



Strong School Systems Strategic Planning Strategic Plan Guidance

	3: Meets expectations	2: Approaching expectations	1: Emergent
Steering Committee health and effectiveness	<p><u>Norms</u> The Steering Committee has codified norms that meet all three of these criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observable – they describe something you can see - Actionable – they describe something you can do - Sticky – they’re simple; there are fewer than 5 	<p><u>Norms</u> The Steering Committee has codified norms that meet some but not all three of these criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Observable – they describe something you can see - Actionable – they describe something you can do - Sticky – they’re simple; there are fewer than 5 	<p><u>Norms</u> The Steering Committee has not codified norms.</p>
	<p><u>Effectiveness of facilitation</u> Average response of 4.5 or higher to this question of the SteerCo (meetings #2-5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How would you rate the effectiveness of this meeting? (5 = Very effective; 1 = Not at all effective) 	<p><u>Effectiveness of facilitation</u> Average response of 4.0-4.4 to this question of the SteerCo (meetings #2-5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How would you rate the effectiveness of this meeting? (5 = Very effective; 1 = Not at all effective) 	<p><u>Effectiveness of facilitation</u> Average response of less than 4.0 to this question of the SteerCo (meetings #2-5):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How would you rate the effectiveness of this meeting? (5 = Very effective; 1 = Not at all effective)
Stakeholder engagement	<p><u>Representation</u> - Representatives of all of the following groups were engaged during the planning process: School leaders, educators, families, community groups, and students.</p> <p>- The representatives engaged reflect the demographics of the community served.</p>	<p><u>Representation</u> - Representatives of all but one of the following groups were engaged during the planning process: School leaders, educators, families, community groups and students.</p>	<p><u>Representation</u> - Representatives of two or fewer of the following groups were engaged during the planning process: School leaders, educators, families, community groups and students.</p> <p>- The representatives engaged did not adequately reflect the demographics of the community served.</p>
	<p><u>Engagement</u> - > 75% of focus group participants Strongly Agree or Agree with this statement: "I am satisfied with the opportunities stakeholders have had to provide input on our school system's strategic plan"</p>	<p><u>Engagement</u> - 60-75% of focus group participants Strongly Agree or Agree with this statement: "I am satisfied with the opportunities stakeholders have had to provide input on our school system's strategic plan"</p>	<p><u>Engagement</u> - < 60% of focus group participants Strongly Agree or Agree with this statement: "I am satisfied with the opportunities stakeholders have had to provide input on our school system's strategic plan"</p>
Diagnostic	<p><u>Perceived utility</u> Average response of 4.4 or higher to these statements put to the Steering Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This diagnostic accurately captured my school system's strengths and challenges and the sentiments of stakeholders - This diagnostic was insightful (i.e., added to my understanding of my school system's strengths and challenges) - This diagnostic was clear and digestible - How would you rate the effectiveness of this meeting? <p>(5 = Strongly agree/ Very effective; 1 = Strongly disagree/ Not at all effective)</p>	<p><u>Perceived utility</u> Average response of 3.9-4.3 to these statements put to the Steering Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This diagnostic accurately captured my school system's strengths and challenges and the sentiments of stakeholders - This diagnostic was insightful (i.e., added to my understanding of my school system's strengths and challenges) - This diagnostic was clear and digestible - How would you rate the effectiveness of this meeting? <p>(5 = Strongly agree/ Very effective; 1 = Strongly disagree/ Not at all effective)</p>	<p><u>Perceived utility</u> Average response of less than 3.9 to these statements put to the Steering Committee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This diagnostic accurately captured my school system's strengths and challenges and the sentiments of stakeholders - This diagnostic was insightful (i.e., added to my understanding of my school system's strengths and challenges) - This diagnostic was clear and digestible - How would you rate the effectiveness of this meeting? <p>(5 = Strongly agree/ Very effective; 1 = Strongly disagree/ Not at all effective)</p>



