

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 state educational agency (SEA) is doing to help the school address this problem.

DAS and Year 3 Corrective Action Protocol to make revisions to its LEA Plan, as necessary, 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. (34 CFR Section 200.44(i))

Provide notification to the parents that the school is identified for year three of PI.

Provide the parent notification letter directly to the parent(s) of each student before the beginning of the traditional school year.

Provide the letter in an understandable and uniform format, and to the extent practicable, in a language or languages that the parent(s) can understand. In California, if 15 percent or more of the students in the school speak a primary language other than English, the letter must be written in the primary language. 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). 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.

If the LEA anticipates it will not have sufficient funds to serve all eligible students, information for parents that the LEA will prioritize requests to serve low-achieving students from low-income families first; and

If requested, help for parents to select an SES provider.

LEA and SES providers enter into agreements which must contain:

Specific achievement goals for each student and the timeframe for completion developed in consultation with the student's parents and the provider;

Description of how each student's progress will be measured;

Description of how each 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;

**YEAR 3
CORRECTIVE ACTION PROTOCOL**

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 and 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 observe management structure at other more successful sites to determine how governance and leadership at those sites have been assigned and distributed. Some professional development offered for administrators and school staff should focus on the development of collaborative styles of site governance and leadership. 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 one or more outside experts to advise the school on revising and implementing the school improvement plan for addressing specific issues underlying the school's continued failure to make AYP and for identifying corrective actions.** For this option, the advice and expertise of an outside expert with a demonstrated 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 have a history of effective practice in working with low-performing schools in California, be knowledgeable about program evaluation, data analysis, utilizing data to improve instruction, monitoring innovations, building professional learning communities and leading change. Before choosing, determine if the expert has worked in similar schools, if recent clients viewed the work as satisfactory, and examine achievement data to ascertain if the consulting work resulted in increased student achievement at the schools. Once selected, the external expert may conduct a comprehensive analysis of school operations and LEA support and identify areas of need 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 S4 offices) and private providers. Selection of an external expert may be accomplished through a

Selecting the Most Appropriate Corrective Action(s):

3. Measureable. The effects of the corrective action must result in a measurable result.
Example: Student absences will be reduced by 40 percent and tardies will be reduced by 60 percent by the end of first semester.

Once agreed upon, the LEA, school, and community, with support from available regional or local resources, must implement the corrective actions. The corrective actions must be incorporated into a revised school plan, implemented with fidelity, and assessed on a regular basis. Findings from these worksheets may serve as a critical starting point in this process and should be considered as the school plan is created.

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

Option 1: Replace the school staff who are relevant to the failure to make Adequate Yearly Progress (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 Academic Program Survey (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, (California High School Exit Exam [CAHSEE], 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?
--

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?

Corrective Action:

**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 (CAHSEE, 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 (kindergarten-grade 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?

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:

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

Corrective Action:

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

When did all teachers complete SB 472 (or materials-based professional development) 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:

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

Corrective Action:

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 does the current curriculum meet the needs of all students at the school (special education, English learners, socioeconomically disadvantaged, etc)?

Worksheet for Considering

Corrective Action Option 3

PI Year 3 Schools

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

Instructions:

Other issue(s) to consider:

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

Corrective Action:

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?

Corrective Action:

How many days are used for assemblies? Minimum days?

**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 (CAHSEE, 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: