

## Appendix B, Charter Schools Implementing NM DASH Plans



**From:** [Martinez, Severo, PED](#)  
**To:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Cesar Chavez Community School - NM DASH Feedback Tool  
**Date:** Monday, January 08, 2018 4:01:08 PM

---

---

**From:** Tani Arness [mailto:tarness@cesarchavezcharter.net]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 07, 2017 4:17 PM  
**To:** Martinez, Severo, PED  
**Cc:** Connie Copeland; Southworth, Margaret, PED; Sandy Gladden  
**Subject:** RE: Cesar Chavez Community School - NM DASH Feedback Tool

Thanks, Severo. This is helpful feedback as I will be at DASH training tomorrow and can look at those areas again. I appreciate you replying so quickly. And, again, sorry about the draft mixup before.

My best,  
Tani

---

**From:** Martinez, Severo, PED [mailto:[Severo.Martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:Severo.Martinez@state.nm.us)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 07, 2017 3:45 PM  
**To:** Tani Arness  
**Cc:** Connie Copeland; Southworth, Margaret, PED; Sandy Gladden  
**Subject:** RE: Cesar Chavez Community School - NM DASH Feedback Tool

Good Afternoon,

I was able to re-review your plan and have rated it as followed:

Solid Progress- 14 Indicators  
Limited Progress-2  
Not Evident-0

Below is some feedback. Since I am on the road, I was unable to scan and send to you the complete feedback tool, I can do that when I am back in the office.

Step 4- Clear Hypothesis for Root Cause- As I read through your desired outcomes, it clearly articulates what your root causes should be. (Example, might look something like this for root cause: Tier I Core instruction- Teacher classroom practice does not allow for the use of student- generated and high level questioning and critical thinking activities that results in a lack of student motivation and engagement about class work and testing.

Please revisit the Root Cause for Tier I Core instruction keeping in mind what you have stated is your desired outcome.

Critical Actions Timelines and resources- Under Critical actions, timelines are too broad. The

time lengths are too long. Break down the critical actions even further.

**With the changes being made from your initial upload of your plan to PED, it now meets to criteria to be entered into NM DASH. If you address the above, it will only strengthen your plan!**

S

---

**From:** Tani Arness [<mailto:tarness@cesarchavezcharter.net>]  
**Sent:** Monday, November 06, 2017 5:32 PM  
**To:** PSB, PED, PED  
**Cc:** Pelayo, Icela, PED; Martinez, Severo, PED; DelRosario, Baylor, PED; Poulos, Katie, PED; Southworth, Margaret, PED  
**Subject:** RE: Cecar Chavez Community School - NM DASH Feedback Tool

Hi. Thank you for the feedback on our plan. I am embarrassed to say that as we were reading your comments about the areas that did not meet standards we realized that you had received the 2<sup>nd</sup> to last draft of our plan rather than our final draft of the plan. We apologize, it was a matter of clicking the wrong document out of a list of similar documents. We would like to provide you with the completed draft now. We believe the completed draft addresses the concerns noted in the feedback received. Also, Is this something that we should discuss with the person who reviewed our plan?

See Attached.

Thank you,

Tani Arness  
Executive Director/Principal  
Cesar Chavez Community School  
505-877-0558 ext. 102

---

**From:** PSB, PED, PED [<mailto:PED.PSB@state.nm.us>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 02, 2017 11:57 AM  
**To:** Tani Arness  
**Cc:** Pelayo, Icela, PED; Martinez, Severo, PED; DelRosario, Baylor, PED; Poulos, Katie, PED; Southworth, Margaret, PED  
**Subject:** Cecar Chavez Community School - NM DASH Feedback Tool

Good Moring,

Upon review of your 90 Day plan, it **has not met** the requirements for submission to the online NM Dash system (13 or greater indicators in solid progress, 3 or fewer in Limited Progress, and 0 not Evident).



Attached you will find the feedback tool with your ratings per step. The reviewer has included feedback on how to improve your plan. Please address the feedback that has been provided. If you would like a second review of your plan, once your plan has been changed, please submit it to Severo Martinez at [severo.martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:severo.martinez@state.nm.us) ASAP. Keep in mind you will not be receiving a login to NM DASH until your plan has met the requirements. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Severo Martinez at [severo.martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:severo.martinez@state.nm.us).

Best,

Patricia "Kitty" Montoya  
NMPED  
505-827-3671



**New Mexico 90-day Plan  
Offline Planning Process Workbook**

## **ANNUAL PLAN**

### Step 1 – Build Core Team

With district support, the school leader(s) identify critical members to bring together as a team to co-construct the school vision for dramatic change and establish a 90-day Plan that will increase achievement for all students.

### **Guiding Questions –**

- ✓ District Level:
  - To what extent does the district representative need to be involved in the planning process?
  - Should Core Teams look the same at every school?
- ✓ School Level:
  - To what extent does the Core Team represent diverse backgrounds and viewpoints, in order to consider challenges from many perspectives?
    - Are there representatives from across grade levels?
    - Is the group representative of the student body and community?
    - Is the Core Team the same as the school leadership team?
    - Are the strongest teacher-leaders on the Core Team?

### **Core Team Notes**

Team Member	Position	<u>Rationale:</u> What strengths/perspective does this person bring to the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school's current reality?
Sarah Jones	Social Worker	Sarah has a background in adolescent development and a deep understanding of the personal and out of school issues that affect student academic performance at CCCS. Sarah has worked at CCCS for 5 years with students grades 9-12. Sarah also works as a mentor and academic advocate for students at the school. She can help offer understanding of the "whole child."
Samantha Chavez	Registrar and STARS coordinator	Samantha is responsible for entering all student data and runs all STARS report. Her insight into student data and demographics adds to the data informed decision making process. Samantha also works as a mentor and academic advocate for students at the school.
David Lang	Math Teacher, Working on National Board Certification	David has worked at CCCS for 5 years as a Math teacher, grades 9-12. He is currently working on his National Board Certification. He has experience in traditionally A grade schools as well as our SAM school. He mentors students at



		the school. He offers a deeper understanding of statistics and student test data.
Roberta Griego	Reading and ELA Teacher, Bilingual in Spanish	Roberta is in her second year at CCCS teaching ELA and Reading, grades 9-12. Roberta is a native Spanish speaker. She works with our reading intervention program and mentors students at the school.
Tani Arness	Principal, Teacher, Executive Director	Tani has worked at CCCS for 12 years previously as a Registrar and STARS Coordinator and currently as a teacher, grades 9-12, as well as a Principal, Executive Director, and Superintendent. Tani is the school leader as well as district representative. Tani has over 16 years of experience working with marginalized youth in diverse cultures. She expresses a desire to meet the needs of the whole child while holding a high bar for rigor and growth for all students.
Nathan Everett	Teacher, Dean of Students	Nathan has worked at CCCS for 6 years. He has worked as Attendance Coordinator involving working with data and in-depth interventions with students and parents. He is currently a teacher, grades 9-12, and Dean of Students. He has insights into school-wide student culture and behavior.
Jess Lionne	Governance Council Member, Tenured Professor at CNM	Jess Lionne is has worked as a professor at CNM for the past 10 years. She has her Ph.D. in Philosophy. She sees students struggle with the transitions to college and offers insights into what is needed to help students be successful at the college level.
Laurie Ihm	Special Education Lead Teacher	Laurie Ihm has been a Special Education teacher at CCCS for 7 years, grades 9-12. She has worked with students with disabilities and gifted students for approximately 17 years. She has a deep understanding of students' needs, and modifications and supports needed to navigate special needs and support students in reaching their highest potential. She is unsure that PARCC can capture the growth of lowest performing students.

### Step 2 – Analyze Data & Set Student Achievement Goals

With the core team, analyze student achievement data (e.g. interim assessment results, common formative assessments, student work samples, summative results). Through deep data analysis and reflection, set summative student achievement goals for ELA and math. An optional third goal may be identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).

Once summative goals have been established, set benchmark goals to monitor progress toward summative goals. Benchmark goals should be clearly articulated in both ELA and math (and for an optional third goal), align with summative goals, and be connected to the most current interim or formative assessment data.



**Guiding Question** – Given the most recent student achievement data, what summative and benchmark goals will create a sense of focus and urgency towards action to increase student achievement?

### **Data Analysis Notes:**

The team looked at PARCC scores via grade levels and subgroups and decided that the best way to set goals was to set schoolwide goals rather than subgroup goals. This is because: a. CCCS combines all grade levels in Math and English Language Arts (ELA) classes. Students come to us with severe remedial learning needs and credit recovery needs. Therefore, grade levels (how many credits earned) do not correlate to academic skill levels. Therefore, as a small school with combined grades, we are setting schoolwide proficiency goals rather than arbitrarily breaking our goals down by student grade levels. b. Approximately 85% of CCCS are in Hispanic subgroup meaning that other race subgroups are too small (significantly less than 10 students) to show valid data. c. 90-100% of CCCS students are designated as “Free Lunch” meaning that, for CCCS, it is a whole group rather than a subgroup

ELL and Special Education subgroups are possible valid sources of information though often there are such small numbers of students (far below 10) in these subgroups on any particular test that the data is invalidated by small sample size or outliers. Also, due to the nature of our specific population with high remedial needs, there were not significant differences between student with disabilities and our general population in terms of percent of students at different levels. ELL subgroups are not tracked on the PARCC School Performance Level Summary.

All ELA teachers analyzed ELA PARCC scores, including longitudinal scores, individual student growth and Evidence Statement Analysis and School Content Standards Rosters deeply and noted that many students were not writing extended responses at all, getting 0 points on narrative writing questions (see below). The 15 points available for Narrative Writing make a very substantial impact when considering that the difference between a Level 1, Level 2, Level 3, and Level 4 score on PARCC is 25 points.

ELA 9: 34 of 48 students scored 0 of 15 points possible for Narrative Writing

ELA 10: 21 of 30 students scored 0 points of 15 points possible for Narrative Writing

ELA 11: 15 of 23 students scored 0 of 15 points possible for Narrative Writing

All Math teachers analyzed Math PARCC scores, including longitudinal scores, individual student growth and including Evidence Statement Analysis and School Content Standards Rosters deeply and noted that students were scoring markedly low in using modelling in Algebra and Geometry.

CCCS’ DASH Team is concerned that Short Cycle Assessments may not be properly aligned to PARCC to indicate correlating growth and success. It is reasonable that 1 year of growth on Short Cycle Assessments may indicate one level of growth on PARCC as long as students are willing to put effort into their PARCC attempt.

The specific needs and circumstances of our unique and particularly mobile population also means that students, on average, are at CCCS for approximately 1.3 years of their 4 year cohort (data derived from 4 year cohort data). Since this means that CCCS has a limited time to make a large impact on students, we believe that the goals below are especially ambitious.

### **Student Achievement Goals**



Grade/Subject Area	2015-16 PARCC Results	2016-17 PARCC Goals	<u>Benchmark Goals</u> : How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals?
<b>Grades 9-12/ELA</b>  *CCCS combines all grade levels in Math and English Language Arts (ELA) classes. This is because students come to us with severe remedial learning needs and credit recovery needs. Therefore, grade levels (how many credits earned) do not correlate to academic skill levels. Therefore, as a small school with combined grades, we are setting schoolwide proficiency goals rather than arbitrarily breaking our goals down by student grade levels.	14 of 169 (8%) Proficient 39 of 169 (23%) at 3+ 65 of 169 (38%) at Level 1 <b>2016/17 PARCC Results</b> 2 of 103 (2%) Proficient 29 of 103 (28%) at 3+ 55 of 103 (53%) at Level 1	<b>2017-18 PARCC Goals</b> 1. Reduce number of students scoring at Level 1 by 23%. Goal=No more than 30% of students at Level 1  2. Increase number of students at Levels 3 and above by 22%  Goal=at least 45% at Level 3 and above, with at least 10% at level 4 or 5.	CCCS tracks Short Cycle Assessment Data via The Houghton Mifflin Reading Inventory and STAR Math assessments.  Winter 2017 Scores will show an average of ½ year individual growth for all students.  Spring 2018 scores will show an average full school year of individual growth for all students.
<b>Grades 9-12/Math</b>  *CCCS combines all grade levels in Math and English Language Arts (ELA) classes. This is because students come to us with severe remedial learning needs and credit recovery needs. Therefore, grade levels (how many credits	<b>2015-16 PARCC Results</b> 2 of 98 (2%) Proficient 14 of 98 (14%) at 3+ 17 of 98 (18%) at Level 1 <b>2016/17 PARCC Results</b>	<b>2017-18 PARCC Goals</b> 1. Reduce number of students scoring at Level 1 by 31%. Goal=No more than 10% of students at Level 1	CCCS tracks Short Cycle Assessment Data via The Houghton-Mifflin Reading Inventory and STAR Math assessments.  Winter December, 2017 scores will show an average of ½ year expected growth for individual growth of all students. Goal= .5 Grade Equivalent on STAR Math. Goal=30 Lexile points on Houghton-Mifflin Reading Inventory  Spring April, 2018 scores will show on average expected full school year growth for individual growth of all students. Goal= 1 full Grade



earned) do not correlate to academic skill levels. Therefore, as a small school with combined grades, we are setting schoolwide proficiency goals rather than arbitrarily breaking our goals down by student grade levels.	2 of 112 (<2%) Proficient 18 of 112 (16%) at 3+ 46 of 112 (41%) at Level 1	2. Increase number of students at Levels 3 and above by 10% Goal=at least 26% at Level 3 and above, with at least 8% at level 4 or 5.	Equivalent on STAR Math. Goal=60 Lexile points on Houghton-Mifflin Reading Inventory.

Well-written goals help to set a bold, positive vision and establish a sense of urgency. They communicate and make visible to all stakeholders the intent of the plan.

**Guiding Question** – To what extent do summative and benchmark goals meet SMART criteria?

#### SMART Checklist

<b><u>Specific</u></b>	Is the goal clearly defined?	X
<b><u>Measurable</u></b>	Are concrete criteria identified for measuring progress toward attainment of the goal?	X
<b><u>Ambitious &amp; Attainable</u></b>	Does the goal stretch the school while still being attainable?	X
<b><u>Relevant</u></b>	Does the goal relate to student learning and achievement? Is it data-based?	X
<b><u>Time-bound</u></b>	Is the timeframe appropriate for accomplishment of the goal?	X



### Step 3 – Identify Focus Areas

Following deep data analysis and reflection on qualitative and quantitative evidence, the core team identifies the 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas that will increase student achievement for all students. Focus areas are best practices that will increase achievement for all students and narrow the scope for root cause analysis, desired outcomes, and critical actions.

Possible evidence sources to consider include: observation data (evaluative or non), lesson/unit plans, student surveys, interim assessment results, common formative assessment results, student work samples, summative results.

### **Focus Areas & Guiding Questions –**

#### *1. Standards Alignment*

All grade levels have identified essential standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- How do you ensure that the Tier I (core) curriculum and instruction is aligned with the CCSS and is being implemented with fidelity?
- Do you have a scope and sequence aligned to the CCSS?

#### *2. Tier I (core) instruction*

There is a dedicated block of time devoted to providing core instruction to all students aligned with grade level standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- What percent of your students are achieving grade-level expectations or making significant growth? If at least 80% are not attaining proficiency, what are you doing to ensure that your school is making significant progress toward this goal?
- What evidence do you have that the level of rigor of the tasks students perform during the lesson is aligned to the rigor of the CCSS?

#### *3. Data-driven instruction*

There is a precise, systematic approach to improving student learning throughout the year. The cycle of DDI includes assessment, analysis and action.

#### Guiding questions –

- Are the district's and school's assessment strategies firmly in place? (formative, interim, and summative)
- How do teachers and leadership analyze and act on assessment data?
- Do teacher action plans include focused and targeted whole-group, small-group, and individual interventions?





- How effectively does school leadership hold teachers accountable to ensure effective instructional adjustment, interventions, and instructional feedback?

#### 4. *Tier I interventions*

There are fluid, flexible interventions in place during Tier I (core) instruction for students not progressing as expected.

##### Guiding questions –

- How do you identify students in need of Tier I (core) interventions?
- How do you differentiate instruction based on the screening results, as well as the abilities and needs of all students in the core program?
- To what extent are Tier I (core) interventions successful in addressing student needs based on data?

#### 5. *Observation and feedback cycles*

Principal and other instructional leaders devote time daily to non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and provide face-to-face feedback to teachers in a timely manner.

##### Guiding questions –

- Are frequent and regular non-evaluative walkthroughs built into the leaders' schedules?
- Do leaders give face-to-face direct feedback to teachers focused on specific action steps for improvement?
- To what extent do leaders hold teachers accountable to translate feedback into practice?

#### 6. *Collaboration*

Teachers have time during the week to work together to promote student success.

##### Guiding questions –

- What evidence do you have that your teacher teams work together weekly to analyze data, share strategies, plan collaboratively, and debrief the outcomes of instruction?
- How do school leaders support and hold teacher teams accountable?

#### 7. *Ongoing, job embedded professional development*

Teacher professional development is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance student learning.

##### Guiding questions –

- Describe the process for identifying and providing job-embedded, ongoing, professional development informed by the teacher evaluation system.





- How is professional development for teachers tied to student needs as identified by assessment data?

#### *8. Tier II (SAT) process*

There is a system in place to provide strategic and individualized support to students for whom Tier I instruction and interventions have proven insufficient.

##### Guiding questions –

- What criteria does the SAT team use to identify students in need of TIER II support?
- To what extent are Tier II interventions successful at addressing skill gaps to allow students to master CCSS? What specific research-based interventions are provided?
- Is progress monitoring frequent enough to ensure fluidity and that the RtI process is working?

#### *9. School leadership and systems*

There is a school leadership framework that supports increasing and sustaining student achievement.

##### Guiding questions –

- Is there a school leadership team in place comprised of key instructional leaders?
- To what extent does the leadership team focus on data-driven instruction, observation and feedback, standards-aligned planning and instruction, and job-embedded professional development?

#### *10. School culture*

All students, staff and stakeholders are aware that student achievement is the top priority of school.

##### Guiding questions –

- Do students receive the continual message that nothing is as important or engaging as learning?
- How do consistent minute-by-minute systems and procedures support a student culture focused on achievement?
- How does leadership monitor and maintain a positive student and staff culture?



### Focus Areas

Focus Area: What are the 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas (best practices – see pp. 3-5) that must be addressed to reach the student achievement goals?	Data Connection: What data analysis led you to identify this focus area? What quantitative and qualitative data led you to this focus area?
<p><i>Tier I (core) instruction</i></p> <p>There is a dedicated block of time devoted to providing core instruction to all students aligned with grade level standards.</p> <p><u>Guiding questions –</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What percent of your students are achieving grade-level expectations or making significant growth? If at least 80% are not attaining proficiency, what are you doing to ensure that your school is making significant progress toward this goal?</li> <li>• What evidence do you have that the level of rigor of the tasks students perform during the lesson is aligned to the rigor of the CCSS?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Quantitative Evidence:</b> In 2016-17, approximately 2% of students scored proficient on Math and ELA PARCC. Approximately 16-28% of Students at Level 3 or above on Math and ELA PARCC.</p> <p>2016-17 Short Cycle Assessments show that students, grades 9-12, (we have only about 10% of students who enter our school as incoming freshman) enter our school at an average of a 6th grade level in Math and Reading with many entering below 6<sup>th</sup> grade level, and 0-2% of students entering at a level proficient for PARCC.</p> <p>Analysis of PARCC Content Standards Rosters show that 69.3% of CCCS students scored 0 of 15 points on the Narrative Writing assessment part of 2016-17 PARCC ELA 9-11, indicating that these students chose not to write at all.</p> <p>Student surveys score teachers highly receiving 40.5 out of 50 points on a Likert scale and 4.5 out of 5 points available for student surveys in the 2017 School Grade. Consistently high scores in every category indicates that teachers are using best practices in the classroom and connecting well with students.</p> <p>NMTEACH evaluation analysis shows that in 2016-17 only three out of 12 teachers scored a 4 in the category of Using Questioning and Discussion Techniques to support Classroom Discourse (3B)</p> <p><b>Qualitative Evidence:</b> Teachers observe and track student skills in classrooms and know that students struggle with very limited vocabulary, low academic stamina and gaps of knowledge (often from missing a lot of school).</p>



	<p>Teachers have noted that they feel they spend too much time on fundamental basic skills and don't succeed often enough in getting students to delve deeply into higher levels of thinking.</p> <p>All teachers have noted that students resist thinking deeply about a subject. They say comments like "what do you want me to put down?" expressing a desire to just get something done rather than connect and think deeply about a topic or problem.</p>
<p><i>School culture</i></p> <p>All students, staff and stakeholders are aware that student achievement is the top priority of school.</p> <p><u>Guiding questions</u> –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do students receive the continual message that nothing is as important or engaging as learning?</li> <li>• How do consistent minute-by-minute systems and procedures support a student culture focused on achievement?</li> <li>• How does leadership monitor and maintain a positive student and staff culture?</li> </ul>	<p><b>Quantitative Evidence:</b> Student surveys score teachers highly receiving 40.5 out of 50 points on a Likert scale and 4.5 out of 5 points available for student surveys in the 2017 School Grade. Consistently high scores in every category indicates that teachers are using best practices in the classroom and connecting well with students.</p> <p>Analysis of PARCC Content Standards Rosters show that 69.3% of CCCS students scored 0 of 15 points on the Narrative Writing assessment part of 2016-17 PARCC ELA 9-11, indicating that these students chose not to write at all.</p> <p><b>Qualitative Evidence:</b> All teachers observed that students are frequently focused on problems happening outside of school and often show an inability or unwillingness to focus in class. Teachers observe signs of students often feeling unmotivated or disconnected to school curriculum.</p> <p>All teachers observed students giving up easily in the classroom, wanting to rush through an assignment and hurry up and get it done, or refuse to work at all because they are "tired" or "don't feel like it."</p> <p>Teachers and mentors often hear students making disparaging comments about their own academic abilities, expressing "it's too hard" or "I'm not good at x."</p>



	<p>Teachers have observed students taking PARCC, and have noted that many students give up on the PARCC test, get tired, skim long readings, guess at answers and refuse to write extended responses.</p> <p>Teachers have observed that some school staff have a “let’s hurry up and get this over with” mentality regarding PARCC.</p>
--	--



#### Step 4 – Conduct Root Cause Analysis

After identifying 2-3 high-leverage focus areas, the core team engages in thoughtful root cause analysis to zero in on the deepest underlying cause or causes of school performance challenges that, if resolved, result in elimination or substantial reduction of the performance challenge.

Resources: Fishbone template, 5 Whys Guidance, Role Play Script

#### **Guiding Questions –**

- What do you believe is at the heart of the problem for this focus area?
- What qualitative and quantitative evidence do you have to support this hypothesis?
- Would the problem/challenge have occurred if that cause had not been present?
- If the cause is corrected, will the problem/challenge reoccur?