Strong School Systems Strategic Planning Strategic Plan Guidance

3: Meets expectations	2: Approaching expectations	1: Emergent
<p><u>Summary and synthesis</u> The beginning of the diagnostic document includes a summary list of diagnostic headlines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These headlines clearly identify strengths and challenges - Diagnostic headlines address all of the domains - No domain has more than 6-8 diagnostic headlines 	<p><u>Summary and synthesis</u> The beginning of the diagnostic document includes a summary list of diagnostic headlines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Diagnostic headlines address all but one of the domains - 1-2 domains have more than eight diagnostic headlines each 	<p><u>Summary and synthesis</u> Diagnostic headlines are not summarized near the beginning of the document; instead, they are sprinkled throughout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - These headlines do not clearly identify strengths and challenges - Two or more domains are missing diagnostic headlines - Three or more domains have more than six diagnostic headlines each
<p><u>Use of evidence</u> - All or almost all diagnostic headlines are fully supported by evidence - All or almost all diagnostic headlines represent the most important insight from a given analysis/ review</p>	<p><u>Use of evidence</u> - Most diagnostic headlines are fully supported by evidence - Most diagnostic headlines represent the most important insight from a given analysis/ review</p>	<p><u>Use of evidence</u> - Some diagnostic headlines are fully supported by evidence - Some diagnostic headlines represent the most important insight from a given analysis/ review</p>
<p><u>Quantity and quality of evidence</u> - Diagnostic includes analysis of all four types of these performance data: a) student outcomes related to academic readiness for college and career, b) student outcomes related to learning in 3-8th grades, c) student well-being, and d) workforce management. - Diagnostic benefits from a survey with a high response rate (proxy: 40% or more of teachers responded) - At least 15 teachers' instruction was observed - All, or almost all, of the following types of instructional artifacts were reviewed and analyzed: a) curriculum adoption map for all or almost all grade levels and subjects; b) curriculum scopes and sequences for math and ELA; c) sample lesson plans in math and ELA; d) assessment map; e) assessment samples; f) sample written informal observation feedback for teachers; g) sample PD agendas/ facilitation plans; h) sample PLC agendas/ plans</p>	<p><u>Quantity and quality of evidence</u> - Diagnostic includes analysis of three types of these performance data: a) student outcomes related to academic readiness for college and career, b) student outcomes related to learning in 3-8th grades, c) student well-being, and d) workforce management. - Diagnostic benefits from a survey with a moderate response rate (proxy: 30-39% of teachers responded) - 10-14 teachers' instruction was observed - Most of the following types of instructional artifacts were reviewed and analyzed: a) curriculum adoption map for all or almost all grade levels and subjects; b) curriculum scopes and sequences for math and ELA; c) sample lesson plans in math and ELA; d) assessment map; e) assessment samples; f) sample written informal observation feedback for teachers; g) sample PD agendas/ facilitation plans; h) sample PLC agendas/ plans</p>	<p><u>Quantity and quality of evidence</u> - Diagnostic includes analysis of 1-2 types of these performance data: a) student outcomes related to academic readiness for college and career, b) student outcomes related to learning in 3-8th grades, c) student well-being, and d) workforce management. - Diagnostic benefits from a survey with a low response rate (proxy: less than 30% of teachers responded) - Fewer than 10 teachers' instruction was observed - Some of the following types of instructional artifacts were reviewed and analyzed: a) curriculum adoption map for all or almost all grade levels and subjects; b) curriculum scopes and sequences for math and ELA; c) sample lesson plans in math and ELA; d) assessment map; e) assessment samples; f) sample written informal observation feedback for teachers; g) sample PD agendas/ facilitation plans; h) sample PLC agendas/ plans</p>



Strong School Systems Strategic Planning Strategic Plan Guidance

	3: Meets expectations	2: Approaching expectations	1: Emergent
	<p><u>Contextualization of performance data</u> Analysis of performance data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Usually draws comparison with the State average - Usually draws comparison with districts that are demographically similar - Usually includes a historical trend. 	<p><u>Contextualization of performance data</u> Analysis of performance data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Sometimes draws comparison with the State average - Sometimes draws comparison with districts that are demographically similar - Sometimes includes a historical trend. 	<p><u>Contextualization of performance data</u> Analysis of performance data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Rarely draws comparison with the State average - Rarely draws comparison with districts that are demographically similar - Rarely includes a historical trend.
	<p><u>Quality of instructional quality reviews</u> Classroom observations accurately assess and provide sufficient evidence for all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether or not adopted curriculum is in use (and if in use, the degree to which teachers have internalized it) - The degree to which texts and tasks reflect grade level rigor - The degree to which students carry the cognitive load - Strength of classroom culture/ management <p>Artifact analysis accurately assesses and provides sufficient evidence for all, or almost all, of following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The degree to which the school system's curricula for core content areas align with college and career ready standards - The degree to which sample lessons indicate use of adopted materials and evidence of teacher internalization - The degree to which teachers are a) using assessments from common core-aligned curriculum and b) administering nationally-normed assessments that provide a broad gauge of student progress and gaps - The degree to which effective collaborative structures are in place for teachers to a) internalize units and lessons, b) look at student work, and c) engage in shared content-specific learning - The degree to which PD a) is effectively designed and b) includes a mix of schoolwide and content-specific training - The degree to which observation feedback a) is clear and actionable and b) includes opportunities for teachers to receive feedback specific to the content and/or curriculum 	<p><u>Quality of instructional quality reviews</u> Classroom observations accurately assess and provide sufficient evidence for most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether or not adopted curriculum is in use (and if in use, the degree to which teachers have internalized it) - The degree to which texts and tasks reflect grade level rigor - The degree to which students carry the cognitive load - Strength of classroom culture/ management <p>Artifact analysis accurately assesses and provides sufficient evidence for most of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The degree to which the school system's curricula for core content areas align with college and career ready standards - The degree to which sample lessons indicate use of adopted materials and evidence of teacher internalization - The degree to which teachers are a) using assessments from common core-aligned curriculum and b) administering nationally-normed assessments that provide a broad gauge of student progress and gaps - The degree to which effective collaborative structures are in place for teachers to a) internalize units and lessons, b) look at student work, and c) engage in shared content-specific learning - The degree to which PD a) is effectively designed and b) includes a mix of schoolwide and content-specific training - The degree to which observation feedback a) is clear and actionable and b) includes opportunities for teachers to receive feedback specific to the content and/or curriculum 	<p><u>Quality of instructional quality reviews</u> Classroom observations accurately assess and provide sufficient evidence for some or none of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Whether or not adopted curriculum is in use (and if in use, the degree to which teachers have internalized it) - The degree to which texts and tasks reflect grade level rigor - The degree to which students carry the cognitive load - Strength of classroom culture/ management <p>Artifact analysis accurately assesses and provides sufficient evidence for some or none of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The degree to which the school system's curricula for core content areas align with college and career ready standards - The degree to which sample lessons indicate use of adopted materials and evidence of teacher internalization - The degree to which teachers are a) using assessments from common core-aligned curriculum and b) administering nationally-normed assessments that provide a broad gauge of student progress and gaps - The degree to which effective collaborative structures are in place for teachers to a) internalize units and lessons, b) look at student work, and c) engage in shared content-specific learning - The degree to which PD a) is effectively designed and b) includes a mix of schoolwide and content-specific training - The degree to which observation feedback a) is clear and actionable and b) includes opportunities for teachers to receive feedback specific to the content and/or curriculum



