvement: The Journey to Innovative Leadership*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 2009.
- DuFour, Richard, & Marzano, Robert. *Leaders of Learning: How District, School, and Classroom Leaders Improve Student Achievement*. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree, 2011.
- Lassiter, Cathy. *The Secret and Simple Truths of High-Performing School Cultures*. Englewood, CO: Lead + Learn Press, 2012.
- Love, Nancy. *Using Data to Improve Learning for All: A Collaborative Inquiry Approach*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, 2008.
- Tschannen-Moran, Megan. *Trust Matters: Leadership for Successful Schools*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, 2004.
- Dweck, Carol S. *Mindset: The New Psychology of Success*. New York, NY: Random House, 2007.

## Strand III: Professional Learning

- Learning Forward – A Professional Learning Organization for administrators and teachers – [www.learningforward.org](http://www.learningforward.org)

- MI Assessment Consortium modules <http://michiganassessmentconsortium.org/common-assessment-module-series>
- National School Reform Faculty protocols- <http://www.nsrffharmony.org/resources.html>
- DuFour, Richard, et al. Learning by Doing: A Handbook for Professional Learning Communities at Work edition). Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree, 2010.
- Eaker, Robert & Keating, Janel. Every School, Every Team, Every Classroom: District Leadership for Gr Professional Learning Communities at Work. Bloomington, IN: Solution Tree, 2011.
- Killion, Joellen, & Roy, Patricia. Becoming a Learning School. Oxford, Ohio: National Staff Development 2009.
- Langer, Georgeia, et al. Collaborative Analysis OF Student Work: Improving Teaching and Learning. Ale VA: ASCD, 2003.
- Reeves, Douglas. Transforming Professional Development into Student Results. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

#### **Strand IV: School, Family and Community Relations**

- Michigan Department of Education. (2013). Collaborating for Success: Parent Engagement Toolkit.
- National PTA. (2012). Parents' Guide to Student Success. (A user friendly guide to the CCSS by grade level and content areas.)
- Middleton, Kelly, and Petitt, Elizabeth. Who Cares? Improving Public Schools Through Relationships and Customer Service. Tuscon, AZ: Wheaton, 2007.

The Office of Field Service appreciates and acknowledges the collaboration, contributions, and resources provided by our partners in the U.S. Department of Education, MDE's Office of Education Improvement, Intermediate School Districts and Local School Districts through the State. We are encouraged this document will assist schools and districts with the development of comprehensive needs assessments as a basis for district and school improvement plans embracing the purposes of ensuring all children receive a high quality education, and closing the achievement gap between children meeting State academic standards an those children not meeting such standards. Mike Radke, Director

The Office of Field Services Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process Rubric Workgroup:  
 Paula Daniels, Gayle Green, Sadie Mahone, Norman Malinowski, Lynda Miller, Maria Silva  
 Badriyyah Sabree, Chairperson