<b>Root Cause Analysis Notes</b>		
<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Root Cause Hypothesis</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
<b><i>School culture</i></b>	<b>Root Cause Hypothesis:</b> Team believes root cause is a lack of student motivation/caring about class work and testing.	<p><b>Quantitative:</b> High student absenteeism (average of 70-73% daily attendance). Student absentee excuses (gathered from Attendance notes) are most often related to: illness, family emergency, not wanting to get up and go to school, mental health issues, transportation issues, legal issues, and addiction issues (many of these issues get interconnected).</p> <p>2016-17 transcript analysis shows that students transfer to CCCS with an average of 8 F's already on their report card.</p> <p>Student surveys score teachers highly receiving 40.5 out of 50 points on a Likert scale and 4.5 out of 5 points available for student surveys in the 2017 School Grade. Consistently high scores in every category indicates that teachers are using best practices in the classroom and connecting well with students.</p> <p>Analysis of PARCC Content Standards</p>



<p><i>School culture</i></p>		<p>Rosters show that 69.3% of CCCS students scored 0 of 15 points on the Narrative Writing assessment part of 2016-17 PARCC ELA 9-11, indicating that these students chose not to write at all.</p> <p><b>Qualitative:</b>          Teachers have analyzed short cycle assessment growth and PARCC growth for every individual student. Staff hypothesize that students who are connected to school, want to be there, are fully engaged in classes, and say they “care” about their test scores show more growth.</p> <p>Many students express not feeling they <i>can</i> succeed and teachers believe this is connected to not wanting to engage fully.</p> <p>Many students express having other things on their mind, being upset about personal issues and insist they cannot or don’t want to learn or focus on schoolwork.</p> <p>Teachers believe these personal struggles are generally beyond the school’s control, but the school can teach positive Habits of Mind that will help build students’ resilience, required to show academic growth in the face of external problems.</p> <p>Teachers have observed that students who are not growing are not motivated or connected. Many give up easily and seek the fastest, easiest way to complete a task or don’t complete the task at all.</p> <p>Teachers observe students not wanting to participate in class activities, refusing to try on “hard” assignments.</p>
------------------------------	--	---



### ***Tier I (core) instruction***



		<p>Many students express not feeling they <i>can</i> succeed and teachers believe this is connected to not wanting to engage full effort on “difficult” work.</p> <p>Teachers have observed that not every student is engaged and working at their most challenging level and is not showing expected academic growth. Teachers have observed many students expressing disinterest in engaging fully in the classroom learning activities.</p> <p>Team believes this is related to teachers’ struggle to motivate and challenge every student. Staff have expressed this is due to teachers uncertainty in how to best teach missing foundational skills and knowledge and still integrate student generated questions and high-level thinking demands in the classroom.</p> <p>Team believes that increased use of high level questioning and critical thinking activities will increase student learning, internal motivation, and stamina for thinking deeply about a subject or problem.</p>
<b><u>0-DAY PLAN</u></b>		

### Step 5 – Create Desired Outcomes & Define Critical Actions

#### *Create Desired Outcomes:*

Based on each thoughtful root cause analysis, the core team creates a 90-day Desired Outcome for each focus area. Specifically, the team identifies the **change in adult behaviors** that will create focus and urgency towards action that would logically result in increased student achievement in math and reading.

#### **Guiding Questions for Setting Desired Outcomes –**

- What specific outcome do you want? What change in adult behaviors will be observable by the end of 90 days?
- How will you know when you have reached this goal? What will be different if you are successful in focusing on this area of practice? After 90 days, what changes in practice will be observed?





Desired Outcomes	
Focus Area	Draft Desired Outcome ( <i>change in adult behaviors</i> )
<i>Tier I (core) instruction</i>	All teachers will increase internal motivation by providing core instruction that is rigorous and relevant. Teachers will demonstrate regular use of student-generated and high-level questioning and critical thinking activities in their classes, in order to build critical thinking, student stamina for thinking deeply, and students' internal motivation.
<i>School culture</i>	All Teachers will promote a culture of persistence and growth mindset through planned growth-mindset lessons and revised rubrics and grading scales focusing on specific, measured goals working toward higher levels of student persistence and movement from a more fixed to more of a growth mindset.

### Define Critical Actions:

After identifying the desired outcomes (change in adult behaviors), the core team determines the critical actions that will promote a sense of urgency toward addressing root cause(s) and achieving each desire outcome.

### Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Options) –

- What are some possible ways to achieve...?
- What will you do to move yourself closer to the goal?
- What have you done in similar situations in the past?
- What is something you have never tried?
- What else?

### Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Decisions) –

- Which would be most impactful?
- What exactly will you do?
- Who will be involved? How are critical actions strategically owned by various school/district individuals?
- What obstacles do you need to address in order to get this done?
- What support/resources will you need to make this happen?

**Focus Area:** *Tier I (core) instruction*

**Desired Outcome:** All teachers will increase internal motivation by providing core instruction that is rigorous and relevant. Teachers will demonstrate regular use of student-generated and high-level questioning and critical thinking activities in their classes, in order to build critical thinking, student stamina for thinking deeply, and students' internal motivation.

### CRITICAL ACTIONS



<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
10-16-17 And 1-2-18	Professional Development In-Service day planning, 10-16-17 and 1-2-18. Teachers will use protocols to Analyze and practice use of High-Level Questioning in the classroom.	1. Depths of Knowledge Wheel 2. Lesson using Protocol for scaffolding and analyzing levels of classroom questioning	Tani A. Laurie B. Dave L. Brian B. Planning and Leading in-service	All instructional staff
4-2-18	In-Service Day planning. Teachers will evaluate NMDASH goals and processes for effectiveness and Next Steps	1. All Critical Action Data gathered 2. Protocol to evaluate all critical action data and next steps	Tani A. Laurie B. Dave L. Brian B. Planning and Leading in-service	All Staff
October, 2017-April, 2018	Formal Teacher Evaluations to monitor Teachers' use of high-level questioning and critical thinking.	1. NMTEACH rubric and evaluation forms 2. Depths of Knowledge Wheel	Tani A. Tina B. doing Teacher Evals	All Teachers
October, 2017-April, 2018	All Bi-weekly staff meetings will require a teachers to bring in a classroom question for discussion and analysis. Specific classroom questioning from that week will be debriefed, discussed and celebrated.	1. Staff Meeting Agendas 2. Staff Meeting Minutes 3. Book: "Mindset" by Carol S. Dweck 4. Khanacademy.org 5. Trevor Ragan, "GM, What it is, How it works, Why it Matters"	1. Tani A. Staff Mtg Agendas 2. Sam C. Staff Mtg. Minutes 3. All Teachers for classroom lessons and resources	All Instructional Staff

**Focus Area:** *School culture*

**Desired Outcome:** All Teachers will promote a culture of persistence and growth mindset through planned growth-mindset lessons and revised rubrics and grading scales focusing on specific, measured goals working toward higher levels of



<b>CRITICAL ACTIONS</b>				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
December, 2017-May, 2018	Every teacher in every class will facilitate at least one lesson/activity per month focused on a persistence or growth mindset.	1. Persistence and growth mindset lesson plans/activities. 2. Growth mindset quiz 3. Book: "Mindset" by Carol S. Dweck 4. Khanacademy.org 5. Trevor Ragan, "GM, What it is, How it works, Why it Matters"	All Teachers for Classroom lessons and resources	All instructional staff
December, 2017-May, 2018	Every teacher will integrate persistence and/or growth mindset points into their rubric on at least one extended class project/assignment per quarter.	1. Persistence rubric 2. Growth mindset quiz 3. Growth mindset rubric 4. Book: "Mindset" by Carol S. Dweck 5. Khanacademy.org 6. Trevor Ragan, "GM, What it is, How it works, Why it Matters"	All Teachers for Classroom lessons and resources	All instructional staff
December, 2017-May, 2018	All Bi-weekly staff meetings will schedule a time to debrief, discuss and celebrate a habit of mind lesson.	1. Staff Mtg. Agenda 2. Staff Mtg. Minutes	1. Tani A. Agendas 2. Sam C. Minutes 3. All Teachers to report out	All instructional staff

### Step 6 – Monitor Implementation



After creating a desired outcome for each focus area and defining the critical actions, the core team strategically selects progress indicators – the metrics and evidence that will be used to measure progress toward the desired outcomes and goals. The core team identifies how the plan might be adjusted due to accelerated progress and unanticipated barriers.

### Guiding Questions –

- What are the metrics, feedback, observations, etc. the core team will use to determine progress toward the desired outcome? What is the evidence of progress?
- How will you know the critical actions are having a positive impact?
- How might the plan be adjusted due to accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers?

<b>Focus Area:</b> <i>Tier I (core) instruction</i>				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> All teachers will demonstrate regular use of student-generated and high-level questioning and critical thinking activities in their classes, in order to build critical thinking, student stamina for thinking deeply, and students' internal motivation.				
<b>CRITICAL ACTIONS</b>				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.				
<b>PROGRESS INDICATORS</b>				
<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>		
4-3-18	Agenda and plan from 10-16-17 In-Service Agenda and plan from 1-2-18 In-Service Agenda and Notes from 4-3-18			
March 23, 2018	Staff meeting minutes will indicate the debrief, discussion and/or celebration of a high-level questioning and/or critical thinking in a classroom	If staff are not showing consistent implementation of goals, lesson plans will be turned in to show implementation.		
May 30, 2018	All teachers have been evaluated at least two times in Critical Questioning using the NMTEACH rubric and have discussed this evaluation with the evaluator,	Goals in this area may shift per individual teacher.		

<b>Focus Area:</b> <i>School culture</i>
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> All Teachers will promote a culture of persistence and growth mindset through planned growth-mindset lessons and revised rubrics and grading scales focusing on specific, measured



goals working toward higher levels of

### CRITICAL ACTIONS

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
-----------------	--	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.

### PROGRESS INDICATORS

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
March 23, 2018	Staff meeting minutes will indicate teachers debriefed, discussed and/or celebrated at least one lesson/activity per month focused on a persistence or growth mindset.	If staff are not showing consistent implementation of goals, lesson plans will be turned in to show implementation.
March 23, 2018	Every teacher has turned in/shared their rubric integrating persistence and/or growth mindset points into at least one extended class project/assignment per quarter.	Rubrics may shift over time as effectiveness is evaluated.

### System to Monitor Implementation –

The core team clearly details a system to monitor implementation of the plan including a procedure, timelines, and person(s) responsible.

### Guiding Questions –

- How will the core team systematize implementation and monitoring of the plan?
- What is the procedure? What are the timelines? Who is responsible?

### System to Monitor Implementation

<i>Procedure</i>	<i>Timelines</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>
NMDASH Core Team will continue to meet throughout the year to monitor implementation and effectiveness of goals and timelines.	NMDASH Scheduled Meetings: 11/17/17, 1/26/18, 3/9/18, 3/23/18, 5/4/18	Sarah J., Tani A. Dave L., Nate E. Jess L., Laurie I. Roberta G., Sam C.



NM PED Calibration Review  
Date: 10/30/17  
Reviewer Code: 002

## New Mexico 90-day Plan Offline Planning Process Workbook Feedback Tool

District: CCCS  
School:  
Date:  
Completed By:

To enter into DASH...		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
13 or greater/ of 16	3 or fewer of 16	0

Your plan (as reviewed by your district designee):		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident

PED review:		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
8	5	3

### Overall comment:

The PED reviewer finds that this Offline Planning Process Workbook has 10 indicators Solid Progress, 3 Limited Progress, and 3 Not Evident. The plan does not meet the minimum criteria of 13 or greater of 16 indicators Solid Progress and no Not Evident. Please consider the feedback provided below each indicator rated less than Solid Progress when creating the Spring 2018 90-day Plan. Spring 2018 90-day Plans will be due online in early January 2018.

### NM PED Reviewer comments in RED

<b>Step 1 – Build Core Team</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Diverse backgrounds and viewpoints NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders likely to bring different viewpoints to discussions and a clear rationale for selection is provided.	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders and a rationale for selection is provided.	The core team consists of principal, district representative, and/or teachers or instructional leaders. A rationale for selection may or may not be provided.	Shows lack of attempt or action <b>OR</b> No district representative is identified.

Representation <sup>1</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	The core team has <b>full representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	The core team has representation from <b>two of the following</b> : across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and</b> community.	The core team has <b>limited representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and/or</b> community.	Shows lack of attempt or action
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------

**Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:**

Core team reflects all school stakeholders.

<b>Step 2 – Analyze Data &amp; Set Student Achievement Goals</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Summative goals NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	In addition to the indicators for solid progress, <b>an optional third goal has been identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in both ELA <b>and</b> math <b>using the most recent available baseline data.</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Benchmark goals <sup>2</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to the <b>most current interim assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are <b>clearly</b> articulated in both ELA and math, <b>align with summative goals, and are connected to interim or formative assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress <b>are articulated</b> in both ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Ambitious & Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria <b>and create a sense of focus and urgency towards action.</b>	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>all</b> SMART criteria.	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>4 or fewer</b> SMART criteria.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 2 Reflections and Feedback:**

Summative and benchmark goals are written to meet SMART criteria. Your analysis of data is clearly articulated in both ELA and Math. It might be helpful to include a chart of PARCC scores and Short Cycle Assessment scores to allow a reviewer a better understanding of your analysis. It would be a helpful reference when reading the narrative.

<sup>1</sup> Title I schools shall assure meaningful input and involvement of stakeholders listed in Section 1118(b)(2) of ESSA Guidance

<sup>2</sup> For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://ped.state.nm.us/assessmentaccountability/assessmentevaluation/2015/Test%20Graph%202016.pdf>



<b>Step 3 – Focus Areas</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
High leverage and aligned <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	The 2-3 <b>highest-leverage</b> focus areas selected are aligned to <b>deep</b> data analysis and include qualitative and quantitative evidence.	The 2-3 focus areas selected are <b>aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative evidence.</b>	2-3 focus areas <b>are selected.</b>	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 3 Reflections and Feedback:**

CCCS identified 2 focus areas that are aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and quantitative evidence.

<b>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Clear hypothesis <b>NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress</b>	Each focus area has a clear hypothesis of the <b>deepest</b> underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges <b>that will result in a substantial reduction of the performance challenge.</b>	<b>Each</b> focus area has a <b>clear</b> hypothesis of the <b>underlying root cause</b> or causes of school performance challenges.	<b>Some or all</b> of the focus areas <b>have a hypothesis</b> of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Evidence to support <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and quantitative data <b>and are supported by evidence.</b>	Root causes seem to have been <b>generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data.</b>	Root causes are identified, but <b>are not connected</b> to data analysis.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 4 Reflections and Feedback:**

Root Cause Hypothesis notes are “observations” regarding the root cause. CCCS might consider for the School Culture Focus Area...“Lack of student engagement/motivation in the instructional setting” as the root cause. Root cause is NOT what is needed or observations about the issue...it is the largest hurdle or barrier to increasing student achievement. The “need” and “observation” discussions are necessary, but for future DASH planning, please consider a very succinct and targeted statement.

For Tier I (core) Instruction Focus Area...suggested wording might be, “Lack of instructional rigor and relevance within core subjects.” Evidence to Support for both Focus Areas is excellent.

<b>Step 5 – Desired Outcomes &amp; Critical Actions</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – observable changes in adult behavior  <b>NM PED Review Determination:</b>	Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying the specific observable change(s) in adult behaviors, <b>which creates focus and urgency toward action.</b>	<b>Each focus area has</b> a 90-day desired outcome <b>identifying specific observable change(s)</b> in adult behavior.	Desired outcomes <b>do not</b> identify specific observable changes in adult behavior.	Shows lack of attempt or action



Limited Progress				
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – specific focus on student achievement  <b>NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress</b>	Each desired outcome is specific in focus and <b>should logically result in</b> increased student achievement.	<b>Each</b> desired outcome is <b>specific</b> and <b>there is a clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	The desired outcomes <b>lack specificity</b> about the observable changes in adult behavior. There is <b>no clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – sense of urgency toward action  <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	For each focus area, critical actions <b>promote a sense of urgency toward</b> addressing root cause(s) and achieving the desired outcome.	<b>For each focus area</b> , critical actions <b>address clear underlying root cause(s)</b> and <b>are connected to</b> achieving the desired outcome.	It is <b>not clear</b> how critical actions will result in achieving the desired outcome in 90 days.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – person(s) responsible for completing actions  <b>NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress</b>	Responsibility for action items are <b>strategically owned</b> by various school/district individuals.	<b>Each</b> critical action <b>identifies</b> a person responsible.	It is <b>not clear</b> who is responsible for completing each critical action.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – timelines and resources  <b>NM PED Review Determination: Limited progress</b>	All critical actions have a clear timeline and identify resources needed to support them, <b>including funding sources</b> .	<b>All</b> critical actions have a <b>clear</b> timeline and identify resources needed to support them.	Critical actions <b>do not identify</b> timelines and/or needed resources.	Shows lack of attempt or action

#### **Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:**

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Desired Outcomes: Observable changes in adult behavior: CCCS has listed several “options” for teachers to choose from in Tier I instruction but have not identified specifically what adults will be doing differently in 90 days CCCS might consider “envisioning” what effective instructors will look like in 90 days....i.e., “CCCS teachers will provide core instruction that is rigorous and relevant.” Much of what is contained in the submitted Desired Outcomes is actually Critical Actions leading to the outcome.

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Critical Actions-person(s) responsible for completing actions: All outcomes require identification of person(s) responsible.

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Critical Actions-timelines and resources: All critical action must have timelines and resources. Example: CCCS might consider a script for teachers to use when interviewing students. OR CCCS teachers will use a specific curriculum or model for teaching a “habit of mind” so that the message is consistent.

<b><u>Step 6 – Monitor Implementation</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Progress Indicators <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: No evidence</b>	<b>Strategically selected</b> progress indicators identify the metrics and evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>All</b> progress indicators <b>identify the metrics and evidence</b> used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>Some</b> progress indicators have been identified, and they <b>may or may not include</b> metrics or evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Potential Adjustments to the 90-day Plan <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: No evidence</b>	For <b>all</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>and</b> unanticipated barriers.	For <b>most</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers.	For <b>some</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>or</b> unanticipated barriers.	Shows lack of attempt or action
System to Monitor <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: No evidence</b>	The system to monitor implementation <b>clearly details</b> the procedure, timelines, and persons responsible.	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.</b>	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies one or more of the following:</b> the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.	Shows lack of attempt or action

#### **Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:**

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Progress Indicators: all progress indicators must identify the metrics and evidence that will be used to measure progress towards the desired outcome.

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Potential Adjustments to the 90-day plan: expectations for potential adjustments and/or unanticipated barriers are to be identified.

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator System to Monitor: no system has been identified.

It appears to the reviewer that CCCS did not finish the workbook. The work done on the first part of the workbook indicated that CCCS understands the significance of this process and has started a comprehensive plan for improvement.

CCCS, please consider using the 30/60/90 day reflective guides available on DASH resource site to help focus monthly core team meetings.



## New Mexico 90-day Plan Offline Planning Process Workbook Feedback Tool

District: Cesar Chavez  
Community School  
School: Cesar Chavez  
Community School  
Date: 10-15-17  
Completed By: Jess Lionne

To enter into DASH...		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
13 or greater/16	3 or fewer/16	0

Your plan:		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
16	0	0

<u>Step 1 – Build Core Team</u>	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
Diverse backgrounds and viewpoints	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders <b>likely to bring different viewpoints to discussions</b> and a <b>clear</b> rationale for selection is provided.	<b>In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders and a rationale for selection is provided.</b>	The core team <b>consists of principal, district representative, and/or teachers or instructional leaders</b> . A rationale for selection <b>may or may not</b> be provided.	Shows lack of attempt or action <b>OR</b> No district representative is identified.
Representation <sup>1</sup>	The core team has <b>full representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	<b>The core team has representation from two of the following: across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.</b>	The core team has <b>limited representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and/or</b> community.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:** Solid Progress on step one. Team has diverse backgrounds, represents all grade levels and different aspects of our school community are reflected (bilingual). Governance council member is a community representative as well as district level.

<u>Step 2 – Analyze Data &amp; Set Student Achievement Goals</u>	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
--	-----------	----------------	------------------	-------------

<sup>1</sup> Title I schools shall assure meaningful input and involvement of stakeholders listed in Section 1118(b)(2) of ESSA Guidance

Summative goals	In addition to the indicators for solid progress, <b>an optional third goal has been identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in both ELA and math <b>using the most recent available baseline data.</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Benchmark goals <sup>2</sup>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to the <b>most current interim assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are <b>clearly</b> articulated in both ELA and math, <b>align with summative goals, and are connected to interim or formative assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress <b>are articulated</b> in both ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Ambitious & Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria <b>and create a sense of focus and urgency towards action.</b>	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>all SMART criteria.</b>	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>4 or fewer</b> SMART criteria.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 2 Reflections and Feedback:** Solid Progress on step 2. Measurable summative goals have been identified for ELA and Math using most recent baseline data (2016-17 PARCC). Benchmark goals are clearly articulated in ELA and Math and connected to Short Cycle Interim data.

<b><u>Step 3 – Focus Areas</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
High leverage and aligned	The 2-3 <b>highest-leverage</b> focus areas selected are aligned to <b>deep</b> data analysis and include qualitative <b>and</b> quantitative evidence.	The 2-3 focus areas selected are <b>aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative evidence.</b>	2-3 focus areas <b>are selected.</b>	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 3 Reflections and Feedback:** Solid Progress on Step 3. Team chose 2 leverage areas (Tier One Instruction and School Culture) at length and informed discussion using multiple layers of qualitative and quantitative evidence.

<b><u>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Clear hypothesis	Each focus area has a clear hypothesis of the <b>deepest</b> underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges <b>that will result in a substantial reduction of the performance challenge.</b>	Each focus area has a <b>clear</b> hypothesis of the <b>underlying root cause</b> or causes of school performance challenges.	<b>Some or all</b> of the focus areas <b>have a hypothesis</b> of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action

<sup>2</sup> For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://ped.state.nm.us/assessmentaccountability/assessmentevaluation/2015/Test%20Graph%202016.pdf>

Evidence to support	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and quantitative data and are supported by evidence.	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data.	Root causes are identified, but <b>are not connected</b> to data analysis.	Shows lack of attempt or action
---------------------	---	--	--	---------------------------------

**Step 4 Reflections and Feedback:** Exemplary on Step 4. Team generated a clear hypothesis of underlying root cause at deep level including thoughtful analysis of qualitative and quantitative evidence. Entire team contributed to in-depth discussion and analysis.