Strong School Systems Strategic Planning Strategic Plan Guidance

	3: Meets expectations	2: Approaching expectations	1: Emergent
	<p><u>Attention to equity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis of performance data usually disaggregates performance data by race or class or learning needs. - Analysis of constituents perspectives disaggregates responses by race. - Classroom observations usually assess the equity of teacher-student interactions - Diagnostic headlines pull out all or almost all of the equity implications of the analyses described above. 	<p><u>Attention to equity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis of performance data sometimes disaggregates performance data by race or class or learning needs. - Classroom observations sometimes assess the equity of teacher-student interactions - Diagnostic headlines pull out most of the equity implications of the analyses described above. 	<p><u>Attention to equity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Analysis of performance data rarely disaggregates performance data by race or class or learning needs. - Analysis of constituents perspectives does not disaggregate responses by race - Classroom observations rarely assess the equity of teacher-student interactions - Diagnostic headlines pull out some of the equity implications of the analyses described above
Aspirations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SteerCo has defined clear aspirations for the system that completely answer the question: What do we want to be true about our district in 5 years in terms of: Our graduates' capabilities, our students' academic and SEL outcomes, equity, academics, student culture, family engagement, adult culture, and operations and finance? - There is ample evidence that the SteerCo's aspirations are consistent with constituents' perspectives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is limited evidence that the SteerCo's aspirations are consistent with constituents' perspectives 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SteerCo has not defined clear aspirations for the system that completely answer the question: What do we want to be true about our district in 5 years in terms of: Our graduates' capabilities, our students' academic and SEL outcomes, equity, academics, student culture, family engagement, adult culture, and operations and finance?
Mission measures and targets	<p><u>Quality of measures</u></p> <p>More than half of the measures earn High ratings in both of these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Validity -- the extent to which the measure meaningfully assesses the mission-level aspiration - Clarity -- the extent to which the measure is broadly familiar and understandable to the diverse constituents your system serves <p><u>Readiness and comparability of measures</u></p> <p>More than half of the measures earn High ratings in both of these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Readiness -- the extent to which the system has collected historical data on the measure, and reliable data continues to be available on a timely basis (and when not High, then a data readiness plan is included) - Comparability -- the extent to which local and/ or national benchmarks exist for the measure <p><u>Alignment of measures</u></p> <p>At least three of the LDOE's six "Critical Goals" are directly represented in the system's measures</p> <p><u>Prioritization of measures</u></p> <p>There are fewer than eight mission measures</p>	<p><u>Quality of measures</u></p> <p>Some of the measures earn High ratings in both of these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Validity -- the extent to which the measure meaningfully assesses the mission-level aspiration - Clarity -- the extent to which the measure is broadly familiar and understandable to the diverse constituents your system serves <p><u>Readiness and comparability of measures</u></p> <p>Some of the measures earn High ratings in both of these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Readiness -- the extent to which the system has collected historical data on the measure, and reliable data continues to be available on a timely basis (and when not High, then a data readiness plan is included) - Comparability -- the extent to which local and/ or national benchmarks exist for the measure <p><u>Alignment of measures</u></p> <p>1-2 of LDOE's "Critical Goals" are directly represented in the system's measures</p> <p><u>Prioritization of measures</u></p> <p>There are 8-9 mission measures</p>	<p><u>Quality of measures</u></p> <p>Some or few of the measures earn High ratings in both of these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Validity -- the extent to which the measure meaningfully assesses the mission-level aspiration - Clarity -- the extent to which the measure is broadly familiar and understandable to the diverse constituents your system serves <p><u>Readiness and comparability of measures</u></p> <p>Few of the measures earn High ratings in both of these areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Readiness -- the extent to which the system has collected historical data on the measure, and reliable data continues to be available on a timely basis - Comparability -- the extent to which local and/ or national benchmarks exist for the measure <p><u>Alignment of measures</u></p> <p>None of the system's measures are directly represented in LDOE's six "Critical Goals"</p> <p><u>Prioritization of measures</u></p> <p>There are 10 or more mission measures</p>



