



Measure N Education Improvement Plan Design Assessment and Recommendation

Measure N Planning Process: 2017-18 Measure N Plan

Aspire Golden State Prep

Checklist of Required Elements:

- ✓ Submitted Measure N Education Improvement Plan (SPSA)
- ✓ Submitted Measure N Budget for 2017-18
- ✓ Submitted Measure N Self Assessment
- ✓ Submitted Measure N Presentation
- ✓ Submitted Program of Study
- ✓ Presented to Measure N Commission

Criteria 1: Measure N Overall Design Process Assessment: Has the School demonstrated a robust design process that leads to the development of the 4 Essential Elements of a Linked Learning Pathway?

(NOTE: If you do not receive a 4 in this category, the highest final recommendation you can receive is “Developing” and the final recommendation will reflect quality of the plan and the alignment of expenditures to build out Linked Learning Pathways.)

Category	Full Implementation 4	Developing 3	Planning 2	No Implementation 1
Evidence of Comprehensive Pathway Readiness Pathway Development Readiness Rubric	Score: 2 Rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pathways score a 1 (Developing proposal with no supporting evidence) or 2 (Developing proposal with some supporting evidence) on all categories There is no evidence of curriculum development and the development of the CTE industry aligned sequence There is no evidence of a plan to develop teacher leadership and capacity to support pathway development There is no evidence that current staff have expertise or a plan to recruit staff with industry expertise Proposal does not demonstrate how pathway will address equity issues 			

Criteria 2: Measure N Overall Pathway Assessment: Has the School Developed the 4 Essential Elements of a Linked Learning Pathway?



(NOTE: If you do not receive a 4 in this category, the highest final recommendation you can receive is “Developing” and the final recommendation will reflect quality of the plan and the alignment of expenditures to build out Linked Learning Pathways.)

Category	Full Implementation 4	Developing 3	Planning 2	No Implementation 1
Evidence of Comprehensive Pathway Program (Measure N Self Assessment) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rigorous Academics Integrated in Pathway Integrated Students Supports Work Based Learning Industry Theme and CTE Sequence 	Score: 1 Rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pathways score a minimum of 1 (Beginning & Designing) on all categories 			

Criteria 2: Quality of the Measure N Education Improvement Plan (SPSA)

Category	Excelling 4	Meeting 3	Approaching 2	Beginning 1
Coherence (Measured by alignment of plan) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Site leadership is redesigning larger school structures, systems, and processes to support quality pathway development Site leadership and staff understand pathway development plans and the role they play in ensuring the implementation of these plans 	Score: 1 Rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Master schedule has been revised to allow for more options but it is unclear what type of pathway development is occurring and what options are available for students 			
Research Question <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The design team has developed clear research questions that lead the inquiry process for the design team The research questions should drive the root-cause analysis for targeted sub-groups that are not achieving in key outcome indicators Research questions should determine area of focus and identify key areas for root cause analysis 	Score: 3 Rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research question led the inquiry process for the design team Research question led root-cause analysis for one specific sub-group 			
Deeper Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of root-cause analysis into specific areas of focus outlined by Measure N and Linked Learning as driven by research analysis above. Evidence of at least 2 additional site visits and further exploration into best practices, literature review, and survey, as driven by results of root cause analysis. Clear commitment to sharing information with the broader community. 	Score: 2 Rationale: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is evidence of literature review, site visits, and surveys There is very little evidence of site visits to entrepreneurship pathways that can inform the CTE and curriculum development, teacher development, integration, and other key pillars 			



<p>Data Analysis</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Review of Measure N outcome data analysis that must address all 6 areas for reflection including cohort graduation rates, dropout rates, A-G rates, students who are not on track to graduation because they have D's and F's, student attrition, climate and culture indicators.• Schools and pathways have disaggregated data based on demographics to identify subgroups (LCAP) that are not achieving key outcome indicators.• Root Cause Analysis is a deep reflection of school site or pathway uncovering key issues that are impacting student achievement in each of the areas outlined.• Data includes Measure N Self-Assessment (rubric) against categories of Linked Learning Pathway Design criteria	<p>Score: 2</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is evidence that there is a need for disaggregated data in order to help uncover key issues that are impacting student achievement• The root cause of the Post-Secondary Readiness challenge is unclear and demonstrates a need for disaggregated data and an opportunity to further investigate why students have a low exit reading level
<p>Clear Theory of Action</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Design Team has articulated a theory of action that bridges from their root cause analysis logically into their goals and strategies.• For large comprehensive schools, there is alignment between school site plan and pathway plans so that they complement each other.	<p>Score: 2</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is some evidence that the theory of action bridges the root cause analysis to the goals and strategies.
<p>Goals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clearly articulated goals that are specifically aligned to the data analysis, deeper learning, and are logically connected to the theory of action.• Goals are specific, measurable, and will ultimately lead to improved student outcomes.• The resulting Design for site and Pathway development reflects Linked Learning Pathway design criteria.• The resulting Design articulates how it will address the root cause analysis and data points related to student learning outcomes.	<p>Score: 2</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Goals are not clearly aligned to the data and root cause analysis
<p>Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Strategies meet the goals, are research based, and have proven effective for improving equitable student outcomes• Strategies are embedded in inquiry design so as to produce evidence of their enacting the theory of action and achieving the goals.• The school/pathway have articulated goals that: establish new practices to support student outcomes, current strategies that are effective in meeting Measure N outcomes, the purpose of Measure N, and the instructional focus for professional development in the upcoming year.	<p>Score: 2</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• It is unclear how some of the strategies will support or be integrated with the pathway design
<p>Implementation: Measure N Work Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Work plan Identifies how key stakeholder groups will be involved in implementation of the plan, how they will be supported, and accountability structures for ensuring quality implementation.• Work plan leads to cycles of inquiry and continuous improvement for the school community.• Implementation includes a realistic timeline and "project management" plan including adequate and persisting resources to support key goals and strategies.• Work plan is embedded into a well articulated team structure for the school site to distribute leadership across the school community.• The school/pathway has developed a plan and procedures for entering into a cycle of continuous improvement with leadership and pathway teams charged with implementing the plan.• A clear cycle of continuous improvement is embodied in the focus on Design, Continuous Improvement of Signature Practices, and Instructional Strategies that are the foci for the school site's SPSA	<p>Score: 1</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There is very little evidence of a plan to build out all key pillars of a Linked Learning pathway