<u>Step 5 – Desired Outcomes &amp; Critical Actions</u>	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – observable changes in adult behavior	Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying the specific observable change(s) in adult behaviors, <b>which creates focus and urgency toward action.</b>	<b>Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying specific observable change(s) in adult behavior.</b>	Desired outcomes <b>do not</b> identify specific observable changes in adult behavior.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – specific focus on student achievement	Each desired outcome is specific in focus and <b>should logically result in</b> increased student achievement.	<b>Each desired outcome is specific and there is a clear connection between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.</b>	The desired outcomes <b>lack specificity</b> about the observable changes in adult behavior. There is <b>no clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – sense of urgency toward action	For each focus area, critical actions <b>promote a sense of urgency toward</b> addressing root cause(s) and achieving the desired outcome.	<b>For each focus area, critical actions address clear underlying root cause(s) and are connected to achieving the desired outcome.</b>	It is <b>not clear</b> how critical actions will result in achieving the desired outcome in 90 days.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – person(s) responsible for completing actions	Responsibility for action items are <b>strategically owned</b> by various school/district individuals.	<b>Each critical action identifies a person responsible.</b>	It is <b>not clear</b> who is responsible for completing each critical action.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – timelines and resources	All critical actions have a clear timeline and identify resources needed to support them, <b>including funding sources.</b>	<b>All critical actions have a clear timeline and identify resources needed to support them.</b>	Critical actions <b>do not identify</b> timelines and/or needed resources.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:** Solid Progress on Step 5. Each focus area has identified observable behaviors for adults. There is a connection between desired outcome and increase in student achievement and a clearly identified sequence of actions for all instructional staff to take in and out of the classroom. Persons responsible, timeline, and resources are clearly identified.

<b><u>Step 6 - Monitor Implementation</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Progress Indicators	<b>Strategically selected</b> progress indicators identify the metrics and evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>All</b> progress indicators <b>identify the metrics and evidence</b> used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>Some</b> progress indicators have been identified, and they <b>may or may not include</b> metrics or evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Potential Adjustments to the 90-day Plan	For <b>all</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>and</b> unanticipated barriers.	For <b>most</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers.	For <b>some</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>or</b> unanticipated barriers.	Shows lack of attempt or action
System to Monitor	The system to monitor implementation <b>clearly details</b> the procedure, timelines, and persons responsible.	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.</b>	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies one or more of the following:</b> the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<b><u>Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:</u> Solid Progress for Step 6. Metrics and evidence are collected and assessed as per timeline. Real-time adjustments can be made if the staff meeting debriefings indicate that satisfactory progress is not being made.</b>				



**From:** [Martinez, Severo, PED](#)  
**To:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Revised NM Dash Plan  
**Date:** Thursday, January 04, 2018 10:51:55 AM

---

---

**From:** Melissa Miranda [mailto:mmiranda@ladh.org]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 07, 2017 3:45 PM  
**To:** Martinez, Severo, PED  
**Subject:** RE: Revised NM Dash Plan

Mr. Martinez,

Thank you very much for your feedback!! I appreciate your quick response!!!

Melissa

---

**From:** Martinez, Severo, PED [mailto:Severo.Martinez@state.nm.us]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 7, 2017 3:33 PM  
**To:** Miranda, Melissa  
**Cc:** Connie Copeland; Sandy Gladden; Southworth, Margaret, PED  
**Subject:** RE: Revised NM Dash Plan

Good Afternoon,

I was able to re-review your plan and have rated it as followed:

Solid Progress- 14 Indicators  
Limited Progress-2  
Not Evident-0

Below is some feedback. Since I am on the road, I was unable to scan and send to you the complete feedback tool, I can do that when I am back in the office.

Step 2 Benchmark Goals- Keep in mind that benchmark goals are a data point that should be a predictor of how students will do on the summative assessment. You have provided Istation data and looking at BOY, MOY and EOY. It would be best to look at MOY to MOY progress from year to year. This will be data you can analyze and see before the students take PARCC.

Step 5- Desired Outcomes- These have met solid progress but think they can still be worked on. For Tier I Core instruction, the first sentence of your desired outcomes is a solution. That can be omitted as that goes into the critical actions.

Data Driven instruction- I would omit the first sentence of your desired outcome and bring the last sentence to the beginning.



Step 5- Critical Actions- Sense of Urgency toward Action

Critical actions can be more specific. The times frames are many months where I believe many more critical actions are taking place and just not listed.

With the changes being made from your initial upload of your plan to PED, it now meets to criteria to be entered into NM DASH.

Severo

---

**From:** Melissa Miranda [<mailto:mmiranda@ladh.org>]

**Sent:** Tuesday, November 07, 2017 12:40 PM

**To:** Martinez, Severo, PED

**Subject:** Revised NM Dash Plan

Good afternoon Mr. Martinez,

I have attached our revised Dash plan. Will you please review it and provide additional feedback? LADH would really appreciate it.

Thank you,

*Melissa A. Miranda*

*La Academia Dolores Huerta*

*1480 N. Main St.*

*Las Cruces, NM 88005*

*Phone (575)526-2984 Fax (575) 523-5407*



**New Mexico 90-day Plan  
Offline Planning Process Workbook**

## **ANNUAL PLAN**

### Step 1 – Build Core Team

With district support, the school leader(s) identify critical members to bring together as a team to co-construct the school vision for dramatic change and establish a 90-day Plan that will increase achievement for all students.

### **Guiding Questions –**

- ✓ District Level:
  - To what extent does the district representative need to be involved in the planning process?
  - Should Core Teams look the same at every school?
- ✓ School Level:
  - To what extent does the Core Team represent diverse backgrounds and viewpoints, in order to consider challenges from many perspectives?
    - Are there representatives from across grade levels?
    - Is the group representative of the student body and community?
    - Is the Core Team the same as the school leadership team?
    - Are the strongest teacher-leaders on the Core Team?

### **Core Team Notes**

Team Member	Position	<u>Rationale:</u> What strengths/perspective does this person bring to the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school's current reality?
Melissa Miranda	Interim Head Administrator	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interim head administrator (July 11, 2017)</li> <li>• Special Education Director (3 years)</li> <li>• Currently attending NMSU</li> <li>• Special Education Teacher (14 years)</li> <li>• </li> <li>• Ms. Miranda is the interim head administrator. In addition to this position, Ms. Miranda also serves as the Special Education Director. Therefore, Ms. Miranda can provide an administrative and special education perspective to the team.</li> </ul>
Steve Pereira	Governing Council President	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pursuing doctoral degree in psychology</li> <li>• Works with some students of LADH</li> <li>• Community member</li> <li>• Mr. Pereira is the governing council president. Mr.</li> </ul>



		Pereira is pursuing his doctoral degree at New Mexico State University. Therefore, in addition to providing his perspective as a GC member, he can also provide a perspective as a student and a community member.
Chris Bardey	Art Teacher	Mr. Bardey is an art teacher at LADH who has experience teaching various grade levels. Mr. Bardey is also part of the leadership team and is viewed as a leader not only by his colleagues but also by the office and administrative staff. Mr. Bardey has served as a governing board member for an art depot.
Jose Brito	Math Teacher	Mr. Brito is a math teacher who teaches all grade levels (6 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup> Grade) who was also a teacher in Mexico. Therefore, Mr. Brito can contribute a perspective that others cannot, teaching in another country and at the university level. In addition to teaching math, Mr. Brito is also part of the SAT team.
Ruben Diaz	Science Teacher	Mr. Diaz is a (6 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup> Grade) science teacher who has attended numerous professional development trainings throughout the country. Mr. Diaz also attended Teach for America and has experience working with various educators across the country. Mr. Diaz is also a team member who is part of the leadership team and is a valuable member of LADH.
Kerri Pettes	Language Arts/Bilingual Teacher & Director	Mrs. Pettes is a bilingual teacher and provides bilingual services to students in 6 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup> Grade, including English Language Development to ensure students receive the services to continue to progress toward grade level curriculum. Mrs. Pettes is an endorsed bilingual and TESOL teacher. Therefore, Mrs. Pettes' perspective particular in bilingual education will assist in developing the 90 day plan.
Kevin Rendon	Conjunto/Norteño (Music) Teacher	Mr. Rendon is a new staff member to LADH. Mr. Rendon provides music instruction to students in grades 6 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup> Grade. Mr. Rendon also is a musician in the community. Therefore, Mr. Rendon can provide information to the team as a member of the community, but can also provide a perspective as a new staff member that the team may have overlooked.
Terry Tavarez	Language Arts & Social Studies Teacher/Testing Coordinator/Special Education Teacher	Ms. Tavarez is a special education teacher and provides special education services in the area of language arts to students in 6 <sup>th</sup> -8 <sup>th</sup> Grade. Ms. Tavarez is also the 6 <sup>th</sup> Grade social studies teacher. In addition, Ms. Tavarez is the testing coordinator and can provide input regarding both data and special education to the team.



Mirna Rodriguez	Business Specialist/Parent	Mrs. Rodriguez is the business specialist at LADH and also has a child who is currently attending LADH. Therefore, Mrs. Rodriguez can contribute to the team a parent/community perspective.
Dalia Gallegos	Secretary/Former Student	Mrs. Gallegos is the school secretary who previously attended LADH. Therefore, Mrs. Gallegos can provide a student body perspective as a former student of LADH.

### Step 2 – Analyze Data & Set Student Achievement Goals

With the core team, analyze student achievement data (e.g. interim assessment results, common formative assessments, student work samples, summative results). Through deep data analysis and reflection, set summative student achievement goals for ELA and math. An optional third goal may be identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).

Once summative goals have been established, set benchmark goals to monitor progress toward summative goals. Benchmark goals should be clearly articulated in both ELA and math (and for an optional third goal), align with summative goals, and be connected to the most current interim or formative assessment data.

**Guiding Question** – Given the most recent student achievement data, what summative and benchmark goals will create a sense of focus and urgency towards action to increase student achievement?

Student Achievement Goals			
Grade/Subject Area	2017 PARCC Results	2018 PARCC Goals	<u>Benchmark Goals</u> : Comparing BOY, MOY, & EOY <b>istation</b> Tier 1 (on grade level) data from 2017-2018 school year
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	0.2% Proficient	10.2% Proficient	Increase from 32% in Tier 1 to 47%
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	0.2% Proficient	10.2% Proficient	Increase from 58% in Tier 1 to 73%
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	17% Proficient	27% Proficient	Increase from 61% in Tier 1 to 76%
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	0% Proficient	10% Proficient	Increase from 15% in Tier 1 to 30%
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	0.3% Proficient	10.3% Proficient	Increase from 9% in Tier 1 to 24%
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	0% Proficient	10% Proficient	Increase from 17% in Tier 1 to 32%

Well-written goals help to set a bold, positive vision and establish a sense of urgency. They communicate and make visible to all stakeholders the intent of the plan.

**Guiding Question** – To what extent do summative and benchmark goals meet SMART criteria?

**SMART Checklist**

<b><u>S</u>pecific</b>	Is the goal clearly defined?	
<b><u>M</u>easurable</b>	Are concrete criteria identified for measuring progress toward attainment of the goal?	
<b><u>A</u>mbitious &amp; <u>A</u>ttainable</b>	Does the goal stretch the school while still being attainable?	
<b><u>R</u>elevant</b>	Does the goal relate to student learning and achievement? Is it data-based?	
<b><u>T</u>ime-bound</b>	Is the timeframe appropriate for accomplishment of the goal?	



### Step 3 – Identify Focus Areas

Following deep data analysis and reflection on qualitative and quantitative evidence, the core team identifies the 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas that will increase student achievement for all students. Focus areas are best practices that will increase achievement for all students and narrow the scope for root cause analysis, desired outcomes, and critical actions.

Possible evidence sources to consider include: observation data (evaluative or non), lesson/unit plans, student surveys, interim assessment results, common formative assessment results, student work samples, summative results.

### **Focus Areas & Guiding Questions –**

#### *1. Standards Alignment*

All grade levels have identified essential standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- How do you ensure that the Tier I (core) curriculum and instruction is aligned with the CCSS and is being implemented with fidelity?
- Do you have a scope and sequence aligned to the CCSS?

#### *2. Tier I (core) instruction*

There is a dedicated block of time devoted to providing core instruction to all students aligned with grade level standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- What percent of your students are achieving grade-level expectations or making significant growth? If at least 80% are not attaining proficiency, what are you doing to ensure that your school is making significant progress toward this goal?
- What evidence do you have that the level of rigor of the tasks students perform during the lesson is aligned to the rigor of the CCSS?

#### *3. Data-driven instruction*

There is a precise, systematic approach to improving student learning throughout the year. The cycle of DDI includes assessment, analysis and action.

#### Guiding questions –

- Are the district's and school's assessment strategies firmly in place? (formative, interim, and summative)
- How do teachers and leadership analyze and act on assessment data?
- Do teacher action plans include focused and targeted whole-group, small-group, and individual interventions?



- How effectively does school leadership hold teachers accountable to ensure effective instructional adjustment, interventions, and instructional feedback?

#### 4. *Tier I interventions*

There are fluid, flexible interventions in place during Tier I (core) instruction for students not progressing as expected.

##### Guiding questions –

- How do you identify students in need of Tier I (core) interventions?
- How do you differentiate instruction based on the screening results, as well as the abilities and needs of all students in the core program?
- To what extent are Tier I (core) interventions successful in addressing student needs based on data?

#### 5. *Observation and feedback cycles*

Principal and other instructional leaders devote time daily to non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and provide face-to-face feedback to teachers in a timely manner.

##### Guiding questions –

- Are frequent and regular non-evaluative walkthroughs built into the leaders' schedules?
- Do leaders give face-to-face direct feedback to teachers focused on specific action steps for improvement?
- To what extent do leaders hold teachers accountable to translate feedback into practice?

#### 6. *Collaboration*

Teachers have time during the week to work together to promote student success.

##### Guiding questions –

- What evidence do you have that your teacher teams work together weekly to analyze data, share strategies, plan collaboratively, and debrief the outcomes of instruction?
- How do school leaders support and hold teacher teams accountable?

#### 7. *Ongoing, job embedded professional development*

Teacher professional development is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance student learning.

##### Guiding questions –

- Describe the process for identifying and providing job-embedded, ongoing, professional development informed by the teacher evaluation system.



- How is professional development for teachers tied to student needs as identified by assessment data?

#### *8. Tier II (SAT) process*

There is a system in place to provide strategic and individualized support to students for whom Tier I instruction and interventions have proven insufficient.

##### Guiding questions –

- What criteria does the SAT team use to identify students in need of TIER II support?
- To what extent are Tier II interventions successful at addressing skill gaps to allow students to master CCSS? What specific research-based interventions are provided?
- Is progress monitoring frequent enough to ensure fluidity and that the RtI process is working?

#### *9. School leadership and systems*

There is a school leadership framework that supports increasing and sustaining student achievement.

##### Guiding questions –

- Is there a school leadership team in place comprised of key instructional leaders?
- To what extent does the leadership team focus on data-driven instruction, observation and feedback, standards-aligned planning and instruction, and job-embedded professional development?

#### *10. School culture*

All students, staff and stakeholders are aware that student achievement is the top priority of school.

##### Guiding questions –

- Do students receive the continual message that nothing is as important or engaging as learning?
- How do consistent minute-by-minute systems and procedures support a student culture focused on achievement?
- How does leadership monitor and maintain a positive student and staff culture?





### Focus Areas

<i>Focus Area:</i> What are the 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas (best practices – see pp. 3-5) that must be addressed to reach the student achievement goals?	<i>Data Connection:</i> What data analysis led you to identify this focus area? What quantitative and qualitative data led you to this focus area?
Tier 1 Instruction	<p>Tier 1 curriculum &amp; instruction is not aligned and with CCSS and is not being implemented with fidelity</p> <p>Teacher instructing same content/grade level (curriculum) are providing varied instruction and are not aligned to CCSS and curriculum</p> <p>Based on PARCC data more than 80% of students are not proficient in both ELA and Math</p>
Data-driven Instruction	<p>No PLCs in place to analyze data</p> <p>Over half of the teachers are not using data to guide instruction</p> <p>F grade for students on grade level, school growth, growth of highest AND lowest performing students on 2017 School Grade Report Card (down from previous year, 2016)</p>



#### Step 4 – Conduct Root Cause Analysis

After identifying 2-3 high-leverage focus areas, the core team engages in thoughtful root cause analysis to zero in on the deepest underlying cause or causes of school performance challenges that, if resolved, result in elimination or substantial reduction of the performance challenge.

Resources: Fishbone template, 5 Whys Guidance, Role Play Script

#### **Guiding Questions –**

- What do you believe is at the heart of the problem for this focus area?
- What qualitative and quantitative evidence do you have to support this hypothesis?
- Would the problem/challenge have occurred if that cause had not been present?
- If the cause is corrected, will the problem/challenge reoccur?

<b>Root Cause Analysis Notes</b>		
<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Root Cause Hypothesis</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
Tier 1 instruction	Instruction is not aligned to CCSS; therefore, there is no common expectation for instruction	Teachers have never received PD in scope and sequence; therefore, teachers have not been utilizing the scope in sequence to provide the students with common instruction to address CCSS. No common lesson plan No common lesson plan template
Data-driven Instruction	No short cycle assessments were in place for the 2016-2017 school year.	Teacher did not analyze or utilize common data to guide instruction because there were no short cycle assessments in place at LADH for the 2016-2017. PLCs to analyze data were not conducted in the 2016-2017 school year.



## 90-DAY PLAN

### Step 5 – Create Desired Outcomes & Define Critical Actions

#### *Create Desired Outcomes:*

Based on each thoughtful root cause analysis, the core team creates a 90-day Desired Outcome for each focus area. Specifically, the team identifies the ***change in adult behaviors*** that will create focus and urgency towards action that would logically result in increased student achievement in math and reading.

#### **Guiding Questions for Setting Desired Outcomes –**

- What specific outcome do you want? What change in adult behaviors will be observable by the end of 90 days?
- How will you know when you have reached this goal? What will be different if you are successful in focusing on this area of practice? After 90 days, what changes in practice will be observed?

<b>Desired Outcomes</b>	
<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Draft Desired Outcome (<u>change in adult behaviors</u>)</i>
Tier I (Core Instruction)	Core teachers will receive on-going professional development in sheltered language instruction. Teachers will implement strategies learned to enhance instruction. Teachers will implement sheltered instruction strategies with fidelity.
Data-driven Instruction	Teachers will utilize data to drive instruction. In addition, teachers will create individual data folders for each student. Teachers will collect data and analyze data to enhance instruction.

#### *Define Critical Actions:*

After identifying the desired outcomes (change in adult behaviors), the core team determines the critical actions that will promote a sense of urgency toward addressing root cause(s) and achieving each desired outcome.

#### **Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Options) –**

- What are some possible ways to achieve...?
- What will you do to move yourself closer to the goal?
- What have you done in similar situations in the past?
- What is something you have never tried?
- What else?

#### **Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Decisions) –**



- Which would be most impactful?
- What exactly will you do?
- Who will be involved? How are critical actions strategically owned by various school/district individuals?
- What obstacles do you need to address in order to get this done?
- What support/resources will you need to make this happen?

<b>Focus Area:</b> Tier I (Core Instruction)				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Core teachers will receive on-going professional development in sheltered language instruction. Teachers will implement strategies learned to enhance instruction				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>	<i>Persons Responsible</i>
9/25/17	Core teachers attended a professional development training regarding sheltered language instruction	Sheltered Instruction Language Instructor	Teachers Principal Sheltered Instruction Language Instructor	Teachers Principal Sheltered Instruction Language Instructor
9/25/17-12/19/17	Core teachers will participate in book study and collaborate with teachers including teacher from another district to improve student success, modify & improve instruction and improve teacher practices	Canvas Book: Making Content Comprehensible for English Learners: The SIOP Model	Teachers Principal Sheltered Instruction Language Instructor	Teachers Principal Sheltered Instruction Language Instructor
9/25/17-12/19/17	Teachers will implement sheltered language strategies as demonstrated by teacher observations, classroom walk throughs, lesson plans, and student progress	Observation & Classroom walk through feedback, lesson plans, student assessments	Teachers Principal	Teachers Principal



<b>Focus Area:</b> Data-driven Instruction				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Teachers will utilize Istation data to drive instruction (modify and/or reteach lessons, provide intervention, student groups, etc). In addition, teachers will create individual data folders for each student. Teachers will collect data and analyze data to enhance instruction.				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>	<i>Persons Responsible</i>
August 2017	Conduct assessment to determine students' baseline in Language Arts & Math	Istation Schedule Calendar	Teachers Principal Testing Coordinator	Teachers Principal Testing Coordinator
By 9/1/17	Teachers will analyze initial Istation assessment.	Istation results	Teachers	Teachers
9/5/17-12/19/17	Teachers will collect & analyze data after every unit completed to address & enhance instruction as demonstrated by student progress toward standards and student assessments	Data folders Assessment results	Teachers Principal Testing Coordinator	Teachers Principal
11/3/17	Teachers will create individual student data folders.	Data folders Assessment results	Teachers Principal Testing Coordinator	Teachers Principal
11/3/17-12/19/17	Review data in student folders monthly (after Istation assessments) and facilitate data analysis meetings biweekly with teachers to address students' needs, modify lessons, and utilize various strategies to increase student achievement as demonstrated by student assessments.	Data folders Assessment results	Teachers Principal Testing Coordinator	Teachers Principal

### Step 6 – Monitor Implementation



After creating a desired outcome for each focus area and defining the critical actions, the core team strategically selects progress indicators – the metrics and evidence that will be used to measure progress toward the desired outcomes and goals. The core team identifies how the plan might be adjusted due to accelerated progress and unanticipated barriers.

### Guiding Questions –

- What are the metrics, feedback, observations, etc. the core team will use to determine progress toward the desired outcome? What is the evidence of progress?
- How will you know the critical actions are having a positive impact?
- How might the plan be adjusted due to accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers?

Focus Area: Tier I (Core Instruction)		
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Core teachers will receive on-going professional development in sheltered language instruction. Teachers will implement strategies learned to improve teacher practices and enhance instruction.		
PROGRESS INDICATORS		
Indicator Date	Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals	Potential Adjustments
9/25/17	Teachers attend professional development	n/a
Monthly	Teachers participation in Canvas discussion and collaboration with teacher Sheltered language strategies will be implemented as documented in teacher observations/classroom walk throughs/lesson plans	Provide support/mentoring/coaching to teachers who are not implementing strategies or are struggling

Focus Area: Data-driven Instruction		
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Teachers will utilize Istation data to improve and/or modify instruction. In addition, teachers will create individual data folders for each student and collect data to analyze. The information obtained from the data will be used to improve teacher practices and to enhance instruction.		
CRITICAL ACTIONS PROGRESS INDICATORS		
Indicator Date	Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals	Potential Adjustments
August 2017	Istations Initial Assessments Completed	n/a
11/2/17	Complete Data Folders	n/a
11/2/17-5/18/17	Teachers will analyze data monthly and use data to guide instruction as documented in teachers observations/walk throughs/lesson plans	Provide support/mentoring/coaching to teacher who are struggling



### *System to Monitor Implementation –*

The core team clearly details a system to monitor implementation of the plan including a procedure, timelines, and person(s) responsible.

### **Guiding Questions –**

- How will the core team systematize implementation and monitoring of the plan?
- What is the procedure? What are the timelines? Who is responsible?

### **System to Monitor Implementation**

#### **Biweekly Site Visits:**

During observations/classroom walkthroughs, the principal and team will discuss progress on 90-day Plan, trends from observations/walkthroughs, and pattern from observations during leadership meetings.

#### **Monthly Update Meetings:**

The team will meet monthly to revisit the plan and progress indicators and reflect upon evidence that critical actions are having a positive impact toward achieving desired outcomes and summative/benchmark goals. The team will make any necessary adjustments to the 90-day Plan.

#### **Mid-Year Meetings:**

At the end of the first 90-day Plan, the Core Team will facilitate a staff meeting to identify lessons learned, progress made, and generate input for the next semester's 90-day Plan.

**From:** [PSB, PED, PED](#)  
**To:** [Miranda, Melissa](#)  
**Cc:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [Martinez, Severo, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#); [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#)  
**Subject:** La Academia Dolores Huerta - NM DASH Feedback Tool  
**Date:** Thursday, November 02, 2017 12:12:52 PM  
**Attachments:** [LADH Feedback Tool.docx](#)

---

Good Afternoon,

Upon review of your 90 Day plan, it **has not met** the requirements for submission to the online NM Dash system (13 or greater indicators in solid progress, 3 or fewer in Limited Progress, and 0 not Evident).

Attached you will find the feedback tool with your ratings per step. The reviewer has included feedback on how to improve your plan. Please address the feedback that has been provided. If you would like a second review of your plan, once your plan has been changed, please submit it to Severo Martinez at [severo.martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:severo.martinez@state.nm.us) ASAP. Keep in mind you will not be receiving a login to NM DASH until your plan has met the requirements. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Severo Martinez at [severo.martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:severo.martinez@state.nm.us).

Best,

Patricia "Kitty" Montoya  
NMPED  
505-827-3671





NM PED Calibration Review  
Date: 10/26/17  
Reviewer Code: 002

## New Mexico 90-day Plan Offline Planning Process Workbook Feedback Tool

District: LADH  
School:  
Date:  
Completed By:

To enter into DASH...		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
13 or greater/ of 16	3 or fewer of 16	0

Your plan (as reviewed by your district designee):		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident

PED review:		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
9	6	1

### Overall comment:

A PED reviewer has reviewed this plan and finds that this Offline Planning Process Workbook has 9 indicators Solid Progress, 6 Limited Progress, and 1 Not Evident. The plan does not meet the minimum criteria of 13 or greater of 16 indicators Solid Progress and no Not Evident. Please consider the feedback provided below each indicator rated less than Solid Progress when creating the Spring 2018 90-day Plan. Spring 2018 90-day Plans will be due online in early January 2018.

### NM PED Reviewer comments in RED

<b>Step 1 – Build Core Team</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Diverse backgrounds and viewpoints NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders likely to bring different viewpoints to discussions and a clear rationale for selection is provided.	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders and a rationale for selection is provided.	The core team consists of principal, district representative, and/or teachers or instructional leaders. A rationale for selection may or may not be provided.	Shows lack of attempt or action <b>OR</b> No district representative is identified.

Representation <sup>1</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	The core team has <b>full representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	The core team has representation from <b>two of the following</b> : across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and</b> community.	The core team has <b>limited representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and/or</b> community.	Shows lack of attempt or action
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------

**Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:**

Core team reflects all school stakeholders. LADH, in the development of future 90-day plans, might consider using a bulleted format with objective experience and educational descriptors as with the rationale for Ms. Miranda and Mr. Pereira.

<b>Step 2 – Analyze Data &amp; Set Student Achievement Goals</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Summative goals NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	In addition to the indicators for solid progress, <b>an optional third goal has been identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in both ELA <b>and</b> math <b>using the most recent available baseline data.</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Benchmark goals <sup>2</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to the <b>most current interim assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are <b>clearly</b> articulated in both ELA and math, <b>align with summative goals, and are connected to interim or formative assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress <b>are articulated</b> in both ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Ambitious & Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria <b>and create a sense of focus and urgency towards action.</b>	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>all</b> SMART criteria.	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>4 or fewer</b> SMART criteria.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 2 Reflections and Feedback:**

While LADH identified summative student achievement goals using PARCC data, consideration for other data such as short-term assessment data, student work samples, common formative assessments and EOC data to assist in development of SMART goals.

<sup>1</sup> Title I schools shall assure meaningful input and involvement of stakeholders listed in Section 1118(b)(2) of ESSA Guidance

<sup>2</sup> For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://ped.state.nm.us/assessmentaccountability/assessmentevaluation/2015/Test%20Graph%202016.pdf>

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook indicator for Benchmark goals: LADH might consider identifying the BOY, MOY and EOY dates and target scores to provide teachers with expectations throughout the year. Scores throughout the school year provide teachers with information to drive instruction, provide RtI, re-teach, and/or other interventions.

<b>Step 3 – Focus Areas</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
High leverage and aligned <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	The 2-3 <b>highest-leverage</b> focus areas selected are aligned to <b>deep</b> data analysis and include qualitative <b>and</b> quantitative evidence.	The 2-3 focus areas selected are <b>aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative evidence.</b>	2-3 focus areas <b>are selected.</b>	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 3 Reflections and Feedback:**

Focus Areas are aligned to data but contains mostly qualitative evidence. Quantitative data will help drive further development of goals.

<b>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Clear hypothesis <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each focus area has a clear hypothesis of the <b>deepest</b> underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges <b>that will result in a substantial reduction of the performance challenge.</b>	<b>Each</b> focus area has a <b>clear</b> hypothesis of the <b>underlying root cause</b> or causes of school performance challenges.	<b>Some or all</b> of the focus areas <b>have a hypothesis</b> of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Evidence to support <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative <b>and</b> quantitative data <b>and are supported by evidence.</b>	Root causes seem to have been <b>generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data.</b>	Root causes are identified, but <b>are not connected</b> to data analysis.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 4 Reflections and Feedback:**

Each focus area has a clear hypothesis based on analysis of data. LADH should consider gathering evidence in the form of quantitative data so that the next 90-day plan and workbook revision contains quantitative data in addition to qualitative data.

<b>Step 5 – Desired Outcomes &amp; Critical Actions</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – observable changes in adult behavior	Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying the specific observable change(s) in adult	<b>Each focus area has</b> a 90-day desired outcome <b>identifying specific observable change(s)</b> in adult	Desired outcomes <b>do not</b> identify specific observable changes in adult behavior.	Shows lack of attempt or action

NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	behaviors, <b>which creates focus and urgency toward action.</b>	behavior.		
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – specific focus on student achievement  NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	Each desired outcome is specific in focus and <b>should logically result in</b> increased student achievement.	<b>Each</b> desired outcome is <b>specific</b> and <b>there is a clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	The desired outcomes <b>lack specificity</b> about the observable changes in adult behavior. There is <b>no clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – sense of urgency toward action NM PED Review Limited Progress	For each focus area, critical actions <b>promote a sense of urgency toward</b> addressing root cause(s) and achieving the desired outcome.	<b>For each focus area</b> , critical actions <b>address clear underlying root cause(s) and are connected to</b> achieving the desired outcome.	It is <b>not clear</b> how critical actions will result in achieving the desired outcome in 90 days.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – person(s) responsible for completing actions NM PED Review Determination: No evidence	Responsibility for action items are <b>strategically owned</b> by various school/district individuals.	<b>Each</b> critical action <b>identifies</b> a person responsible.	It is <b>not clear</b> who is responsible for completing each critical action.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – timelines and resources NM PED Review Determination: Limit Progress	All critical actions have a clear timeline and identify resources needed to support them, <b>including funding sources.</b>	<b>All</b> critical actions have a <b>clear</b> timeline and identify resources needed to support them.	Critical actions <b>do not identify</b> timelines and/or needed resources.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:**

- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Desired Outcomes/observable change in adult behavior: specific observable changes in adult behavior needs to be articulated. (Example for Standard/Curriculum Alignment: At the end of this 90-day plan, 100% of teachers will reference aligned Common Core State Standard in lesson plans.) (Example for Data-driven instruction: At the end of this 90-day plan, 100% of teachers will have evidence of data analysis from short cycle assessment given to students and the modifications in lesson plans to address student lack of understanding.)

- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Desired Outcomes/specific focus on student achievement: statements should specify how the change in adult behavior would effect student achievement. (Example: 100% of the teachers will provide evidence of reteaching standards when student assessment shows a lack of understanding.)
- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Critical Action/ sense of urgency: statements should identify progress-monitoring dates through out the year to indicate to teachers that there will be accountability and expectations. There should be opportunity for mid-year adjustments if data shows non-compliance. Doing a book study without an expectation of using the material learned does not show a sense of urgency. Example: On the first of every month, 100% of teachers will turn in lesson plans showing implementation of SIOP strategies. OR After every Istation assessment, 100% of the teachers will provide data analysis to principal along with plan for re-teach or intervention for students that have not mastered the material.
- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Critical Action/person responsible: column appears to have been deleted and no responsible person was identified.
- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Critical Action/timelines and resources: timelines need more specificity and there should be requirements through out the year for periodic monitoring.

<b><u>Step 6 – Monitor Implementation</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Progress Indicators NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	<b>Strategically selected</b> progress indicators identify the metrics and evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>All</b> progress indicators <b>identify the metrics and evidence</b> used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>Some</b> progress indicators have been identified, and they <b>may or may not include</b> metrics or evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Potential Adjustments to the 90-day Plan NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	For <b>all</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>and</b> unanticipated barriers.	For <b>most</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers.	For <b>some</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>or</b> unanticipated barriers.	Shows lack of attempt or action
System to Monitor NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	The system to monitor implementation <b>clearly details</b> the procedure, timelines, and persons responsible.	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.</b>	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies one or more of the following:</b> the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.	Shows lack of attempt or action

#### **Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:**

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Progress Indicators: Metrics and evidence needs to be identified. Example: A non-evaluative walkthrough will be done in 100% of the classrooms every 2 weeks and data will be gathered on implementation of SIOP strategies.

Potential Adjustments are listed for most of the progress indicators but not all.

The LADH system to Monitor provides more clarity than the desired outcomes and critical actions. LADH ought to consider adding the specifics on monitoring to the other areas of the 90-day plan.

LADH, please consider using the 30/60/90 day reflective guides available on DASH resource site to help focus monthly core team meetings.



Dolores Huerta

“A Dual Language Charter Middle School”  
1480 N. Main Street  
Las Cruces, NM 88001  
Phone: 575/526-2984 • Fax: 575/523-5407

GOVERNING COUNCIL MEETING AGENDA  
Thursday, October 19, 2017 at 6:00 pm at LADH

---

1) Call to order: 6:05

2) Roll call and establish quorum: Steve R. Pereira, President, Michelle Saenz-Adames, VP, Michael Gutierrez; Elaine Palma. Absent Members: Sarah Luz Ramos & Mariaelena de la Rosa

3) Approval of agenda: Michael Gutierrez moved to approve the agenda; Michelle Adames seconded; all in favor; none opposed; motion passed

4) Approval of September 7, 2017 meeting minutes

Michael Gutierrez asked for clarification regarding Elaine Palma's position. Steve Pereira noted that she is a member at large. Michelle Adams moved to approved September 7, 2017 meeting minutes; seconded by Michael Gutierrez; all in favor; none opposed; motion passed

5) Open forum-public input\*

(a.) Mr. Bardey: Had a great meeting to plan for 8<sup>th</sup> grade trip last night. Good committee of 8<sup>th</sup> grade parents

-questions: How is the principal search going?

-Steve Pereira: GC looking to start search soon.

-Michael Gutierrez reported that the GC has not started search

-Mr. Bardey: discipline has been a huge issue recently. Would like to invite GC members to visit classrooms, so they can be better informed of the issues teachers are dealing with. Additionally, morale is low and there could possibly be a massive staff turnover. Willing to work on any problems.

-Steve Pereira: visiting classrooms would be good. Need to discuss search and how to start that.

-Mr. Bardey: GC will most like have to renew Ms. Miranda's contract.

-Elaine Palma: new Director needs to be hired by the Spring to allow time for them to shadow.

-Mr. Bardey: staff learned at last staff meeting that they would not be given their stipend for having an 8-period school day.

-Mirna Rodriguez: Mr. Casillas knew that the stipend would not be received by the staff, but he did not inform/communicate that to the staff. Although the proposal was made to reduce the day to seven periods, staff wanted to maintain an 8-period day.

-Steve Pereira: At the June meeting the GC was not happy about the removal of stipend. Mr. Casillas stated that he was going hire an assistant and therefore the stipend was going to be

use to cover the salary. Upset about the decision.

-Mr. Salazar: Now I have to do something to compensate for the cut.

-Mr. Salazar: Is it possible to plan for a raise? Currently making the same as a level one teacher with 13 years of experience.

-Michelle Adames: asked for history of the situation

-Steve Pereira: Mr. Casillas presented a document in the spring that indicated the school needed to hire an assistance to help raise the school grade. He stated that the teachers had agreed to pay cut. So, GC agreed. In June GC asked Mr. Casillas what happened to the person you were going to hire. Mr. Casillas didn't hire the person but moved the money to another line item.

-Elaine Palma: Where was the money was moved to?

-Mirna: There was a miscommunication, as the \$60,000.00 never actually existed for 2017-2018 school year. Teachers voted that they would take the cut, keep the 8<sup>th</sup> period b/c they thought they were getting a stipend.

-Steve Pereira: Working with Julie and Mirna to try and give teachers compensation.

-Mirna: Need to wait until after audit, which is only 95% completed, to determine where the finances are and if a teacher compensation would be feasible. Expected completion of the audit? Field work is done and within the next two weeks draft should be ready.

-Ms. Gallegos: Unity Day Oct 25<sup>th</sup> 9-11:30 inviting council to attend. Perspective on how students react to these events.

-Elaine Palma: Expressed concerned about rumors about school closing

-Ms. Miranda: Working on recharter in Oct. 2018 for submission. Still another school year on this contract. Will be up to State. To ways to recharter by State or LCPS. We are the 2<sup>nd</sup> worst facility in the State and there is money available but we need to have 36% of the amount. Pursuing a meeting with Dr. Ewing to get on the school Bond election. However, that money PSFA cannot be used for land. Initially it was believed that we needed to have a new facility to get recharter, but the facility is not a dire need to get the recharter.

-Ms. Mirna: Dr. Ewing came and reached out. Has been trying to schedule a meeting with him. LCPS Board has to approve LADH to be on the school bond. Gabe Jaquez is the one to speak with.

-Elaine updated on the Foundation

-Ms. Gallegos: Mr. Casillas stated that we needed to increase population to get new building.

-Ms. Miranda: The current population is a struggle. We needed 170 to support the budget.

-Ms. Mirna: Validated everything that the teachers have been brought up. We are looking into concerns, but do not want to speak without being certain. Have saved a lot of money and hopefully can do something.

*Public comments and observations regarding education policy and governance issues, as well as the strategic planning, are heard at this time. Time limit per presenter may be imposed by Chair.*

#### NEW BUSINESS: DISCUSSION ITEMS ONLY – NO ACTION WILL BE TAKEN

#### 6) Principal's Report by Melissa Miranda

Please see attached document

### ACTION ITEMS

#### 7) Approval of NM Dash

Michael Gutierrez moved to approve; second by Michelle Adames; all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

#### 8) Budget Adjustment Requests

Spaceport: \$11,104.70 adjustment instead of what was presented

Michael Gutierrez moved to approve; second by Michelle Adames; all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

9) Adjourn to closed session: 7:12 PM; Michael Gutierrez moved to move into closed session; second by Michelle Adames; all in favor, none opposed. Motion passed.

To discuss personnel matters relating to any individual employee, including hiring, promotion, demotion, dismissal, resignation, or investigation of complaints or charges against an employee. [10-15-1(H)(2) NMSA 1978]

*\*Any individual attending a board meeting may sign in to participate in the Public Input section of the Agenda, if any. Such persons may speak on any item after the individual is recognized by the President of the Board and introduces himself/herself at the podium. The Governing Council of La Academia Dolores Huerta will not take action on any item presented under Public Input, until an opportunity to do so is afforded. La Academia Dolores Huerta will provide an interpreter for the Hearing Impaired and simultaneous Spanish translation upon request. Requests should be submitted to the governing council three days prior to the meeting.*





**From:** [Martinez, Severo, PED](#)  
**To:** [Jones, Chris](#)  
**Cc:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Peterson, Elisabeth, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**Subject:** La Promesa  
**Date:** Tuesday, November 14, 2017 11:16:38 AM

---

Good Morning,

Upon review of your 90 Day plan, it **has met** the requirements for submission to the online NM Dash system (13 or greater indicators in solid progress, 3 or fewer in Limited Progress, and 0 not Evident).

You will be receiving an email from NMDASH shortly allowing you access to create a password, login to the NMDASH system and create users.

Sincerely,

Severo Martinez

**From:** Chris Jones [mailto:cjones@lpelc.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, November 09, 2017 4:12 PM  
**To:** Martinez, Severo, PED  
**Cc:** Pelayo, Icela, PED; Poulos, Katie, PED; Peterson, Elisabeth, PED; Southworth, Margaret, PED; Patricia Matthews  
**Subject:** Re: FW: La Promesa

Dear Mr. Martinez:

Thank you for providing Katie with this clarification. Based on our phone conversation, I did not recall your request to have the plan submitted to a general PSB inbox. Based on the notes I took during our telephone conversation, your recommendations were as follows:

1. Solidify start and end dates before entering into the online system.
2. Add a governance council member to the core team.

Attached is our plan that you previously reviewed, scored, and provided us feedback on. The conversation prior to the October 5 training was that we would receive credentials to enter the plan into the system. Also attached you will find the email correspondence regarding our plan, which was submitted to Katie and the PEC for their review and consideration during the October 12 PEC meeting.

Finally, thank you again for the books to help us improve our walkthroughs. You have been most helpful and responsive to date and I appreciate everything.

Take good care for now.

Sincerely,

Chris

Chris Jones  
Head Administrator  
La Promesa Early Learning Center  
Office: (505) 836-7706  
Website: [Mr. Chris R. Jones](#)

"If we teach today's students as we taught yesterday's, we rob them of tomorrow."  
John Dewey

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: The contents of this email message and any attachments are intended solely for the addressee(s) and may contain confidential and/or privileged information and may be legally protected from disclosure. If you are not the intended recipient of this message or their agent, or if this message has been addressed to you in error, please immediately alert the sender by reply email and then delete this message and any attachments. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any use, dissemination, copying, or storage of this message or its attachments is strictly prohibited.

On Wed, Nov 8, 2017 at 10:52 AM, Martinez, Severo, PED <[Severo.Martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:Severo.Martinez@state.nm.us)> wrote:

Good Morning,

I provided La Promesa with Steps 1-6 training at their school site on July 21<sup>st</sup>. After this training I mentioned to them that I would review their plan once they had it complete. Mr. Jones reached out to me on September 5<sup>th</sup> with their plan that was approved by their Governing Board and wanted me to also provide him with feedback. Upon review, it Scored 12 Solid Progress and 4 Limited Progress.

We then had a phone call to review my feedback and discussed shifts that could be made to make plan stronger on October 2nd.

**These changes were to be made and submitted to the PSB email. This is the step that was not done.**

Upon reviewing the plan, it had very minimal shifts that needed to be made and would easily be approved with a few changes.

Severo

---

**From:** Poulos, Katie, PED  
**Sent:** Wednesday, November 08, 2017 9:36 AM  
**To:** Martinez, Severo, PED  
**Cc:** Peterson, Elisabeth, PED; Pelayo, Icela, PED  
**Subject:** La Promesa

Hi Severo,

La Promesa is reporting that they did submit the NMDASH plan to you and you reviewed and approved it. That is not what any of us have in our records. Can you confirm or dispute what they're telling us?

Thanks!

Katie

Katie Poulos  
Director of Options for Parents and Families  
NM Public Education Department  
[300 Don Gaspar](#)  
[Santa Fe, NM 87501](#)  
c: [\(505\) 469-0373](#)  
o: [\(505\) 827-6532](#)  
[www.ped.state.nm.us](http://www.ped.state.nm.us)

*Driving student success in New Mexico by supporting excellent authorizing practices and charter schools that provide innovative, quality education.*



**New Mexico 90-day Plan  
Offline Planning Process Workbook**

## **ANNUAL PLAN**

### Step 1 – Build Core Team

With district support, the school leader(s) identify critical members to bring together as a team to co-construct the school vision for dramatic change and establish a 90-day Plan that will increase achievement for all students.

### **Guiding Questions –**

- ✓ District Level:
  - To what extent does the district representative need to be involved in the planning process?
  - Should Core Teams look the same at every school?
- ✓ School Level:
  - To what extent does the Core Team represent diverse backgrounds and viewpoints, in order to consider challenges from many perspectives?
    - Are there representatives from across grade levels?
    - Is the group representative of the student body and community?
    - Is the Core Team the same as the school leadership team?
    - Are the strongest teacher-leaders on the Core Team?

### **Core Team Notes**

Team Member	Position	<u>Rationale:</u> What strengths/perspective does this person bring to the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school's current reality?
Cristina Sanchez	Pre-K Teacher / Coach / Observer	Knowledge of child development (whole child approach to learning); early childhood education; dual language programming; teacher evaluation; and; curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Sanchez has also earned exemplary and highly effective ratings on 2016 and 2017 summative evaluation reports.
Danielle Miranda	SPED Teacher / Director of Student Services	Educational Leadership student; Seven years of experience with LPELC; Dual certified (SPED and General Education); Experience with aspects of school administration; Experience with data analysis and instructional leadership; Track record of increasing student proficiency levels amongst Q1 students; Current 'coordinator' of board services.
Esteban Cole	5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher / District Testing	Six years of experience with LPELC teaching at the intermediate level (5 <sup>th</sup> grade); In depth knowledge of



	Coordinator	NMPED testing requirements; Experience coordinating school-wide testing program; Serves as secondary tech support for instructional staff; Experience implementing school initiatives; Experience implementing dual language programming.
Irma Cera	7 <sup>th</sup> /8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Teacher	Over 15 years experience in dual language schools; Experience at early childhood, primary, intermediate, and secondary levels; In depth understanding of curriculum and instruction principles that foster language development;
Roseanne Ibarra	Instructional Coach	25+ years experience in education; Experience as an interventionist and instructional coach; Experience serving within dual language schools; Large district experience – knowledge of past initiatives.
Yvette Barnwell	SPED Teacher / Community Schools and School Activities Coordinator	Five years experience with LPELC; Dual certified (SPED and General Education); Experience coordinating school-home programs and leading communications efforts; Current ‘coordinator’ of community schools initiative at LPELC.
Brenda Baca	Governance Council Member/Finance Committee Member	Experience working in Belen Public Schools; Served on the YDI foundation board for several years; President of the LPELC PTAT; Guardian of LPELC Student; Active in the LPELC community.
Chris Jones	Principal	Head Administrator.

### Step 2 – Analyze Data & Set Student Achievement Goals

With the core team, analyze student achievement data (e.g. interim assessment results, common formative assessments, student work samples, summative results). Through deep data analysis and reflection, set summative student achievement goals for ELA and math. An optional third goal may be identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).

Once summative goals have been established, set benchmark goals to monitor progress toward summative goals. Benchmark goals should be clearly articulated in both ELA and math (and for an optional third goal), align with summative goals, and be connected to the most current interim or formative assessment data.

**Guiding Question** – Given the most recent student achievement data, what summative and benchmark goals will create a sense of focus and urgency towards action to increase student achievement?

Student Achievement Goals				
Grade/Subject Area	2015-16 PARCC Results (3-8)	2016-17 PARCC Results (3-8)	2017-2018 PARCC Goals (3-8)	<u>Benchmark Goals</u> : How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals? (3-8)



Overall ELA	7%	9.05%	15% (+13 students)	20% (NWEA)
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade ELA	7.1%	8.89%	15%	20%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	10.8%	4.65%	15%	20%
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	9.1%	14.29%	15%	20%
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	3.4%	10.71%	15%	20%
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	0%	9.52%	15%	20%
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	6.7%	6.25%	15%	20%
Overall Math	10%	7.59%	12% (+11 students)	15% (NWEA)
Kindergarten Math	NA	NA	NA	15%
1 <sup>st</sup> Grade Math	NA	NA	NA	15%
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade Math	NA	NA	NA	15%
3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade Math	28.6%	17.78%	20%	15%
4 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	2.6%	9.3%	12%	15%
5 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	4.5%	3.45%	12%	15%
6 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	3.4%	7.14%	12%	15%
7 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	0%	4.76%	12%	15%
8 <sup>th</sup> Grade Math	13.3%	0%	12%	15%
Grade/Subject Area	2015-16 Istation Results (K-2)	2016-17 Istation Results (K-2)	2017-2018 Istation Goals (K-2)	<b>Benchmark Goals:</b> How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals? (K-2)
Overall ISIP Early Reading	NA (DIBELS)	62.5%	75% (EOY)	60-70% (Istation – MOY) 75% (Istation – EOY)
Kindergarten ISIP	NA (DIBELS)	92.5%	92.5%	70-75% (Istation – MOY) 92.5% (Istation – EOY)



1 <sup>st</sup> Grade ISIP	NA (DIBELS)	42.5%	75%	60-70% (Istation – MOY) 75% (Istation – EOY)
2 <sup>nd</sup> Grade ISIP	NA (DIBELS)	52.5%	60%	45-50% (Istation – MOY) 60% (Istation – EOY)

Well-written goals help to set a bold, positive vision and establish a sense of urgency. They communicate and make visible to all stakeholders the intent of the plan.

**Guiding Question** – To what extent do summative and benchmark goals meet SMART criteria?

SMART Checklist		
<b><u>S</u>pecific</b>	Is the goal clearly defined?	
<b><u>M</u>easurable</b>	Are concrete criteria identified for measuring progress toward attainment of the goal?	
<b><u>A</u>mbitious &amp; <u>A</u>ttainable</b>	Does the goal stretch the school while still being attainable?	
<b><u>R</u>elevant</b>	Does the goal relate to student learning and achievement? Is it data-based?	
<b><u>T</u>ime-bound</b>	Is the timeframe appropriate for accomplishment of the goal?	





### Step 3 – Identify Focus Areas

Following deep data analysis and reflection on qualitative and quantitative evidence, the core team identifies the 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas that will increase student achievement for all students. Focus areas are best practices that will increase achievement for all students and narrow the scope for root cause analysis, desired outcomes, and critical actions.

Possible evidence sources to consider include: observation data (evaluative or non), lesson/unit plans, student surveys, interim assessment results, common formative assessment results, student work samples, summative results.

### **Focus Areas & Guiding Questions –**

#### *1. Standards Alignment*

All grade levels have identified essential standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- How do you ensure that the Tier I (core) curriculum and instruction is aligned with the CCSS and is being implemented with fidelity?
- Do you have a scope and sequence aligned to the CCSS?

#### **2. Tier I (core) instruction**

There is a dedicated block of time devoted to providing core instruction to all students aligned with grade level standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- What percent of your students are achieving grade-level expectations or making significant growth? If at least 80% are not attaining proficiency, what are you doing to ensure that your school is making significant progress toward this goal?
- What evidence do you have that the level of rigor of the tasks students perform during the lesson is aligned to the rigor of the CCSS?

#### **3. Data-driven instruction**

There is a precise, systematic approach to improving student learning throughout the year. The cycle of DDI includes assessment, analysis and action.

#### Guiding questions –

- Are the district's and school's assessment strategies firmly in place? (formative, interim, and summative)
- How do teachers and leadership analyze and act on assessment data?
- Do teacher action plans include focused and targeted whole-group, small-group, and individual interventions?



- How effectively does school leadership hold teachers accountable to ensure effective instructional adjustment, interventions, and instructional feedback?

#### **4. Tier I interventions**

There are fluid, flexible interventions in place during Tier I (core) instruction for students not progressing as expected.

##### Guiding questions –

- How do you identify students in need of Tier I (core) interventions?
- How do you differentiate instruction based on the screening results, as well as the abilities and needs of all students in the core program?
- To what extent are Tier I (core) interventions successful in addressing student needs based on data?

#### **5. Observation and feedback cycles**

Principal and other instructional leaders devote time daily to non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and provide face-to-face feedback to teachers in a timely manner.

##### Guiding questions –

- Are frequent and regular non-evaluative walkthroughs built into the leaders' schedules?
- Do leaders give face-to-face direct feedback to teachers focused on specific action steps for improvement?
- To what extent do leaders hold teachers accountable to translate feedback into practice?

#### **6. Collaboration**

Teachers have time during the week to work together to promote student success.

##### Guiding questions –

- What evidence do you have that your teacher teams work together weekly to analyze data, share strategies, plan collaboratively, and debrief the outcomes of instruction?
- How do school leaders support and hold teacher teams accountable?

#### **7. Ongoing, job embedded professional development**

Teacher professional development is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance student learning.

##### Guiding questions –

- Describe the process for identifying and providing job-embedded, ongoing, professional development informed by the teacher evaluation system.



- How is professional development for teachers tied to student needs as identified by assessment data?

#### *8. Tier II (SAT) process*

There is a system in place to provide strategic and individualized support to students for whom Tier I instruction and interventions have proven insufficient.

##### Guiding questions –

- What criteria does the SAT team use to identify students in need of TIER II support?
- To what extent are Tier II interventions successful at addressing skill gaps to allow students to master CCSS? What specific research-based interventions are provided?
- Is progress monitoring frequent enough to ensure fluidity and that the RtI process is working?

#### *9. School leadership and systems*

There is a school leadership framework that supports increasing and sustaining student achievement.

##### Guiding questions –

- Is there a school leadership team in place comprised of key instructional leaders?
- To what extent does the leadership team focus on data-driven instruction, observation and feedback, standards-aligned planning and instruction, and job-embedded professional development?

#### *10. School culture*

All students, staff and stakeholders are aware that student achievement is the top priority of school.

##### Guiding questions –

- Do students receive the continual message that nothing is as important or engaging as learning?
- How do consistent minute-by-minute systems and procedures support a student culture focused on achievement?
- How does leadership monitor and maintain a positive student and staff culture?



### Focus Areas

<i>Focus Area:</i> What are the 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas (best practices – see pp. 3-5) that must be addressed to reach the student achievement goals?	<i>Data Connection:</i> What data analysis led you to identify this focus area? What quantitative and qualitative data led you to this focus area?
Tier One Instruction	<p>Data Points Analyzed: 2017 A-F School Letter Grade; Spring 2017 needs assessment; Analysis of 6 week unit plans; Analysis of 15-16 and 17-18 DIBELS/Istation and PARCC assessment data; 16-17 Accountability report .</p> <p>2017 A-F School Grading Report Card indicates that 65% of students are not proficient in Reading and 91% of students are not proficient in Math across all grades.</p> <p>Teachers' 6 week unit plans lacked alignment with CCSS and failed to utilize formative and summative assessment to help evaluate the effectiveness of instruction, and did not evidence planning for small group structures to differentiate instruction.</p>
Data-Driven Instruction	<p>Data Points Analyzed: 2017 A-F School Letter Grade; Spring 2017 needs assessment; Informal surveying of staff – Sheltered Content Instruction PD; Analysis of 15-16 and 17-18 DIBELS/Istation and PARCC assessment data; 16-17 Accountability report.</p> <p>Teachers' 6 week unit plans lacked evidence of data analysis through use of available assessment reports, failed to utilize formative and summative assessment to help evaluate the effectiveness of instruction, and did not evidence data-driven plans for small group structures to differentiate instruction based on more than one data point.</p>
Tier One Intervention	<p>Data Points Analyzed: 2017 A-F School Letter Grade; Spring 2017 needs assessment; Analysis of 6 week unit plans; Analysis of 15-16 and 17-18 DIBELS/Istation and PARCC assessment data; Analysis of SAT documentation and referrals; 16-17 Accountability report.</p> <p>Teachers' instructional plans did not evidence data-driven plans for small grouping structures to differentiate instruction based on more than one data point.</p>



#### Step 4 – Conduct Root Cause Analysis

After identifying 2-3 high-leverage focus areas, the core team engages in thoughtful root cause analysis to zero in on the deepest underlying cause or causes of school performance challenges that, if resolved, result in elimination or substantial reduction of the performance challenge.

Resources: Fishbone template, 5 Whys Guidance, Role Play Script

#### **Guiding Questions –**

- What do you believe is at the heart of the problem for this focus area?
- What qualitative and quantitative evidence do you have to support this hypothesis?
- Would the problem/challenge have occurred if that cause had not been present?
- If the cause is corrected, will the problem/challenge reoccur?

<b>Root Cause Analysis Notes</b>		
<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Root Cause Hypothesis</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
Tier One Instruction	If tier one instruction is to be implemented in order to increase overall student achievement, then a guaranteed and viable curriculum must be in place and supported through a consistent planning tool, availability of supplementary resources, and consistent monitoring (via walkthroughs and structured collaboration meetings) of completed plans as well as the implementation of said plans during the delivery phase of instruction.	2017 A-F School Letter Grade; Spring 2017 needs assessment; Analysis of 6 week unit plans; Analysis of 15-16 and 17-18 DIBELS/Istation and PARCC assessment data, and; 16-17 Accountability report.  Observations from 16-17 clearly highlighted the variance in pedagogical knowledge and skills with respect to the teaching staff at LPELC. Teachers' unit plans were compliance documents that lacked rigor. Training in the use of resources and availability of supplemental resources were both limited. Common core alignment was lacking based on the analysis of unit plans as was the use of collaboration structures to hone in on problems in practice. Walkthroughs and feedback cycles were inadequate and unit plans were not reviewed in a manner that promoted continuous improvement.
Data-Driven Instruction	If data-driven instruction is to be used to differentiate instruction for all students, then all instructional staff members must participate in professional development to help them understand how to access and	2017 A-F School Letter Grade; Spring 2017 needs assessment; Informal surveying of staff – Sheltered Content Instruction PD; Analysis of 15-16 and 17-18 DIBELS/Istation and PARCC



	review reports, use data from said reports to plan whole and small group instruction, and use acquired resources to align with assessment values (i.e. NWEA RIT scores to identify appropriate resources from Reading A-Z and Kahn Academy).	assessment data, and ; 16-17 Accountability report.  Instructional ladders or a continuous improvement process was not used. Collaborations lacked structure and protocols that required teachers to review and discuss student achievement data were missing. Training to assist in the understanding of reports was lacking.
Tier One Intervention	If tier one intervention is to be effective in closing achievement gaps for struggling students, then all teachers must be intentional in the planning and delivery of tier one intervention that is made possible through sacred intervention blocks built into the daily schedule, the use of intervention-based resources and strategies, the use of small fluid groups driven by data, and a monitoring via structured collaboration meetings.	2017 A-F School Letter Grade; Spring 2017 needs assessment; Analysis of 6 week unit plans; Analysis of 15-16 and 17-18 DIBELS/Istation and PARCC assessment data; Analysis of SAT documentation and referrals, and; 16-17 Accountability report.  Tier one interventions were not implemented during school days. Small grouping was missing from unit plans and the expectation that all teachers implement a center-based rotation system was missing. Teachers were not utilizing language supports for students, failed to incorporate fluid groups based on data, and did not have a data-based rationale for their instructional decisions.



## 90-DAY PLAN

### Step 5 – Create Desired Outcomes & Define Critical Actions

#### *Create Desired Outcomes:*

Based on each thoughtful root cause analysis, the core team creates a 90-day Desired Outcome for each focus area. Specifically, the team identifies the ***change in adult behaviors*** that will create focus and urgency towards action that would logically result in increased student achievement in math and reading.

#### **Guiding Questions for Setting Desired Outcomes –**

- What specific outcome do you want? What change in adult behaviors will be observable by the end of 90 days?
- How will you know when you have reached this goal? What will be different if you are successful in focusing on this area of practice? After 90 days, what changes in practice will be observed?

<b>Desired Outcomes</b>	
<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Draft Desired Outcome (<u>change in adult behaviors</u>)</i>
Tier One Instruction	Each teacher will re-develop unit plans on a bi-weekly basis; Plans will be evaluated by the principal and instructional coach; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.
Data-Driven Instruction	Bi-weekly collaboration meetings will focus on the use of student achievement data to drive instruction; Collaboration protocols will be used to influence teacher focus on data-driven instructional planning and implementation.
Tier One Intervention	Each teacher will submit unit plans that include a supplemental page for purposeful small group planning; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.

#### **Define Critical Actions:**

After identifying the desired outcomes (change in adult behaviors), the core team determines the critical actions that will promote a sense of urgency toward addressing root cause(s) and achieving each desired outcome.

#### **Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Options) –**

- What are some possible ways to achieve...?
- What will you do to move yourself closer to the goal?
- What have you done in similar situations in the past?
- What is something you have never tried?
- What else?



### Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Decisions) –

- Which would be most impactful?
- What exactly will you do?
- Who will be involved? How are critical actions strategically owned by various school/district individuals?
- What obstacles do you need to address in order to get this done?
- What support/resources will you need to make this happen?

Focus Area: Tier I Instruction				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Each teacher will re-develop unit plans on a bi-weekly basis; Plans will be evaluated by the principal and instructional coach; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.				
CRITICAL ACTIONS				
Timeline	Critical Action to Address Root Cause & Achieve Desired Outcome	Resources Needed/Source	Person(s) Responsible	Person(s) Involved
By 9/1/17; Check-ins: 10/5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Develop calendar and schedule to finalize classroom walkthrough rotations; Monitor 30, 60, 90 day milestones; Conduct walkthroughs in accordance with calendar (to the fullest extent possible); Provide walkthrough feedback to staff	Calendar/schedule template	Principal / IC / Observer	Teachers
By 9/11/17; Check-ins: 10/5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Develop calendar and schedule to finalize a collaboration meeting schedule in order to provide 1:1 feedback; Facilitate collaboration schedules in accordance with calendar; Prepare protocols, questions, and arrange external experts to assist in data analysis and teacher reflection	Calendar / schedule template	Principal / IC / Observer	Teachers
Ongoing; Check-ins: 10/5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Plan monthly PD sessions based on needs identified through walkthroughs and collaboration meetings – based on tier one instructional planning; Secure substitute contract; Document needs of staff; Identify external	Calendar / project-based learning plans / substitutes for coverage	Principal / IC	Principal, IC, External PD providers, EAs, Substitutes, Art and PE Teachers, General Ed. Teachers





	PD providers to assist in facilitating sessions			
By 9/11/17; Check-ins: 10 5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Develop a unit plan checklist / rubric; Use checklist to evaluate unit plans and provide teacher feedback as needed	Rubric template for development	Principal / IC	Teachers
By 9/11/17; Check-ins: 10 5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Develop collaboration protocols that focus on intentionality in planning, looking for effective use of the unit plan template and instructional resources; Distribute protocol to teachers prior to collaborations; Collect from teachers during collaboration meetings; Facilitate thoughtful discussions during collaboration meetings; Provide feedback and support in using protocols	Collaboration protocol template	IC	Principal, Teachers

**Focus Area: Data-Driven Instruction**

**Desired Outcome:** Bi-weekly collaboration meetings will focus on the use of student achievement data to drive instruction; Collaboration protocols will be used to influence teacher focus on data-driven instructional planning and implementation.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
By 9/11/17; Collaborations held biweekly; Check-ins: 10 5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Develop collaboration protocols that focus on data analysis and disaggregation; Distribute protocol to teachers prior to collaborations; Collect from teachers during collaboration meetings; Facilitate thoughtful discussions during collaboration meetings; Provide feedback and support in using protocols	Collaboration protocol template	IC	Principal, Teachers
By 9/11/17; Ongoing;	Develop calendar and schedule to finalize a collaboration	Calendar / schedule template	Principal / IC /	Teachers



Check-ins: 10 5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	meeting schedule in order to provide 1:1 feedback; Facilitate collaboration schedules in accordance with calendar; Prepare protocols, questions, and arrange external experts to assist in data analysis and teacher reflection		Observer	
Ongoing; Check-ins: 10 5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Plan monthly PD sessions based on needs centered around using the data from assessment reports to plan effective instruction; Secure substitute contract; Document needs of staff; Identify external PD providers to assist in facilitating sessions	Calendar / project-based learning plans / substitutes for coverage	Principal / IC	Principal, IC, External PD providers, EAs, Substitutes, Art and PE Teachers, General Ed. Teachers

**Focus Area: Tier One Intervention**

**Desired Outcome:** Each teacher will submit unit plans that include a supplemental page for purposeful small group planning; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
By 8/21/17; Check-ins: 10 5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Develop master schedule with sacred intervention blocks; Monitor fidelity to intervention program via walkthroughs and protocols; Provide coaching and support to staff during blocks	Master schedule template	Director of Student Services	Principal, IC, Teachers, Interventionists, Students
By 9/1/17; Ongoing (45 minute daily intervention blocks (Tier 1); 30 minutes after school intervention block (Tier 2)); Check-ins: 10 5/17	Develop calendar and schedule to finalize classroom walkthrough rotations to capture implementation of tier one interventions during intervention blocks; Conference with staff members during collaboration regarding implementation; Differentiate support based on effectiveness as evidenced by data/progress	Calendar/schedule template	Principal / IC / Observer	Teachers



(30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)				
By 9/11/17; Ongoing; Check-ins: 10 5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Develop calendar and schedule to finalize a collaboration meeting schedule in order to provide 1:1 feedback regarding intervention planning; Facilitate collaboration schedules in accordance with calendar; Prepare protocols, questions, and arrange external experts to assist in data analysis and teacher reflection	Calendar / schedule template	Principal / IC / Observer	Teachers
Ongoing – trimesters 1, 2, and 3; Check-ins: 10 5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Plan monthly PD sessions based on needs identified through walkthroughs and collaboration meetings – based on tier one instructional planning and use of resources; Secure substitute contract; Document needs of staff; Identify external PD providers to assist in facilitating sessions	Calendar / project- based learning plans / substitutes for coverage	Principal / IC	Principal, IC, External PD providers, EAs, Substitutes, Art and PE Teachers, General Ed. Teachers
By 9/11/17; Check-ins: 10 5/17 (30D); 11/17/17 (60D); 1/24/17 (90D)	Develop collaboration protocols that focus on intentionality in planning, looking for effective use of the unit plan template and supplementary small group planning page as well as Q1 and Q3 interventions and supports; Distribute protocol to teachers prior to collaborations; Collect from teachers during collaboration meetings; Facilitate thoughtful discussions during collaboration meetings; Provide feedback and support in using protocols	Collaboration protocol template	IC	Principal, Teachers

### Step 6 – Monitor Implementation



After creating a desired outcome for each focus area and defining the critical actions, the core team strategically selects progress indicators – the metrics and evidence that will be used to measure progress toward the desired outcomes and goals. The core team identifies how the plan might be adjusted due to accelerated progress and unanticipated barriers.

### Guiding Questions –

- What are the metrics, feedback, observations, etc. the core team will use to determine progress toward the desired outcome? What is the evidence of progress?
- How will you know the critical actions are having a positive impact?
- How might the plan be adjusted due to accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers?

<b>Focus Area:</b> Tier I Instruction				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Each teacher will re-develop unit plans on a bi-weekly basis; Plans will be evaluated by the principal and instructional coach; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.				
CRITICAL ACTIONS				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.				
PROGRESS INDICATORS				
<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>		
9/1/17	Review walkthrough schedule and calendar with IC and academic leadership team to ensure it is equitable and consistent	Adjust calendar based on teacher needs – PGP's and 2016-2017 Summative Evaluations		
10/6/17	Develop walkthrough checklist for teachers	Adjust checklist based on identified needs and changes based on student performance data		
11/17/17	Develop unit plan exemplars	Compare and contrast unit plans, and select exemplar components of plans to craft a master exemplar		
11/17/17	Develop a year long plan/CCSS pacing guide to drive unit planning	Review historical PARCC and benchmark data to identify needs and determine pacing, including spiraling/review for math and reading pacing guides		
9/1/17	Review collaboration schedule with IC and academic leadership team to verify equity in	Provide coverage for teachers whose collaboration opportunities		



	collaboration opportunities	are compromised due to testing schedule
Week of 9/11/17	Finalize schedule for coverage during PD Fridays based on teacher grade bands (K-3 and 4-8)	Approval of contract with external substitute and academic enrichment providers
Monthly	Plan PD schedule for teachers focused on turnaround pillars (Social and Emotional Curriculum, Tier I Intervention, and PD) and NM Dash Focus Areas (Tier I Instruction, Tier I Intervention, and Data-Driven Instruction)	For individual teachers, IC to provide differentiated support; Secure external PD providers – appropriate funding/amend federal applications as needed
Bi-weekly	Review submitted unit plans using checklist/ <i>rubric</i> to ensure appropriate rigor in planning is evident and instruction is aligned with focus areas	1 on 1 coaching by IC and principal via co-teaching, co-planning, resource allocation
Bi-weekly	Review teacher reflections provided via collaboration protocols	Differentiate PD and teacher support based on feedback obtained from protocols

**Focus Area: Data-Driven Instruction**

**Desired Outcome:** Bi-weekly collaboration meetings will focus on the use of student achievement data to drive instruction; Collaboration protocols will be used to influence teacher focus on data-driven instructional planning and implementation.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
-----------------	--	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
Bi-weekly	Review teacher reflections provided via collaboration protocols to gauge use of data to influence instructional decisions – monitoring of Q1 and Q3 identification and planning via priority report as well as ACCESS, NWEA, and formative assessment data	Differentiate monthly PD and teacher support based on feedback obtained from protocols; IC and Principal to assist with data analysis and disaggregation
9/1/17	Review collaboration schedule with IC and academic leadership team to verify equity in collaboration opportunities – collaboration to focus on data driven instruction via protocol reflections	Principal to arrange coverage for teachers whose collaboration opportunities are compromised due to testing schedule
11/30/17	<i>Teacher-drive assessment analysis and data action plans.</i>	<i>Modify template used to perform calculation of proficiency and</i>



		<i>growth, identify action planning templates, use goal setting worksheets during parent teacher conferences.</i>
Monthly	Plan PD schedule for teachers focused on turnaround pillars (Social and Emotional Curriculum, Tier I Intervention, and PD) and NM Dash Focus Areas (Tier I Instruction, Tier I Intervention, and Data-Driven Instruction)	For individual teachers, IC to provide differentiated support; Secure external PD providers – appropriate funding/amend federal applications as needed

**Focus Area:** Tier I Intervention

**Desired Outcome:** Each teacher will submit unit plans that include a supplemental page for purposeful small group planning; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
-----------------	--	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
9/1/17 and Weekly	Walkthroughs to determine effective use of intervention blocks	IC support in planning instruction
9/1/17 and Weekly	Review walkthrough schedule and calendar with IC and academic leadership team to ensure it is equitable and consistent	Adjust calendar based on teacher needs – PGP's and 2016-2017 Summative Evaluations
9/1/17 and Bi-Weekly	Review collaboration schedule with IC and academic leadership team to verify equity in collaboration opportunities	Provide coverage for teachers whose collaboration opportunities are compromised due to testing schedule
11/17/17	<i>Develop blended learning station rotation model for 5<sup>th</sup> – 8<sup>th</sup> grade classrooms- MyPath (Prescriptive Intervention-Based Program).</i>	<i>Principal support for rotations schedule development, training on using courseware data to influence face to face instruction, re-alignment of face to face unit plans and potential acquisition of curricula, Re-evaluate course placement upon completion of MOY and EOY assessments.</i>
Monthly	Plan PD schedule for teachers focused on turnaround pillars (Social and Emotional	For individual teachers, IC to provide differentiated support;



	Curriculum, Tier I Intervention, and PD) and NM Dash Focus Areas (Tier I Instruction, Tier I Intervention, and Data-Driven Instruction)	Secure external PD providers – appropriate funding/amend federal applications as needed
Bi-weekly	Review teacher reflections provided via collaboration protocols to gauge use of data to influence instructional decisions	Differentiate monthly PD and teacher support based on feedback obtained from protocols; IC and Principal to assist with data analysis and disaggregation

### *System to Monitor Implementation –*

The core team clearly details a system to monitor implementation of the plan including a procedure, timelines, and person(s) responsible.

### **Guiding Questions –**

- How will the core team systematize implementation and monitoring of the plan?
- What is the procedure? What are the timelines? Who is responsible?

<b>System to Monitor Implementation</b>		
Procedure	Timelines	Person(s) Responsible
Leadership Meetings: During weekly leadership meetings, the IC, Principal, Coach/Evaluator, Director of Operations, and Director of Student Services will analyze walkthrough and collaboration protocol trends as they relate to the NM Dash 90-day plan.	Weekly	Principal, IC, Coach/Evaluator, Director of Operations, Director of Student Services
NM Dash Team Meetings: The core team will meet monthly to revisit the plan, review progress indicators, analyze data and adult behaviors, and evaluate efficacy of systems and resources to assess progress toward goals. Changes to the 90 day plan will be made as necessary.	Monthly	Core Team and Governance Council
<b>COMMUNICATING PROGRESS:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updates will be made to the school website where</li> </ul>	Quarterly (BOY, MOY, EOY)	





<p>progress toward goals is shared openly with stakeholders (Curriculum page);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The director will present monthly updates to the governance council during regular meetings;</li> <li>• Updates will be included in the Monday Memo for the purpose of staff review and analysis</li> <li>• Updates will be shared in the monthly newsletter</li> <li>• Updates will be shared on a quarterly basis via LPELC Class DOJO and social media sites.</li> </ul> <p>During the January Teacher In-Service, the core team will share their analysis of the first 90 day plan with all instructional and non-instructional staff members to celebrate short-term victories, adjust the plan as needed, and set short-term goals that will facilitate goal attainment during the second semester (2<sup>nd</sup> 90 day plan)</p>	<p>Monthly</p> <p>Weekly (as needed)</p> <p>Monthly</p> <p>Quarterly</p> <p>January 2, 2018</p>	
---	---	--



**From:** [PSB, PED, PED](#)  
**To:** [Miranda, Melissa](#)  
**Cc:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [Martinez, Severo, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#); [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#)  
**Subject:** La Academia Dolores Huerta - NM DASH Feedback Tool  
**Date:** Thursday, November 02, 2017 12:12:52 PM  
**Attachments:** [LADH Feedback Tool.docx](#)

---

Good Afternoon,

Upon review of your 90 Day plan, it **has not met** the requirements for submission to the online NM Dash system (13 or greater indicators in solid progress, 3 or fewer in Limited Progress, and 0 not Evident).

Attached you will find the feedback tool with your ratings per step. The reviewer has included feedback on how to improve your plan. Please address the feedback that has been provided. If you would like a second review of your plan, once your plan has been changed, please submit it to Severo Martinez at [severo.martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:severo.martinez@state.nm.us) ASAP. Keep in mind you will not be receiving a login to NM DASH until your plan has met the requirements. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Severo Martinez at [severo.martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:severo.martinez@state.nm.us).

Best,

Patricia "Kitty" Montoya  
NMPED  
505-827-3671



NM PED Calibration Review  
Date: 10/26/17  
Reviewer Code: 002

## New Mexico 90-day Plan Offline Planning Process Workbook Feedback Tool

District: LADH  
School:  
Date:  
Completed By:

To enter into DASH...		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
13 or greater/ of 16	3 or fewer of 16	0

Your plan (as reviewed by your district designee):		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident

PED review:		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
9	6	1

### Overall comment:

A PED reviewer has reviewed this plan and finds that this Offline Planning Process Workbook has 9 indicators Solid Progress, 6 Limited Progress, and 1 Not Evident. The plan does not meet the minimum criteria of 13 or greater of 16 indicators Solid Progress and no Not Evident. Please consider the feedback provided below each indicator rated less than Solid Progress when creating the Spring 2018 90-day Plan. Spring 2018 90-day Plans will be due online in early January 2018.

### NM PED Reviewer comments in RED

<b>Step 1 – Build Core Team</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Diverse backgrounds and viewpoints NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders likely to bring different viewpoints to discussions and a clear rationale for selection is provided.	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders and a rationale for selection is provided.	The core team consists of principal, district representative, and/or teachers or instructional leaders. A rationale for selection may or may not be provided.	Shows lack of attempt or action <b>OR</b> No district representative is identified.

Representation <sup>1</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	The core team has <b>full representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	The core team has representation from <b>two of the following</b> : across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and</b> community.	The core team has <b>limited representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and/or</b> community.	Shows lack of attempt or action
--	--	---	---	---------------------------------

**Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:**

Core team reflects all school stakeholders. LADH, in the development of future 90-day plans, might consider using a bulleted format with objective experience and educational descriptors as with the rationale for Ms. Miranda and Mr. Pereira.

<b>Step 2 – Analyze Data &amp; Set Student Achievement Goals</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Summative goals NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	In addition to the indicators for solid progress, <b>an optional third goal has been identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in both ELA <b>and</b> math <b>using the most recent available baseline data.</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Benchmark goals <sup>2</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to the <b>most current interim assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are <b>clearly</b> articulated in both ELA and math, <b>align with summative goals, and are connected to interim or formative assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress <b>are articulated</b> in both ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Ambitious & Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria <b>and create a sense of focus and urgency towards action.</b>	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>all</b> SMART criteria.	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>4 or fewer</b> SMART criteria.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 2 Reflections and Feedback:**

While LADH identified summative student achievement goals using PARCC data, consideration for other data such as short-term assessment data, student work samples, common formative assessments and EOC data to assist in development of SMART goals.

<sup>1</sup> Title I schools shall assure meaningful input and involvement of stakeholders listed in Section 1118(b)(2) of ESSA Guidance

<sup>2</sup> For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://ped.state.nm.us/assessmentaccountability/assessmentevaluation/2015/Test%20Graph%202016.pdf>

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook indicator for Benchmark goals: LADH might consider identifying the BOY, MOY and EOY dates and target scores to provide teachers with expectations throughout the year. Scores throughout the school year provide teachers with information to drive instruction, provide RtI, re-teach, and/or other interventions.

<b>Step 3 – Focus Areas</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
High leverage and aligned <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	The 2-3 <b>highest-leverage</b> focus areas selected are aligned to <b>deep</b> data analysis and include qualitative <b>and</b> quantitative evidence.	The 2-3 focus areas selected are <b>aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative evidence.</b>	2-3 focus areas <b>are selected.</b>	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 3 Reflections and Feedback:**

Focus Areas are aligned to data but contains mostly qualitative evidence. Quantitative data will help drive further development of goals.

<b>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Clear hypothesis <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each focus area has a clear hypothesis of the <b>deepest</b> underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges <b>that will result in a substantial reduction of the performance challenge.</b>	<b>Each</b> focus area has a <b>clear</b> hypothesis of the <b>underlying root cause</b> or causes of school performance challenges.	<b>Some or all</b> of the focus areas <b>have a hypothesis</b> of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Evidence to support <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative <b>and</b> quantitative data <b>and are supported by evidence.</b>	Root causes seem to have been <b>generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data.</b>	Root causes are identified, but <b>are not connected</b> to data analysis.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 4 Reflections and Feedback:**

Each focus area has a clear hypothesis based on analysis of data. LADH should consider gathering evidence in the form of quantitative data so that the next 90-day plan and workbook revision contains quantitative data in addition to qualitative data.

<b>Step 5 – Desired Outcomes &amp; Critical Actions</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – observable changes in adult behavior	Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying the specific observable change(s) in adult	<b>Each focus area has</b> a 90-day desired outcome <b>identifying specific observable change(s)</b> in adult	Desired outcomes <b>do not</b> identify specific observable changes in adult behavior.	Shows lack of attempt or action

NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	behaviors, <b>which creates focus and urgency toward action.</b>	behavior.		
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – specific focus on student achievement  NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	Each desired outcome is specific in focus and <b>should logically result in</b> increased student achievement.	<b>Each</b> desired outcome is <b>specific</b> and <b>there is a clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	The desired outcomes <b>lack specificity</b> about the observable changes in adult behavior. There is <b>no clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – sense of urgency toward action NM PED Review Limited Progress	For each focus area, critical actions <b>promote a sense of urgency toward</b> addressing root cause(s) and achieving the desired outcome.	<b>For each focus area</b> , critical actions <b>address clear underlying root cause(s) and are connected to</b> achieving the desired outcome.	It is <b>not clear</b> how critical actions will result in achieving the desired outcome in 90 days.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – person(s) responsible for completing actions NM PED Review Determination: No evidence	Responsibility for action items are <b>strategically owned</b> by various school/district individuals.	<b>Each</b> critical action <b>identifies</b> a person responsible.	It is <b>not clear</b> who is responsible for completing each critical action.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – timelines and resources NM PED Review Determination: Limit Progress	All critical actions have a clear timeline and identify resources needed to support them, <b>including funding sources.</b>	<b>All</b> critical actions have a <b>clear</b> timeline and identify resources needed to support them.	Critical actions <b>do not identify</b> timelines and/or needed resources.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:**

- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Desired Outcomes/observable change in adult behavior: specific observable changes in adult behavior needs to be articulated. (Example for Standard/Curriculum Alignment: At the end of this 90-day plan, 100% of teachers will reference aligned Common Core State Standard in lesson plans.) (Example for Data-driven instruction: At the end of this 90-day plan, 100% of teachers will have evidence of data analysis from short cycle assessment given to students and the modifications in lesson plans to address student lack of understanding.)

- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Desired Outcomes/specific focus on student achievement: statements should specify how the change in adult behavior would effect student achievement. (Example: 100% of the teachers will provide evidence of reteaching standards when student assessment shows a lack of understanding.)
- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Critical Action/ sense of urgency: statements should identify progress-monitoring dates through out the year to indicate to teachers that there will be accountability and expectations. There should be opportunity for mid-year adjustments if data shows non-compliance. Doing a book study without an expectation of using the material learned does not show a sense of urgency. Example: On the first of every month, 100% of teachers will turn in lesson plans showing implementation of SIOP strategies. OR After every Istation assessment, 100% of the teachers will provide data analysis to principal along with plan for re-teach or intervention for students that have not mastered the material.
- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Critical Action/person responsible: column appears to have been deleted and no responsible person was identified.
- To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Critical Action/timelines and resources: timelines need more specificity and there should be requirements through out the year for periodic monitoring.

<b><u>Step 6 – Monitor Implementation</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Progress Indicators NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	<b>Strategically selected</b> progress indicators identify the metrics and evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>All</b> progress indicators <b>identify the metrics and evidence</b> used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>Some</b> progress indicators have been identified, and they <b>may or may not include</b> metrics or evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Potential Adjustments to the 90-day Plan NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	For <b>all</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>and</b> unanticipated barriers.	For <b>most</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers.	For <b>some</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>or</b> unanticipated barriers.	Shows lack of attempt or action
System to Monitor NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	The system to monitor implementation <b>clearly details</b> the procedure, timelines, and persons responsible.	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.</b>	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies one or more of the following:</b> the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.	Shows lack of attempt or action

### **Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:**

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Progress Indicators: Metrics and evidence needs to be identified. Example: A non-evaluative walkthrough will be done in 100% of the classrooms every 2 weeks and data will be gathered on implementation of SIOP strategies.

Potential Adjustments are listed for most of the progress indicators but not all.

The LADH system to Monitor provides more clarity than the desired outcomes and critical actions. LADH ought to consider adding the specifics on monitoring to the other areas of the 90-day plan.

LADH, please consider using the 30/60/90 day reflective guides available on DASH resource site to help focus monthly core team meetings.



**LA PROMESA EARLY LEARNING CENTER**  
**Special Meeting: Governance Council Board Meeting Minutes**  
**Date: September 2, 2017**

Board Members Present	Julian Munoz, Judy Griego, Cipriano Lucero, Regina Sanchez (by phone)	
Absent		
Others in Attendance	Chris Jones, Danielle Miranda	
QUORUM	<u>  X  </u> YES <u>    </u> NO	
Meeting called to order	Mr. Munoz called the meeting to order at 6:43pm	
Item	Discussion	Action/Recommendation
Approval of the Agenda	No discussion.	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the 09/02/17 amended agenda. Cipriano Lucero motioned, Judy Griego seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Approval of Minutes	*Tabled to next meeting	Julian Munoz called for a motion to table approval of minutes from 08/28/2017 until next meeting. Judy Griego motioned, Cipriano Lucero seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Discussion/Action Items		
Budget Report	*Tabled to next meeting	Julian Munoz called for a motion to table Items A & B until next meeting. Judy Griego motioned, Cipriano Lucero seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Approval of BARs	*Tabled to next meeting	
Corrective Action Plan (CAP) Updates	<u>Jones</u> : We do have the Board Training that we have satisfied. It’s important that we focus on the academic priorities that we have as a school. This aligns with the Monitoring Tool. This year, the most important thing for us to accomplish is to raise the academics; we have to do better academically. The major focus of all our presentations to you will be about academics. Operationally and Budget-wise we have gotten back on track. We have a stronger GC Board now because of you and your commitment. We have an Audit coming up and we need to re-establish an Audit Committee; we need a couple of members who will participate in that committee. With the Audit, I think we are going to find some trouble in July of last year. After that we have a good history of stability when it comes to finance. So this year, we will not have a disclaimed Audit; we’re going to have a regular Audit. We will have an opinion and I think the opinion is going to be that we have done a great job getting back on track. The CSD is actually coming out on October 20 <sup>th</sup> and again in January and they want to make sure that we’re doing everything correctly. I feel good about these two visits; we’ve made a lot of progress. Academically what this shows in the CAP is that we have to get a ‘C’, next fall we will get the school letter grade. We have a ‘D’ and we have 11 points to go. I feel good about what we are going to be able to accomplish. They want to make a decision in June but that cannot happen because they’ve given us until August. They’ve given us the school letter grade option as well, so they can’t go back on that because that was the first part of the negotiation. NWEA: Our students are actually scoring better than we thought. We have a RIT score	



	which is the scale score for the kids (what they earn on the assessment) and then we have Projected Growth. Their attorney recommended that we use the growth index to determine proficiency, if we met the goal. She made a recommendation to the PEC that they actually took into consideration and plan to go by but that’s inaccurate. So if we were to use that Growth Index, we would never meet our goal because it’s the wrong way to look at our reports. So I need to come back to the PEC meeting when we finalize this to say, they made a mistake and you’re looking at it incorrectly. But I want to show you what we need to use. That is something we will do with NWEA.																					
Performance Framework Updates	<u>Jones:</u> The most important part is Academics because that is where we’ve fallen behind. Academically, we haven’t made a whole lot of progress in many years so now we have the opportunity to do so. We got a ‘D’, so we need something so we can boost our performance and that is the NM Dash Program and the CAP. Once we have the data, we can start to dissect that, and you can see where we really are.																					
Approval of NM Dash 90 Day Plan	<p><u>Jones:</u> The 90-Day plan is something you use for school improvement. I do like this because it gives us focus and it’s going to help us.</p> <p><u>Step 1-</u> We had to come up with a Core Team (Team Member, Position, &amp; Rational).</p> <p><u>Step 2-</u> We had to Analyze Data and set Student Achievement Goals. NWEA is our Benchmark assessment and it is something that you use on a regular basis and we monitor student proficiency.</p> <table><tr><th>Grade/Subject Area</th><th>2015-16 PARCC Results (3-8)</th><th>2016-17 PARCC Results (3-8)</th><th>2017-2018 PARCC Goals (3-8)</th><th>Benchmark Goals: How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals? (3-8)</th></tr><tr><td>Overall ELA</td><td>7%</td><td>9.05%</td><td>15% (+13 students)</td><td>20% (NWEA)</td></tr><tr><td>Overall Math</td><td>10%</td><td>7.59%</td><td>12% (+11 students)</td><td>15% (NWEA)</td></tr><tr><td>Overall ISIP Early Reading</td><td>NA (DIBELS)</td><td>62.5%</td><td>75% (EOY)</td><td>60-70% (Istation – MOY) 75% (Istation – EOY)</td></tr></table> <p>We looked through the reports, we did the calculations, we figured out where we need to be and we set realistic goals. If we meet this goal, we are going to get the 11 points.</p> <p><u>Step 3-</u> We identified 3 Focus Areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tier I (core) instruction- Each teacher will re-develop unit plans on a bi-weekly basis; Plans will be evaluated by the principal and instructional coach; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.</li><li>• Data-driven instruction- Bi-weekly collaboration meetings will focus on the use of student achievement data to drive instruction; Collaboration protocols will be used to influence teacher focus on data-driven instructional planning and implementation.</li><li>• Tier I interventions- Each teacher will submit unit plans that include a supplemental page for purposeful small group planning; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.</li></ul> <p><u>Step 4-</u> Conduct Root Cause Analysis: Our core team identified the underlying causes of our school performance challenges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tier I (core) instruction- If tier one instruction is to be implemented in order to increase overall student achievement, then a guaranteed and viable curriculum must be in place and supported through a consistent planning tool, availability of supplementary resources, and consistent monitoring (via walkthroughs and structured collaboration meetings) of completed plans as well as the implementation of said plans during the delivery phase of instruction.</li><li>• Data-driven instruction- If data-driven instruction is to be used to differentiate instruction for all students, then all instructional staff members must participate in professional development to help them understand how to access and review reports, use data from said reports to plan whole and small group instruction, and use acquired resources to align with assessment values (i.e. NWEA RIT scores to identify appropriate resources from Reading A-Z and Kahn Academy).</li><li>• Tier I interventions- If tier one intervention is to be effective in closing achievement gaps for struggling students, then all teachers must be intentional in the planning and delivery of tier one intervention that is made possible through sacred intervention blocks built into the daily schedule, the use of intervention-based resources and strategies, the use of small fluid groups driven by data, and a monitoring via structured collaboration meetings.</li></ul> <p><u>Step 5-</u> Create Desired Outcomes &amp; Define Critical Actions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tier I (core) instruction- Each teacher will re-develop unit plans on a bi-weekly basis; Plans will be evaluated by the principal and instructional coach; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.</li><li>• Data-driven instruction- Bi-weekly collaboration meetings will focus on the use of student achievement data to drive instruction; Collaboration protocols will be used to influence teacher focus on data-driven instructional planning and implementation.</li><li>• Tier I interventions- Each teacher will submit unit plans that include a supplemental page for purposeful small group planning; Feedback from walkthroughs and unit plan reviews will be provided to teachers during bi-weekly collaboration meetings.</li></ul> <p><u>Step 6-</u> Monitor Implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Tier I (core) instruction- Plan PD schedule for teachers focused on turnaround pillars (Social and Emotional Curriculum, Tier I Intervention, and PD) and NM Dash Focus Areas (Tier I</li></ul>	Grade/Subject Area	2015-16 PARCC Results (3-8)	2016-17 PARCC Results (3-8)	2017-2018 PARCC Goals (3-8)	Benchmark Goals: How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals? (3-8)	Overall ELA	7%	9.05%	15% (+13 students)	20% (NWEA)	Overall Math	10%	7.59%	12% (+11 students)	15% (NWEA)	Overall ISIP Early Reading	NA (DIBELS)	62.5%	75% (EOY)	60-70% (Istation – MOY) 75% (Istation – EOY)	Julian Munoz called for a motion to approve the NM Dash 90 Day Plan. Judy Griego motioned, Cipriano Lucero seconded. -Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained
Grade/Subject Area	2015-16 PARCC Results (3-8)	2016-17 PARCC Results (3-8)	2017-2018 PARCC Goals (3-8)	Benchmark Goals: How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals? (3-8)																		
Overall ELA	7%	9.05%	15% (+13 students)	20% (NWEA)																		
Overall Math	10%	7.59%	12% (+11 students)	15% (NWEA)																		
Overall ISIP Early Reading	NA (DIBELS)	62.5%	75% (EOY)	60-70% (Istation – MOY) 75% (Istation – EOY)																		

	<p>Instruction, Tier I Intervention, and Data-Driven Instruction). Review submitted unit plans using checklist to ensure appropriate rigor in planning is evident and instruction is aligned with focus areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data-driven instruction- Review teacher reflections provided via collaboration protocols to gauge use of data to influence instructional decisions – monitoring of Q1 and Q3 identification and planning via priority report as well as ACCESS, NWEA, and formative assessment data.</li> <li>• Tier I interventions- Walkthroughs to determine effective use of intervention blocks.</li> </ul>	
<b>Closed Session</b>		<p>Julian Munoz called for a motion for La Promesa Board of Education to convene an Executive Session to discuss the Pending Litigation and the OSA's Special Audit Designation.</p> <p>Judy Griego motioned, Regina Sanchez seconded.</p> <p>-Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained</p>
<b>Reconvene to Open Session</b>	<p>Reconvene at 8:07pm</p> <p><u>Munoz</u>: Roll Call- states that all members agree that the matters discussed in the Executive Session were only limited to those specified in the agenda.</p> <p>Roll Call by Judy Griego</p>	<b>Reconvene to Open Session</b>
<b>Action as Necessary from Closed Session (Discussion/Action)</b>	<u>Munoz</u> : No Action	
<b>Head Administrator Report</b>	<u>Jones</u> : The heart of the report is always going to be the Performance Framework and I will keep you posted.	
<b>Public Comment</b>	N/A	<p>Julian Munoz asked for a motion to adjourn.</p> <p>Judy Griego motioned, Cipriano Lucero seconded.</p> <p>-Julian Munoz called for a vote. GC approved unanimously by a vote of 4-0; 0 opposed; 0 abstained</p>
<b>Adjourn</b>	<p>Next GC meeting: September 26, 2017 at 5:30pm</p> <p>Meeting was adjourned at 8:10pm.</p>	



**From:** [PSB, PED, PED](#)  
**To:** [Chaires, Clara](#)  
**Cc:** [Martinez, Severo, PED](#); [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**Subject:** Las Montanas High School - NM DASH Feedback Tool  
**Date:** Friday, November 03, 2017 12:53:12 PM  
**Attachments:** [LMCHS feedback tool \(1\).docx](#)

---

Good Morning,

Upon review of your 90 Day plan, it **has met** the requirements for submission to the online NM Dash system (13 or greater indicators in solid progress, 3 or fewer in Limited Progress, and 0 not Evident).