Strong School Systems Strategic Planning Strategic Plan Guidance

	3: Meets expectations	2: Approaching expectations	1: Emergent
	<p><u>Approach to target-setting</u> The system has used one or both of these methods to set targets for all or almost all of its measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Used historical data to forecast a baseline for the next 5 years - Identified a benchmark for improvement or absolute performance 	<p><u>Approach to target-setting</u> The system has used one or both of these methods to set targets for more than half of its measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Used historical data to forecast a baseline for the next 5 years - Identified a benchmark for improvement or absolute performance 	<p><u>Approach to target-setting</u> The system has used one or both of these methods to set targets for some or few of its measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Used historical data to forecast a baseline for the next 5 years - Identified a benchmark for improvement or absolute performance
	<p><u>Quality of targets</u> The following is true of all or almost all measures with historical data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 5-year target is bold - The 5-year target is attainable - There is a trajectory of annual targets 	<p><u>Quality of targets</u> The following is true of more than half of the measures with historical data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 5-year target is bold - The 5-year target is attainable - There is a trajectory of annual targets 	<p><u>Quality of targets</u> The following is true of few or no measures with historical data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The 5-year target is bold - The 5-year target is attainable - There is a trajectory of annual targets
Decision-making rights	<p><u>Role of the center</u> - The plan identifies the role (Strategic Architect, Strategic Operator, or Full Operator) that the central office will play in the near future</p>		<p><u>Role of the center</u> - The plan identifies the role (Strategic Architect, Strategic Operator, or Full Operator) that the central office will play in the near future</p>
	<p><u>Decision-making rights</u> - ≥ 10 decisions identified as most problematic in the survey are now codified</p>		<p><u>Decision-making rights</u> - < 10 decisions identified as most problematic in the survey are now codified</p>
Strategic plan's clarity	<p><u>Organization</u> - The plan's areas of focus and work to be done are described via an organizational structure with three levels: Priorities, Initiatives, and Deliverables (for Y1-Y2 initiatives) - All or almost all items at a given level are defined at approximately the same grain size (e.g., any two initiatives describe work at about the same level)</p>	<p><u>Organization</u> - Most items at a given level are defined at approximately the same grain size.</p>	<p><u>Organization</u> - The plan is described via an organizational structure with 1-2 levels. - Few items at a given level are defined at approximately the same grain size.</p>
	<p><u>Descriptive clarity</u> - All or almost all priorities, initiatives, and deliverables clearly and precisely describe the work to be done (not a goal or a topic), so that someone outside the system could read them and understand what work is intended. - All or almost all priorities, initiatives, and deliverables are mutually exclusive at their respective levels - All or almost all deliverables are observable (i.e., someone could answer Y or N to the question, "was this done?")</p>	<p><u>Descriptive clarity</u> - Most priorities, initiatives and deliverables clearly and precisely describe the work to be done; some require context to understand, or may be goals instead of describing the work - Most priorities, initiatives, and deliverables are mutually exclusive at their respective levels - Most deliverables are observable (i.e., someone could answer Y or N to the question, "was this done?")</p>	<p><u>Descriptive clarity</u> - Few priorities, initiatives, and deliverables clearly and precisely describe the work to be done; many require context to understand, or may be topics or goals - Few priorities, initiatives, and deliverables are mutually exclusive at their respective levels - Few deliverables are observable (i.e., someone could answer Y or N to the question, "was this done?")</p>