Criteria 3: Alignment of Funding to Linked Learning Criteria and SPSA				
Category	Complaint & Aligned 4	Compliant Partially Aligned 3	Non-Compliant • Supplanting • Not Allowable 2	Missing 1
<p>Budget</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expenditures must be clearly in support of and come from the logical thru-line that is evident in the Education Improvement Plan (SPSA) Expenditures should support and align to specific parts of your SPSA to support students and pathway development. All students receive benefit from Measure N Funding with the resources following the students directly identified in the root cause analysis. Expenditures should support the Theory of Action, should address the Root Cause Analysis, and should ensure the implementation of the Strategies in order to meet the Goals of your SPSA and the purpose of Measure N Budget provides clear resources that are embodied in the school/pathways master schedule in clearly articulated ways. Implementation includes a realistic timeline and “project management” plan including adequate and persisting resources to support it Expenditures must be used to supplement (increase the level of services) and not supplant (replace) funds from any sources Expenditures are in addition to, and not in place of, services that would otherwise be provided to participating students with state and local funds if Measure N funds were not available Expenditures are not being used to cover the expenses of programmatic elements, staff salary, and costs that were previously being funded by the school 	<p>Score: 2</p> <p>Rationale:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some expenditures cover the expenses of programmatic elements, staff salary, and costs that should be funded by the site if Measure N funds were not available There is a clear need to invest Measure N funds in ways that support pathway build out and the majority of the funds are not allocated in that way Expenditures require further justification to demonstrate the alignment to the purpose of Measure N and to demonstrate that supplanting is not occurring 			



Final Staff Recommendation	Funding
<p>Probationary</p> <p>Measure N Education Improvement Plan (SPSA) demonstrates school site needs to develop key conditions required for quality pathway development and/or needs to develop the key pillars of Linked Learning.</p> <p>Sites will be expected to allocate funding to one of the Support Providers listed below in order to receive direct support and guidance in the pathway development process.</p> <p>Required Support Providers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Hire a .5 FTE Pathway Coach to support Pathway Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pathway Coach is required to participate in OUSD Pathway Coaches' Community of Practice ● Hire a consultant that supports Linked Learning Pathway Development <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ConnectEd ○ Linked Learning Alliance ○ CCASN ○ Career Ladders ○ Pivot Learning Partners <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sites will be expected to present to the Measure N Commission in the fall on their action plan, updated Measure N Education Improvement Plan (SPSA), and progress. 2. Site will be prioritized by the Measure N Commission for a follow up site visit during the year. 	<p>Full Funding* (\$850 per student)</p> <p>*Sites will receive Full Funding during the 1 Year of Probationary status.</p> <p>Sites will be expected to have addressed the areas of growth by the end of the 1 Year of Probationary status and must demonstrate this during the annual May presentations to the Measure N Commission.</p> <p>Sites that do not follow the process outlined above will be re-evaluated in May 2018 and will receive Planning Grant Funding.</p>

Measure N Commission Recommendation*:

On June 20th, 2017 the Measure N Commission voted 5-0 to move the schools from “Probationary” to “Planning” for the 2017-18 school year based on the progress made, observations, site visits, and presentations over the past year. The Measure N Commission requested that the staff adjust the per pupil allocation for the school to \$200 per student. The remaining balance of funding (\$650) would be held in the school reserve to be used the 2018-19 school year. The Commission agreed with the feedback included within the report and agreed to forward this recommendation to the governing board for final approval.

Measure N Commission Final Recommendation to School Board	Funding
Planning	\$200 per student



Strengths:

- Awareness of need for pathway development
- Awareness of master schedule constraints

Key Questions:

- How do you plan to integrate your pathway theme into your instructional core?
- What is the root cause of students who are in 9th grade becoming off track and moving on to being in 11th grade and still off track?
 - What is the disaggregated data for this specific group of students?
- What types of support are provided for 9th graders who are off track?
- What is your plan for professional development for teachers to prepare them to teach in your pathway?
- What is your plan for curriculum development?
- What is your plan to engage English Language Learners within the pathway?
- What industry partners will you engage with to build out your pathway to ensure career industry standards are embedded and that would support the development of CTE core sequence?

Possible Supplanting:

- Reading Specialist
- Math teacher
- Math intervention course
- Restorative Justice Coordinator
- BUILD partnership

Next Steps:

What	Suggested Lead	Deliverable	Date
Hire a required support provider as listed above	Principal	Support provider role	Fall 2017
Reallocation of Measure N funds from programmatic expenditures that should be covered by the school site to expenditures that support specific pathway development and pathway buy-in	Principal and Design Team	Revised Budget	June 30th



Revise Measure N budget to ensure transparent alignment to purpose of Measure N and to ensure specific dollar amounts for all expenditures	Principal and Design Team	Revised Budget	June 30th
Develop clear action plan for 2017-18 that will support a clear pathway theme, quality pathway buildout, curriculum development, and teacher buy-in	Design Team	Action Plan	Summer 2017
Update Program of Study to reflect 2017-18	Principal and Design Team	Updated Program of Study	Fall 2017