Attached you will find the feedback tool with your ratings per step. Please keep in mind that your plan met the requirements, but the reviewer has still included some feedback on how to improve your plan. Please bring your revised plan to Implementation and Monitoring training I which you have signed up for. At this training you will receive your login to NM DASH and begin to input your plan into the online system.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Severo Martinez at [severo.martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:severo.martinez@state.nm.us).

Best,

Patricia "Kitty" Montoya  
NMPED  
505-827-3671



NM PED Calibration Review  
Date: 10/31/17  
Reviewer Code: 002

## New Mexico 90-day Plan Offline Planning Process Workbook Feedback Tool

District: LMCHS  
School:  
Date:  
Completed By:

To enter into DASH...		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
13 or greater/ of 16	3 or fewer of 16	0

Your plan (as reviewed by your district designee):		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident

PED review:		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
15	1	

### Overall comment:

**The PED reviewer finds that this Offline Planning Process Workbook meets the minimum criteria of 13 or greater of 16 indicators Solid Progress and no Not Evident.. For indicators marked as Limited Progress, feedback is provided. Please consider the feedback as you develop your Spring 2018 Plan. Spring 2018 90-day Plans will be due online in early January 2018. The plan is ready to be entered online in NM DASH**

### NM PED Reviewer comments in RED

<u>Step 1 - Build Core Team</u>	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
Diverse backgrounds and viewpoints <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders <b>likely to bring different viewpoints to discussions</b> and a <b>clear</b> rationale for selection is provided.	<b>In addition to</b> principal and district representative, the core team <b>includes teachers or instructional leaders</b> and a rationale for selection <b>is provided</b> .	The core team <b>consists of principal, district representative, and/or teachers or instructional leaders</b> . A rationale for selection <b>may or may not</b> be provided.	Shows lack of attempt or action <b>OR</b> No district representative is identified.

Representation <sup>1</sup> <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	The core team has <b>full representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	The core team has representation from <b>two of the following</b> : across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and</b> community.	The core team has <b>limited representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and/or</b> community.	Shows lack of attempt or action
---	--	---	---	---------------------------------

**Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:**

Core team reflects all school stakeholders.

<b><u>Step 2 – Analyze Data &amp; Set Student Achievement Goals</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Summative goals <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	In addition to the indicators for solid progress, <b>an optional third goal has been identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in both ELA <b>and</b> math <b>using the most recent available baseline data.</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Benchmark goals <sup>2</sup> <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to the <b>most current interim assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are <b>clearly</b> articulated in both ELA and math, <b>align with summative goals, and are connected to interim or formative assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress <b>are articulated</b> in both ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Ambitious & Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria <b>and create a sense of focus and urgency towards action.</b>	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>all</b> SMART criteria.	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>4 or fewer</b> SMART criteria.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 2 Reflections and Feedback:**

Data and goals meet Solid Progress.

<sup>1</sup> Title I schools shall assure meaningful input and involvement of stakeholders listed in Section 1118(b)(2) of **ESSA Guidance**<sup>2</sup> For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://ped.state.nm.us/assessmentaccountability/assessmentevaluation/2015/Test%20Graph%202016.pdf>

<b>Step 3 – Focus Areas</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
High leverage and aligned <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	The 2-3 <b>highest-leverage</b> focus areas selected are aligned to <b>deep</b> data analysis and include qualitative and quantitative evidence.	The 2-3 focus areas selected are <b>aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative evidence.</b>	2-3 focus areas <b>are selected.</b>	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 3 Reflections and Feedback:**

Qualitative and quantitative evidence is used to determine high leverage and aligned focus areas.

<b>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Clear hypothesis <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each focus area has a clear hypothesis of the <b>deepest</b> underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges <b>that will result in a substantial reduction of the performance challenge.</b>	<b>Each</b> focus area has a <b>clear</b> hypothesis of the <b>underlying root cause</b> or causes of school performance challenges.	<b>Some or all</b> of the focus areas <b>have a hypothesis</b> of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Evidence to support <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and quantitative data <b>and are supported by evidence.</b>	Root causes seem to have been <b>generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data.</b>	Root causes are identified, but <b>are not connected</b> to data analysis.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 4 Reflections and Feedback:**

Each focus area has a clear hypothesis based on analysis of data. LMCHS should consider gathering evidence in the form of quantitative data so that the next 90-day plan and workbook revision contains quantitative data in addition to qualitative data.

<b>Step 5 – Desired Outcomes &amp; Critical Actions</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – observable changes in adult behavior  <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying the specific observable change(s) in adult behaviors, <b>which creates focus and urgency toward action.</b>	<b>Each focus area has</b> a 90-day desired outcome <b>identifying specific observable change(s)</b> in adult behavior.	Desired outcomes <b>do not</b> identify specific observable changes in adult behavior.	Shows lack of attempt or action

<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – specific focus on student achievement  <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each desired outcome is specific in focus and <b>should logically result in</b> increased student achievement.	<b>Each</b> desired outcome is <b>specific</b> and <b>there is a clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	The desired outcomes <b>lack specificity</b> about the observable changes in adult behavior. There is <b>no clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – sense of urgency toward action  <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	For each focus area, critical actions <b>promote a sense of urgency toward</b> addressing root cause(s) and achieving the desired outcome.	<b>For each focus area</b> , critical actions <b>address clear underlying root cause(s)</b> and <b>are connected to</b> achieving the desired outcome.	It is <b>not clear</b> how critical actions will result in achieving the desired outcome in 90 days.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – person(s) responsible for completing actions  <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Responsibility for action items are <b>strategically owned</b> by various school/district individuals.	<b>Each</b> critical action <b>identifies</b> a person responsible.	It is <b>not clear</b> who is responsible for completing each critical action.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – timelines and resources  <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	All critical actions have a clear timeline and identify resources needed to support them, <b>including funding sources</b> .	<b>All</b> critical actions have a <b>clear</b> timeline and identify resources needed to support them.	Critical actions <b>do not identify</b> timelines and/or needed resources.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<b><u>Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:</u></b> Desired Actions and Critical Actions are well articulated and meet solid progress.				
<b><u>Step 6 – Monitor Implementation</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Progress Indicators <b>NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress</b>	<b>Strategically selected</b> progress indicators identify the metrics and evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>All</b> progress indicators <b>identify the metrics and evidence</b> used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>Some</b> progress indicators have been identified, and they <b>may or may not include</b> metrics or evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	Shows lack of attempt or action



Potential Adjustments to the 90-day Plan <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	For <b>all</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>and</b> unanticipated barriers.	For <b>most</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers.	For <b>some</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>or</b> unanticipated barriers.	Shows lack of attempt or action
System to Monitor <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	The system to monitor implementation <b>clearly details</b> the procedure, timelines, and persons responsible.	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.</b>	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies one or more of the following:</b> the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:**

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Progress Indicators: LMCHS did not identify the metrics that will be used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.

LMCHS, please consider using the 30/60/90 day reflective guides available on DASH resource site to help focus monthly core team meetings.

**From:** [Chaires, Clara](#)  
**To:** [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#); [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#)  
**Cc:** [Caz, Martinez](#)  
**Subject:** Las Montañas NM-DASH Plan  
**Date:** Monday, October 16, 2017 11:01:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [SKM\\_C224e17101611100.pdf](#)

---

Good Morning:

Attached is the governance council approved NM-DASH plan for Las Montañas Charter High School.

Thanks,  
C. Chaires  
Las Montañas Charter HS  
575-636-2100

**New Mexico 90-day Plan**  
**Offline Planning Process Workbook**  
Las Montañas Charter High School

Step 1 – Build Core Team

Team Member	Position	<u>Rationale:</u> What strengths/perspective does this person bring to the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school's current reality?
Caz Martinez	Principal/Director	As the Director of LMCHS, Mr. Martinez has an intimate knowledge of the school's mission, vision, and culture. He understands the school and staff strengths and weaknesses. He will utilize this understanding to build a plan with the core team that will lead to increased student achievement for all students.
Gabriel Estrada	Assistant Principal/Social Studies Teacher	Mr. Estrada has been a Social Studies teacher for 18 years. He is currently the Assistant Principal and also teaches Government and New Mexico History teacher. Mr. Estrada has as a unique perspective since he serves in these dual roles.
Valery Parker-Ratliff	Math Instructional Coach/Math teacher	Leads school-wide activities and is the student council sponsor. Continuously implements activities and events that build school culture and climate. Has 13 years experience as a math teacher and currently teaches college readiness and entry level math courses. Is a Math Coach who observes and coaches classroom teachers and facilitates Professional learning Communities (PLC's) and Professional Development (PD) sessions. Developed a math Response to Intervention (RtI) system of support at LMCHS. Analyzes NWEA MAP data for LMCHS and track results for Benchmark assessments.
Robert Arneson	Social Studies Teacher	Social Studies teacher at LMCHS for 10 years. He is the School SIS liaison and mentor who provides coaching and training to staff members. Mr. Arneson is also a part of several LMCHS committees that work towards school improvement.
Brandi Fuentes	English Language Arts Teacher	English Language Arts Teacher for 6 years. Mrs. Fuentes has 5 years of experience at LMCHS, in addition to 1 year in Arizona at a Title I school. She is experienced teaching English Language Learners (ELL's), and working with high and low functioning students at middle school and high

		school levels. Currently enrolled in Reading Specialist graduate program.
John Lee	Special Education Teacher	Mr. Lee has 17 years of experience in Special Education and has knowledge of case management regarding SPED. Mr. Lee has received training in SPED Director responsibilities and is experienced in facilitating IEP meetings, and incorporating academic modifications and accommodations. teaching Driver's Education and has many years working in an inclusion setting.
Laura Carrion	Governance Council Member	Governance Council Member at LMCHS for 3 years. Has worked for 13 years in a low performing Title I school in southern New Mexico. Has been part of a turnaround school process and is an advocate for standards-based and data driven schools to meet students' educational needs. Currently teaches ELL students in both elementary and high school levels.
Sid Robinson	Physical Education Teacher/Coach	P.E. Teacher/Athletic Director who has taught at LMCHS for 5 years. He has helped form school clubs, and the Metro Athletics League that serves Southern NM charter schools. Works extensively with Senior Advisory Program.
Kim Dunbar	Counselor	High School Counselor for 25 years in Las Cruces. Has been test coordinator for over 20 years, both in a traditional comprehensive school, as well as in a charter school. Going from a large high school to a charter school, has enabled her to work with students on a level that is beneficial to the students.
Sandy Beery	Professional Development Specialist	Leads PLC and PD work at LMCHS. Observes and coaches classroom teachers. Has extensive knowledge of growth and strength areas of staff. Background of school administration K-12 and secondary teaching.

### Step 2 – Analyze Data & Set Student Achievement Goals

#### **Data Analysis Notes**

The core team believes that setting summative goals of growth within the cohort would be realistic for the unique demographics and culture at LMCHS. We believe this will allow us to focus on the achievement of the entire student body and not just the “bubble” students. This will also allow us to

identify students for intervention at all levels.

Our current Performance Framework Contract with the PEC states that we will show that 75% of students in grades 9-11 will show an increase of 1.1 to 1.3 years growth in math and a 1.5 to 1.7 years growth in reading using NWEA MAP assessment.

The core team has no supporting evidence that the MAP assessment aligns with PARCC and for this reason we will be adjusting our Middle of Year (MOY) benchmark goals for the purpose of the DASH plan. This means that we will be setting MAP goals to grade level proficiency as opposed to years growth. We propose that if students are able to achieve grade level proficiency on the MAP assessment they will be able reach our grade level PARCC Student Achievement Goals.

Grade/Subject Area	2016-17 PARCC Results	2017-18 PARCC Goals	<u>Benchmark Goals: MOY NWEA MAP Assessment</u> SY 2016-2017 to 2017-2018
Grade 8 Math	0.0% Proficient	4.2% Proficient	Increase from 0% at grade level to 12% at grade level
Algebra 1	6.7% Proficient	26.7% Proficient	Increase from 10% at grade level to 30% at grade level
Geometry	2.8% Proficient	11.1% Proficient	Increase from 17% at grade level to 40% at grade level
Algebra 2	0.0% Proficient	11.0% Proficient	Increase from 11% at grade level to 33% at grade level
ELA 9	4.3% Proficient	14.9% Proficient	Increase from 10% at grade level to 30% at grade level
ELA 10	0.0% Proficient	18.8% Proficient	Increase from 27% at grade level to 50% at grade level
ELA 11	0.0% Proficient	12.0% Proficient	Increase from 14% at grade level to 30% at grade level

## 2016 - 2017 PARCC Math Results

## Math Cohort Results

School	Test	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	% Prof
LMCHS	Grade 8 Math	79.2	16.7%	4.2%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Algebra 1	33.3%	40.0%	20.0%	6.7%	0.0%	6.7%
	Geometry	25.0%	63.9%	8.3%	2.8%	0.0%	2.8%
	Algebra 2	76.9%	23.1%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

## 2017-2018 PARCC Math Goals

## Math Cohort Goals

School	Test	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	% Prof
LMCHS	Grade 8 Math		79.2%	16.7%	4.2%	0.0%	4.2%
	Algebra 1		33.3%	40.0%	20.0%	6.7%	26.7%
	Geometry		25.0%	63.9%	8.3%	2.8%	11.1%
	Algebra 2		76.9%	12.1%	7.0%	4.0%	11.0%

## 2016 - 2017 PARCC ELA Results

## ELA Cohort Results

School	Test	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	% Prof
LMCHS	Grade 9 ELA	61.7%	23.4%	10.6%	4.3%	0.0%	4.3%
	Grade 10 ELA	56.3%	25.0%	18.8%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
	Grade 11 ELA	68.0%	20.0%	12.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%

## 2017-2018 PARCC ELA Goals

## ELA Cohort Goals

School	Test	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5	% Prof
LMCHS	Grade 9 ELA		61.7%	23.4%	10.6%	4.3%	14.9%
	Grade 10 ELA		56.3%	25.0%	16.8%	2.0%	18.8%
	Grade 11 ELA		68.0%	20.0%	10.0%	2.0%	12.0%

Step 3 – Identify Focus Areas

<i>Focus Area:</i>	<i>Data Connection:</i>
Standards Alignment	<p>92% of teacher's lesson plans are not completely aligned with CCSS.</p> <p>Classroom walkthroughs indicate that objectives are not always aligned and/or posted to grade level expectations and rigor.</p> <p>97% of students are not proficient on PARCC assessment in Math and English which is aligned with CCSS</p> <p>There is no evidence of departmental scope and sequence aligned to CCSS</p> <p>One-on-one feedback from school leadership has not been consistently provided to hold teachers accountable to ensure effective instructional adjustments, interventions and feedback based on CCSS.</p>
Data-driven Instruction	<p>Teachers are not currently using PARCC data for instructional interventions.</p> <p>PLC's have not developed teacher created common formative assessments in order to analyze student achievement data.</p> <p>PLC time has not been established to consistently analyze student achievement data.</p> <p>Data for RtI implementation has not been collected to develop a teacher action plan.</p>
Collaboration	<p>Current schedule does not allow for weekly, monthly or yearly PLC departmental teams to collaborate.</p> <p>School leaders have not had collaboration as a primary focus and goal for school and departmental teams.</p> <p>There were no formal departmental PLC's established.</p>



Step 4 – Conduct Root Cause Analysis

<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Root Cause Hypothesis</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
Standards Alignment	<p>CCSS Alignment is not the primary focus for instructional planning.</p> <p>There is a lack of consistent accountability for CCSS Alignment monitoring, implementation and feedback.</p>	<p>90% of teachers' lesson plans do not consistently include CCSS alignment.</p> <p>There is no consistent monitoring and feedback regarding CCSS alignment in lesson plans.</p>
Data-driven Instruction	Teachers do not know how to analyze and use data to inform and improve instructional strategies.	There is no consistently sustained job embedded PD on data-driven instruction.
Collaboration	Active participation in teacher team PLC's (departmental) is not required and is not a school wide systematic practice.	Departmental PLC's are not established school wide. There is no designated time for PLC's to meet frequently.

Step 5 – Create Desired Outcomes & Define Critical Actions

<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Draft Desired Outcome (change in adult behaviors)</i>
Standards Alignment	All teachers are planning and delivering instruction aligned to CCSS as evidenced by lesson plans, formative assessments, PLC's and classroom walkthroughs.
Data-driven instruction	All teachers will use and analyze student performance data to plan for instruction and RtI as a school-wide agreed upon system and protocol.
Collaboration	All teachers will be part of a departmental PLC that engages in regular conversations, planning and articulation of key actions that focus on improving student achievement.

**Focus Area: Standards Alignment**

**Desired Outcome:** All teachers are planning and delivering instruction aligned to CCSS as evidenced by lesson plans, formative assessments, PLC's and classroom walkthroughs.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
By 10/12/17	Create plan, schedule and calendar with Core Team.	School Calendar, Master Schedule, Bell Schedule, Calendar Template, Substitute coverage	Principal	Core Team
10/13/17	Deliver plan and calendar to Staff.	Copies of calendar, Allotted PD time	Principal	Principal
10/13/17	Training for all teachers on unpacking Math/English CCSS.	Copies of CCSS/Allotted PD time/Sample questions for Math/ELA CCSS	Professional Development Consultant	All teachers and principal
10/13/17	All teachers will look and unpack CCSS.	Copies of CCSS/Allotted PD time/Sample questions for Math/ELA CCSS	Professional Development Consultant	All teachers

Ongoing first semester	Math/English teachers will create CCSS scope and sequence and align with their current curriculum.	Departmental Scope and Sequences/Copies of Math/ELA CCSS	Principal/ Instructional Coach	Math and English teachers
Ongoing first semester	Math/English departmental PLC will create quarterly PARCC common formative assessments.	Departmental Scope and Sequences/Copies of Math/ELA CCSS/Template for common formative assessments	Principal/ Instructional Coach	Math and English teachers
11/17/17	English Department will work with all teachers to create literacy lessons that support CCSS to be taught in all classes.	Copies of English CCSS/Sample questions of ELA CCSS/Copies of strategies/Lesson plan template	Principal	All teachers
Ongoing first semester	Social Studies, Science, P.E, Spanish teachers will create quarterly English CCSS formative assessments.	Copies of English CCSS/Sample questions of ELA CCSS/Template for common formative assessments	Principal	English, SS, Science, P.E., Spanish
Ongoing first semester	Technology teachers will facilitate quarterly activities that will familiarize students with the technological aspects of the PARCC assessment.	Computers, Online resources	Principal	Smart Lab and Edgenuity Teachers
Ongoing first semester	Math teachers will work with science and P.E. teachers to create quarterly CCSS lessons.	Copies of Math CCSS/Sample questions of Math CCSS/Copies of strategies/Lesson plan template	Principal	Math, Science and P.E. teachers
Ongoing first semester	Math, science, and P.E. teachers will create quarterly math CCSS formative assessments.	Copies of English CCSS/Sample questions of ELA CCSS/Template for common formative assessments	Principal	English, SS, Science, P.E., Spanish

<b>Focus Area: Data - driven Instruction</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> All teachers will use and analyze student performance data to plan for instruction and RTI as a schoolwide agreed upon system and protocol.				
<b>CRITICAL ACTIONS</b>				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
By 10/13/17	Core team will create a calendar of when student data will be given to teachers.	Calendar	Principal	Core Team
By 10/13/17	All teachers will receive school wide PARCC data.	PARCC data	Principal	All teachers
By November 17, 2017	Teachers will receive their students' PARCC data.	Individual PARCC Data, Class rosters	Principal/ Instructional Coach	All Teachers
Beginning November 17th and ongoing 1st semester	All teachers will receive training on how to analyze and use student data.	Individual PARCC Data, Class rosters, Samples of data usage, MAP Data, Rubric/Template for analyzing data	Principal/ Instructional Coach/ PD Consultant	All TEachers
Ongoing first semester	All teachers will create quarterly common formative assessments based on student data.	Student Data, copies of CCSS ELA/Math, CFA template	Principal/P D Consultant	All teachers
Ongoing first semester	All PLC's will evaluate and analyze data following quarterly common formative assessments.	Graded Quarterly CFA's, Rubric/Template for analyzing data	Principal	All teachers
Ongoing first semester	All PLC's will use the data from quarterly common formative assessments to guide RtI processes and implementation.	CFA data, School RTI protocol documents	Principal/ Instructional Coach	All teachers

<b>Focus Area: Collaboration</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> All teachers will be part of a departmental PLC that engages in regular conversations, planning and articulation of key actions that focus on improving student achievement.				
<b>CRITICAL ACTIONS</b>				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
By September 15	All PLC's will develop norms and protocols	Norms and Protocol worksheet	Principal	All teachers
By October 13	A schedule and calendar will be made for designated PLC time	School calendar, Master schedule, Bell schedule, calendar template, substitute teachers	Principal	Core Team
Ongoing first semester	Administration will attend each PLC once a month	PLC calendar	Principal	Principal, All teachers
Ongoing first semester	PLC's will create lessons aligned with CCSS	CCSS ELA/Math, Lesson plan template	Principal/ PD Consultant	All teachers
Ongoing first semester	PLC's will create common formative assessments aligned with CCSS	Copies of English and Math CCSS/Sample questions of ELA and Math CCSS/Template for common formative assessments	Principal	All teachers
Ongoing first semester	PLC's will evaluate data from common formative assessments	Graded Quarterly CFA's, Rubric/Template for analyzing data	Principal	All teachers
Ongoing first semester	PLC's will create lessons, strategies and provide RtI based on data from common formative assessments	CFA data, School RTI protocol documents, Lesson plan template	Principal	All teachers

Step 6 – Monitor Implementation**Focus Area: Standards Alignment**

**Desired Outcome:** All teachers are planning and delivering instruction aligned to CCSS as evidenced by lesson plans, formative assessments, PLC's and classroom walkthroughs.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
-----------------	--	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
By October 13, 2017	Review schedule and calendar with core team.	n/a
October 13, 2017	Professional Development Day agenda designates time for CCSS training and unpacking.	Alteration of original PD agenda
Following October 13th PD Training, throughout 2nd Quarter	Teacher Unit Lesson Plans that are aligned to CCSS.	Addition PLC time may be required. Administration will check unit plans at different times depending on unit length (one deadline for all teachers will not work).
December 4, 2017	Math/English Departmental Scope and Sequence. Math/English Departmental CFA's. Other departmental CFA's aligned to CCSS.	Some teachers may give CFA's prior to deadline if ready. Additional training or PD may be needed.