Strong School Systems Strategic Planning Strategic Plan Guidance

	3: Meets expectations	2: Approaching expectations	1: Emergent
Strategic plan's responsiveness	<p><u>Alignment</u> - All or almost all priorities and initiatives are aligned with current strengths and opportunities revealed by the diagnostic.</p>	<p><u>Alignment</u> - Most of the priorities and initiatives are aligned with the strengths and opportunities revealed by the diagnostic.</p>	<p><u>Alignment</u> - The priorities and initiatives do not appear to be aligned with the strengths and opportunities revealed by the diagnostic; they could be written about most school systems</p>
	<p><u>Research basis</u> - All or almost all of the following essential practices are represented in the strategic plan, or were found by the diagnostic to already be areas of strength for the system: 1a-c, 2a, 2c, 3a, 4a, 4d</p>	<p><u>Research basis</u> - Most of the following essential practices are represented in the strategic plan, or were found by the diagnostic to already be areas of strength for the system: 1a-c, 2a-c, 3a, 4a, 4d</p>	<p><u>Research basis</u> - Some or few of the following essential practices are represented in the strategic plan, or were found by the diagnostic to already be areas of strength for the system: 1a-c, 2a-c, 3a, 4a, 4d</p>
Strategic plan's scope	<p><u>Priorities</u> There are 4-6 priorities.</p>		<p><u>Priorities</u> There are more than six priorities, or fewer than four priorities named</p>
	<p><u>Initiatives</u> - Initiatives are scoped and sequenced over multiple years. - There are a manageable number of initiatives each year.</p>	<p><u>Initiatives</u> - Initiatives are scoped and sequenced over multiple years. - There is an unmanageable amount of work intended for one or more years.</p>	<p><u>Initiatives</u> - Initiatives are not scoped and sequenced over multiple years (instead, it appears that they will all be implemented simultaneously).</p>
	<p><u>Deliverables</u> - All or almost all Y1-2 initiatives have fewer than 12 deliverables each - All or almost all Y1-2 initiatives' deliverables are "collectively exhaustive" -- they describe all of the work to be done</p>	<p><u>Deliverables</u> - Most initiatives have fewer than 12 deliverables each - Most initiative's deliverables are "collectively exhaustive"</p>	<p><u>Deliverables</u> - Some or few initiatives have fewer than 12 deliverables each (or lack deliverables entirely) - Some or few initiatives' deliverables are "collectively exhaustive"</p>
Allocation of resources	<p><u>Y1 PD calendar</u> - All or almost all PD topics are clearly and precisely described, so that someone outside the system could read them and understand what training is intended - PD topics address all of the trainings described by Y1 deliverables - All or almost all of the following are identified for all or almost all of the PD topics that support the strategic plan: a) PD planner, b) PD audience, c) mode, d) dates, and e) number of days required - The number of days available for staff and leader PD meets or exceeds the number of days required for PD topics that support the strategic plan</p>	<p><u>Y1 PD calendar</u> - Most PD topics are clearly and precisely described, so that someone outside the system could read them and understand what training is intended - PD topics address most of the trainings described by Y1 deliverables - Most of the following are identified for most of the PD topics that support the strategic plan: a) PD planner, b) PD audience, c) mode, d) dates, and e) number of days required</p>	<p><u>Y1 PD calendar</u> - Some or few PD topics are clearly and precisely described, so that someone outside the system could read them and understand what training is intended - PD topics address some or few of the trainings described by Y1 deliverables - Some or few of the following are identified for some or few of the PD topics that support the strategic plan: a) PD planner, b) PD audience, c) mode, d) dates, and e) number of days required - The number of days available for staff and leader PD is less than the number of days required for PD topics that support the strategic plan, OR the latter number is not calculated</p>



Strong School Systems Strategic Planning Strategic Plan Guidance

	3: Meets expectations	2: Approaching expectations	1: Emergent
	<p><u>Acquisition of capacity/ expertise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan identifies capacity/ expertise needs to implement all Y1 initiatives - The plan articulates the unique responsibilities envisioned for all new hires, stipended personnel, or TAs. 	<p><u>Acquisition of capacity/ expertise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan identifies capacity/ expertise needs to implement most Y1 initiatives - The plan articulates the unique responsibilities envisioned for most new hires, stipended personnel, or TAs. 	<p><u>Acquisition of capacity/ expertise</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The plan identifies capacity/ expertise needs to implement some or few Y1 initiatives - The plan articulates the unique responsibilities envisioned for some or few new hires, stipended personnel, or TAs.
	<p><u>Budget</u></p> <p>There is a budget that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides estimates of all required financial resources - Identifies the source of funding for every cost item - Confirms that sufficient funds are available, by source 	<p><u>Budget</u></p> <p>There is a budget that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides estimates of most required financial resources - Identifies the source of funding for most cost items 	<p><u>Budget</u></p> <p>There is a budget that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provides estimates of some or few required financial resources - Identifies the source of funding for some or few cost items - Does not confirm that sufficient funds are available, by source
	<p><u>Enabling initiatives</u></p> <p>The strategic plan includes at least one initiative that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will save leader or teacher time or money (and this is evident from the description of the initiative) - Is clearly and precisely described 	<p><u>Enabling initiatives</u></p> <p>The strategic plan includes at least one initiative that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Will save leader or teacher time or money (and this is evident from the description of the initiative) - Is not clearly and precisely described 	<p><u>Enabling initiatives</u></p> <p>The strategic plan does not include initiatives that will save leader or teacher time or money (at least as one can tell from the description of the initiative)</p>
Implementation plan (note: these rows do not apply to enabling initiatives)	<p><u>Responsibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All or almost all initiatives have a single Directly Responsible Individual ("DRI"). - All or almost all Y1-2 deliverables have a single DRI 	<p><u>Responsibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most initiatives have a single Directly Responsible Individual ("DRI"). - Most Y1-2 deliverables have a single DRI 	<p><u>Responsibility</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Few initiatives have a single Directly Responsible Individual ("DRI"). - Few Y1-2 deliverables have a single DRI
	<p><u>Timing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All or almost all Y1-2 deliverables have a start and end date - All or almost all action steps have a start and end date 	<p><u>Timing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most Y1-2 deliverables have a start and end date - All or almost all action steps have a start and end date 	<p><u>Timing</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Most Y1-2 deliverables have a start and end date - All or almost all action steps have a start and end date
	<p><u>Action steps</u></p> <p>All or almost all Y1 deliverables have 4-10 action steps, which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Represent the most important work to be done - Are observable - Are clearly and precisely described, so that someone outside the system could read it and understand what work is intended. 	<p><u>Action steps</u></p> <p>Most Y1 deliverables have 4-10 action steps, which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Represent the most important work to be done - Are observable - Are clearly and precisely described, so that someone outside the system could read it and understand what work is intended. 	<p><u>Action steps</u></p> <p>Few Y1 deliverables have 4-10 action steps, which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Represent the most important work to be done - Are observable - Are clearly and precisely described, so that someone outside the system could read it and understand what work is intended.



Strong School Systems
Strategic Planning Resource

Strong School Systems Strategic Planning Strategic Plan Guidance

	3: Meets expectations	2: Approaching expectations	1: Emergent
Communication	<u>Follow-up</u> - The communication plan provides for a face-to-face presentation with all of the following groups: School leaders, the Board, teachers, district staff, families, community groups, and students - The communication plan identifies all or almost all of the following for every group: Aims, Venues, Presenter, and Dates - The standing deck created for presentations includes all of the following components: a) Highlights and gaps from the diagnostic, b) Strategic priorities, c) Initiatives, and d) Mission measures and targets	<u>Follow-up</u> - The communication plan provides for a face-to-face presentation with all but one of the following groups: School leaders, the Board, teachers, district staff, families, community groups, and students - The communication plan identifies most of the following for every group: Aims, Venues, Presenter, and Dates - The standing deck created for presentations includes all but one of the following components: a) Highlights and gaps from the diagnostic, b) Strategic priorities, c) Initiatives, and d) Mission measures and targets	<u>Follow-up</u> - The communication plan provides for a face-to-face presentation with some of the following groups: School leaders, the Board, teachers, district staff, families, community groups, and students - The communication plan identifies some of the following for every group: Aims, Venues, Presenter, and Dates - The standing deck created for presentations includes some of the following components: a) Highlights and gaps from the diagnostic, b) Strategic priorities, c) Initiatives, and d) Mission measures and targets
Execution	- After 1 year, all or almost all targets for strategic priority measures were met.	- After 1 year, most targets for strategic priority measures were met.	- After 1 year, some or targets for strategic priority measures were met, OR - There were no strategic priority measures
Impact	<u>Performance</u> - After 3 years, all or almost all relevant mission targets were met	<u>Performance</u> - After 3 years, most relevant mission targets were met	<u>Performance</u> - After 3 years, few relevant mission targets were met