**Focus Area: Data-driven Instruction**

**Desired Outcome:** All teachers will use and analyze student performance data to plan for instruction and RTI as a schoolwide agreed upon system and protocol.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
-----------------	--	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
By October 13, 2017	Review schedule and calendar with core team.	n/a
By October 13, 2017	PD day agenda designates for PARCC data and data analysis.	Alteration of original PD Agenda.
By November 17, 2017	Class rosters with attached individual student reports. PD Agenda designates time for individual student. PARCC data analysis and training.	Additional PD time may be required.
Following November 17th PD and throughout Quarter 2	PLC Agenda designates time for teachers to align formative assessments with data. CFA's will show evidence of alignment with data.	Additional PLC time may be needed. Additional coaching for creation of CFA's might be required.
Following November 17th PD and throughout Quarter 2	RtI documents will provide evidence of interventions based on data.	PD may be required for RtI monitoring and support.

**Focus Area: Collaboration**

**Desired Outcome:** All teachers will be part of a departmental PLC that engages in regular conversations, planning and articulation of key actions that focus on improving student achievement.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
-----------------	--	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------

Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
By October 13, 2017	PLC norms and protocol worksheet per departmental PLC.	n/a
By October 13, 2017	Review schedule and calendar with core team.	n/a
Throughout 2nd Quarter and by December 4, 2017	PLC's agendas and copies of CFA's.	Additional PLC time may be required Additional PD and/or coaching may be required
December 15, 2017	PLC's data analysis template. RTI document.	Change PD calendar May be moved to 2nd 90 day plan

<b>Procedure</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>
Core team will meet monthly to review plan implementation and progress towards desired outcomes and make any necessary adjustments	Monthly - October, November and December	Core Team Principal
Core team will communicate progress with all teachers	Designated PD days for all staff (PD agenda will include 90 day report)	





**LAS MONTAÑAS CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL  
GOVERNANCE COUNCIL MEETING  
MINUTES**

**Tuesday, October 10, 2017  
LMCHS Library, Room 205  
1405 S. Solano  
Las Cruces, NM 88001  
5:30 PM**

**Officers:**

Michael L. Davis, President  
Kevin Freitas, Vice President  
Laura Carrion, Secretary

**Members:**

Dr. Blanca E. Martinez-Rolle  
Patrick Switzer

**1. Call to Order**

The meeting was called to order by Governance Council Secretary, Laura Carrion at 5:30 PM.

**Roll Call**

Roll was called by Governance Council Secretary, Laura Carrion. Members present were Kevin Freitas, Laura Carrion and Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle and Patrick Switzer. Mike Davis was absent.

**Pledge of Allegiance**

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited by all.

**2. Approval of October 10, 2017 Agenda**

Governance Council Secretary, Laura Carrion asked the members of the Governance Council to review today's agenda. Kevin Freitas moved to approve the October 10, 2017 agenda as written. Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle seconded the motion. Motion passed.

**3. Approval of September 19, 2017 Minutes**

Governance Council Secretary, Laura Carrion asked the members of the Governance Council to review the September 19, 2017 minutes. Kevin Freitas moved to approve the September 19, 2017 minutes as written. Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle seconded the motion. Motion passed.

**4. Open Forum**

Genesis Peña, Student Council Vice President reported that there are currently fifteen members on the Student Council. They are planning several events including a pizza party for good grades, a Halloween dance, prom, winter ball, a food drive and pennies for patients. Members of the Governance Council asked questions which Ms. Peña answered.

Noah Bunker informed the members of the Governance Council that this year is the tenth anniversary of this school. They are planning a contest. Prizes will be awarded. During the anniversary celebration, the student council will unveil a mural which has been painted in the cafeteria. He also stated that open house will be held. They are also planning a Ram stampede, sports, Halloween dance, haunted house and a costume contest.

#### **5. Closed Executive Session**

Pursuant to the Open Meetings Act NMSA 1978010-15-1-10-15-4

Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle moved that the Governance Council move into closed session. Patrick Switzer seconded the motion. Motion passed.

Items discussed during closed session were confidential student matters.  
10-15-1 (H) (4) Exception

Patrick Switzer moved to return from closed session. Kevin Freitas seconded the motion. Roll call votes were made. Kevin Freitas – Yes, Patrick Switzer – Yes, Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle – Yes, Laura Carrion – Yes. Motion passed. Regular meeting resumed at 5:52 PM.

#### **6. Discussion and Action on September, 2017 Fiscal**

Ms. Bennett presented the September, 2017 fiscal to the members of the Governance Council. The Finance Committee reviewed the September, 2017 fiscal at their meeting earlier this day. After a discussion, Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle moved to approve the September, 2017 fiscal as presented. Kevin Freitas seconded the motion. Motion passed.  
(SEE EXHIBITS "A", "B", "C")

#### **7. Discussion and Action on Dual Credit Instructional Materials Allocation**

Ms. Bennett presented the Dual Credit Instructional Materials Allocation to the members of the Governance Council. The amount is \$497.00. A discussion was held. Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle moved to approve the Dual Credit Instructional Materials Allocation in the amount of \$497.00. Patrick Switzer seconded the motion. Motion passed.  
(SEE EXHIBIT "D")

#### **8. Discussion and Action on Spaceport Funding**

Ms. Bennett presented the Spaceport Funding Award to the members of the Governance Council. The amount of the award is \$10,338.86. After a discussion, Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle moved to approve the Spaceport Funding award in the amount of \$10,338.86. Patrick Switzer seconded the motion. Motion passed. (SEE EXHIBIT "E")

#### **9. Discussion and Action on GO Library Funding**

Ms. Bennett presented the GO Library Funding to the Governance Council. She explained that these funds are to be used for items such as books and audio visual items. Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle moved to approve the GO Library Funding. Patrick Switzer seconded the motion. Motion passed.

#### **10. Discussion and Action on Lease Assistance**

Ms. Bennett presented the 2017-2018 Public School Capital Outlay Lease Assistance award to the members of the governance council. After a discussion, Patrick Switzer moved to approve the 2017-2018 Public School Capital Outlay Lease Assistance award. Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle seconded the motion. Motion passed. (SEE EXHIBIT "F")

#### **11. Discussion and Action of DASH Plan**

Mr. Martinez explained the DASH plan to the members of the Governance Council. He explained that this plan is required by PED for schools that received a grade of D or F. He presented the New Mexico 90-day plan offline planning process workbook for LMCHS



to the governance council. Dr. Blanca Martinez-Rolle moved to approve DASH Plan as presented. Patrick Switzer seconded the motion. Motion passed. **(SEE EXHIBIT "G")**

## 12. Principal's Report

### A. Student Enrollees 40D

Mr. Martinez stated that LMCHS was two students short of the projection. He stated that the enrollment is good. Several students have withdrawn due to reasons which are out of our control. There are currently 156 students enrolled at LMCHS.

Mr. Martinez stated that additional special education students have registered. He has hired an additional special education teacher. She will be starting on October 23<sup>rd</sup>.

### B. Attendance Rate

Mr. Martinez stated that at this time, he does not have information on the attendance rate.

### C. Tenth Anniversary Open House October 19, 2017

Mr. Martinez stated that it is the school's 10<sup>th</sup> year anniversary. Open house and the ten year anniversary celebration will be held on October 19<sup>th</sup> from 4:30 – 6:30 PM. Senior parent night will also be held on this date. Mr. Martinez invited the members of the Governance Council to attend this function.

### D. NMCC'S 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference – December 8 & 9, 2017

Mr. Martinez informed the members of the Governance Council that the NMCCS's annual conference will be held in Albuquerque on Friday, December 8<sup>th</sup> and Saturday, December 9<sup>th</sup>. There is a governance council training component during this conference that is designed to fulfill the mandated board training hours.

**(SEE EXHIBIT "H")**

## 9. Adjourn

Laura Carrion moved to adjourn the meeting. Kevin Freitas seconded the motion. Motion passed.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Mike Davis

Governance Council President

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved

\_\_\_\_\_  
Laura Carrion

Governance Council Secretary

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date Approved

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Governance Council Minutes Prepared By:  
Clara Chaires

\_\_\_\_\_  
October 23, 2017  
Date Prepared



**From:** [PSB, PED, PED](#)  
**To:** [Mathis, LaTricia](#)  
**Cc:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [Martinez, Severo, PED](#); [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**Subject:** New America School NM - NM DASH Feedback Tool  
**Date:** Thursday, November 02, 2017 1:13:18 PM  
**Attachments:** [NAS-NM Feedback Tool.docx](#)

---

Good Morning,

Upon review of your 90 Day plan, it **has met** the requirements for submission to the online NM Dash system (13 or greater indicators in solid progress, 3 or fewer in Limited Progress, and 0 not Evident).

Attached you will find the feedback tool with your ratings per step. Please keep in mind that your plan met the requirements, but the reviewer has still included some feedback on how to improve your plan. Please bring your revised plan to Implementation and Monitoring training I which you have signed up for. At this training you will receive your login to NM DASH and begin to input your plan into the online system.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Severo Martinez at [severo.martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:severo.martinez@state.nm.us).

Best,

Patricia "Kitty" Montoya  
NMPED  
505-827-3671



NM PED Calibration Review  
Date: 10/25/17  
Reviewer Code: 002

## New Mexico 90-day Plan Offline Planning Process Workbook Feedback Tool

District: NAS-NM  
School:  
Date: 10/9/17  
Completed By:

To enter into DASH...		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
13 or greater/ of 16	3 or fewer of 16	0

Your plan (as reviewed by your district designee):		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident

PED review:		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
13	3	0

### Overall comment:

A PED reviewer has reviewed this plan and provided feedback on any indicators marked Limited Progress or Not Evident. Please consider the feedback provided below each indicator rated less than Solid Progress when creating the Spring 2018 90-day Plan. Spring 2018 90-day plans will be due online in early January 2018.

The PED reviewer finds that this Offline Planning Process Workbook meets the minimum criteria of 13 or greater of 16 indicators Solid Progress and no Not Evident. The plan is ready to be entered online in NM DASH.

The plan developed by NAS-NM is very well-thought out and systematic; comments of the reviewer are not criticisms; hopefully, "helpful hints."

### NM PED Reviewer comments in RED

<u>Step 1 – Build Core Team</u>	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
Diverse backgrounds and viewpoints NM PED Review	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team <b>includes</b> teachers or instructional leaders	The core team <b>consists of principal, district representative, and/or teachers or instructional leaders.</b> A	Shows lack of attempt or action

Determination: Solid Progress.	likely to bring different viewpoints to discussions and a clear rationale for selection is provided.	and a rationale for selection is provided.	rationale for selection may or may not be provided.	OR No district representative is identified.
Representation <sup>1</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress.	The core team has full representation from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	The core team has representation from two of the following: across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	The core team has limited representation from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and/or community.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:**

Core team reflects all stakeholders. NAS-NM in the development of future 90-day plans, might consider using a bulleted format with objective experience and education descriptors.

<b>Step 2 – Analyze Data &amp; Set Student Achievement Goals</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Summative goals NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	In addition to the indicators for solid progress, an optional third goal has been identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in both ELA and math using the most recent available baseline data.	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in ELA and/or math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Benchmark goals <sup>2</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to the most current interim assessment data.	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to interim or formative assessment data.	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are articulated in both ELA and/or math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Ambitious & Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria and create a sense of focus and urgency towards action.	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria.	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy 4 or fewer SMART criteria.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 2 Reflections and Feedback:**

<sup>1</sup> Title I schools shall assure meaningful input and involvement of stakeholders listed in Section 1118(b)(2) of ESSA Guidance

<sup>2</sup> For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://ped.state.nm.us/assessmentaccountability/assessmentevaluation/2015/Test%20Graph%202016.pdf>

Achievement goals have been identified in ELA and Math and reflect SMART goals.

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Benchmark goals: NAS-NM should consider looking at dates of benchmark assessments throughout the year and provide target scores for each of those dates. This provides opportunity for teachers to look at re-teach, interventions and RtI periodically to be sure they are on target for the end of the year.

<b>Step 3 – Focus Areas</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
High leverage and aligned <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	The 2-3 <b>highest-leverage</b> focus areas selected are aligned to <b>deep</b> data analysis and include qualitative <b>and</b> quantitative evidence.	The 2-3 focus areas selected are <b>aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative evidence.</b>	2-3 focus areas <b>are selected.</b>	Shows lack of attempt or action

### **Step 3 Reflections and Feedback:**

Focus areas are aligned to data analysis. NAS-NM may want to consider using quantitative data as evidence along with qualitative data. The following statement meets Exemplary criteria: NMTeach observations show this is repeatedly a weakness area for more than 90% of teaching staff.

<b>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Clear hypothesis <b>NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress</b>	Each focus area has a clear hypothesis of the <b>deepest</b> underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges <b>that will result in a substantial reduction of the performance challenge.</b>	<b>Each</b> focus area has a <b>clear</b> hypothesis of the <b>underlying root cause</b> or causes of school performance challenges.	<b>Some or all</b> of the focus areas <b>have a hypothesis</b> of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Evidence to support <b>NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress</b>	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative <b>and</b> quantitative data <b>and are supported by evidence.</b>	Root causes seem to have been <b>generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data.</b>	Root causes are identified, but <b>are not connected</b> to data analysis.	Shows lack of attempt or action

### **Step 4 Reflections and Feedback:**

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Clear hypothesis: It is difficult to tie your root cause hypothesis to evidence provided in your data collection. Your data shows that students are not meeting proficiency expectations. Your hypothesis addresses PD at NAS-NM. In order for the indicator to meet solid progress, you need to make a statement that ties the two together. . (i.e., “The use of analyzed data/collaborative planning to differentiate instruction is not evident in classroom instruction.”) An example of the statements in Evidence to Support might read “80% of walkthroughs indicate whole group instruction utilizing the same materials for all students.” The Critical Actions to address that Root Cause could be the description of consistent and focused job-embedded professional development you are planning.

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Evidence to support: Your root cause hypothesis has minimal qualitative or quantitative data. Consider restating the hypothesis and include more specificity in you evidence. This will help you develop the rest of your plan.



<b><u>Step 5 - Desired Outcomes &amp; Critical Actions</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – observable changes in adult behavior <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying the specific observable change(s) in adult behaviors, <b>which creates focus and urgency toward action.</b>	<b>Each focus area has</b> a 90-day desired outcome <b>identifying specific observable change(s)</b> in adult behavior.	Desired outcomes <b>do not</b> identify specific observable changes in adult behavior.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – specific focus on student achievement <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each desired outcome is specific in focus and <b>should logically result in</b> increased student achievement.	<b>Each</b> desired outcome is <b>specific</b> and <b>there is a clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	The desired outcomes <b>lack specificity</b> about the observable changes in adult behavior. There is <b>no clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – sense of urgency toward action <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	For each focus area, critical actions <b>promote a sense of urgency toward</b> addressing root cause(s) and achieving the desired outcome.	<b>For each focus area,</b> critical actions <b>address clear underlying root cause(s)</b> and <b>are connected to</b> achieving the desired outcome.	It is <b>not clear</b> how critical actions will result in achieving the desired outcome in 90 days.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – person(s) responsible for completing actions <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Responsibility for action items are <b>strategically owned</b> by various school/district individuals.	<b>Each</b> critical action <b>identifies</b> a person responsible.	It is <b>not clear</b> who is responsible for completing each critical action.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – timelines and resources <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	All critical actions have a clear timeline and identify resources needed to support them, <b>including funding sources.</b>	<b>All</b> critical actions have a <b>clear</b> timeline and identify resources needed to support them.	Critical actions <b>do not identify</b> timelines and/or needed resources.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<b><u>Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:</u></b>				

Desired Outcomes and Critical Actions are very thoughtfully written and meet Solid Progress. Look back at Root Cause Hypothesis and see if the desired outcomes and critical actions tie to the hypothesis. The Desired Outcomes, as written, capture many of your Critical Actions. The Desired Outcome could read "Teachers will utilize analyzed data and collaborative planning to effectively differentiate instruction in math and reading."

<b><u>Step 6 – Monitor Implementation</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Progress Indicators NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	<b>Strategically selected</b> progress indicators identify the metrics and evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>All</b> progress indicators <b>identify the metrics and evidence</b> used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	<b>Some</b> progress indicators have been identified, and they <b>may or may not include</b> metrics or evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Potential Adjustments to the 90-day Plan NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	For <b>all</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>and</b> unanticipated barriers.	For <b>most</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers.	For <b>some</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>or</b> unanticipated barriers.	Shows lack of attempt or action
System to Monitor NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	The system to monitor implementation <b>clearly details</b> the procedure, timelines, and persons responsible.	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.</b>	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies one or more of the following:</b> the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:**

NAS-NM, please consider using the 30/60/90 day reflective guides available on DASH resource site to help focus monthly core team meetings.

**From:** [Latricia Mathis](#)  
**To:** [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**Cc:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [Mathis, LaTricia](#)  
**Subject:** NMDash Plan for New America School-New Mexico  
**Date:** Thursday, October 12, 2017 2:04:33 PM  
**Attachments:** [NMDash NAS-NM 10-9-17.docx](#)  
[NAS Minutes October 2017.docx](#)

---

Hello, Meghan and Icela,

Here is the NMDash Improvement plan for The New America School-New Mexico. I have also attached our draft minutes from last night's governing board meeting showing GC approval of the plan.

I will also upload to WebEPSS. Please let me know if I need to take additional action at this stage, or if I am missing something.

Respectfully,  
LaTricia Mathis  
Principal  
The New America School-NM  
505-222-4365



**New Mexico 90-day Plan  
Offline Planning Process Workbook**

## **ANNUAL PLAN**

### Step 1 – Build Core Team

With district support, the school leader(s) identify critical members to bring together as a team to co-construct the school vision for dramatic change and establish a 90-day Plan that will increase achievement for all students.

### **Guiding Questions –**

✓ School Level:

- To what extent does the Core Team represent diverse backgrounds and viewpoints, in order to consider challenges from many perspectives?
  - Are there representatives from across grade levels?
  - Is the group representative of the student body and community?
  - Is the Core Team the same as the school leadership team?
  - Are the strongest teacher-leaders on the Core Team?

### **Core Team Notes**

Team Member	Position	<u>Rationale:</u> What strengths/perspective does this person bring to the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school's current reality?
LaTricia Mathis	Director	In education for 23 years, 16 of those as a building administrator at both the elementary and high school levels. Strengths include historical knowledge of school and students, data interpretation, and school leadership.
Lynn Ortiz	Special Ed Case Manager, Mathematic Support	A Level I teacher, new to her second career as an special education case manager and support teacher, this is Lynn's first year supporting mathematics teachers in the classroom to meet special education needs of students.
Alex Moralez	ESL Lead Teacher, Newcomer Program teacher	A veteran Level II teacher with background in ELL and Bilingual education, representing the ELL population at NAS-NM. She has prior experience with school change and Improvement Plans.
Ileana Gallegos	College and Career Coordinator, Special Education English Language Arts support	A Level II teacher, Iliana currently serves in the capacity of a College and Career resource for students to enable them to begin building post-secondary plans and guide them through the process to be successful.



Kaiya Ahrens	Testing and Data Coordinator, English Department Head	English department head for six years, now also Testing and Data for students. She is very good at finding details in data and looking for trends. She is not a fan of PARCC but does support the NMCCS initiative.
Sandy Beery	Community Representative	Ms. Beery is familiar with the New America School-NM, having worked with the school for the past five years. She is a recent Doctoral graduate in Education, and has extensive background knowledge of education and charter school administration.
Wade Randall	Instructional Coach, Dean of Students	NAS-NM veteran teacher of six years, former Head of Social Studies department. Background in Restorative Justice for students Mr. Randall currently works with all departments to improve instructional practices.
Dominic DiFelice	New America Schools Network Superintendent	43 years in education, with 27 years' experience as superintendent in a very large school district. He is a former teacher, assistant principal and principal, with areas of expertise including assessment practices, curriculum review, development and implementation
Dominic Griego	Governing Council Member	A 2011 graduate of New America School-New Mexico, Mr. Griego is now a UNM graduate with a degree in Business Administration. He has sat on the NAS-NM Governing Council for two years.

## Step 2 – Analyze Data & Set Student Achievement Goals

**Guiding Question** – Given the most recent student achievement data, what summative and benchmark goals will create a sense of focus and urgency towards action to increase student achievement?

### **Data Analysis Notes**

The NMDash team looked at the most recent PARCC scores available for 2016-2017, to determine possible trends and weak areas in instruction. That data, by grade level and proficiency level are as follows:

Reading PARCC Grade Level	Level I Did Not Meet Expectations	Level II Approaching Expectations	Level III Partially Met Expectations	Level IV Met Expectations	Level V- Exceeded Expectations
9	55% (18)	30% (10)	12% (4)	3% (1)	0
10	82% (44)	9% (5)	6% (3)	4% (2)	0
11	45% (17)	38% (14)	16% (6)	3% (1)	0



Math PARCC Grade Level	Level I Did Not Meet Expectations	Level II Approaching Expectations	Level III Partially Met Expectations	Level IV Met Expectations	Level V- Exceeded Expectations
Math 1	41% (29)	51% (36)	9% (6)	0	0
Math II	35% (21)	52% (31)	13% (8)	0	0
Math III	0	67% (2)	33% (1)	0	0

Further analysis, at the student level indicates:

#### In Math

27% (or 19 of 69) of students are within 10 points of moving from level 2 to level 3.

39% (or 26 of 66) of students are within 10 points of moving from level 1 to level 2.

#### In ELA

30% (or 15 of 50) of students are within 10 points of moving from level 1 to level 2.

The percentage of students on the bubble between level 2 and 3 is negligible (5 students total across 3 grade levels).

In addition, the areas demonstrating regressions as noted in the 2016-2017 School Effectiveness Report are:

	Change
Current Standing	-4.6
School Improvement	-0.06
Higher-Performing Students	-0.8
Lower Performing Students	-0.6

Since NAS-NM demonstrated a regression in both Q1 and Q3 students, data analysis of teacher observations was looked at, which also showed that most teachers score below effective on making differentiation for students based on factors such as ELL or Sped.

Testing Cohort is defined as those students who attended NAS-NM in 2016-2017 are enrolled in 2017-2018. This would include 9<sup>th</sup> or 10<sup>th</sup> grade students in 2016-2017 who will be tested at 10<sup>th</sup> or 11<sup>th</sup> grade students in 2017-2018.

### Student Achievement Goals

Cohort (see definition above)	2016-17 PARCC Results	2017-2018 PARCC Goals	<u>Benchmark Goals:</u> MAPs Interim Assessment During the 2017-2018 school year
2016-17 Reading Testing Cohort	See table above	80% of students scoring at Proficiency	57% of Reading Test Cohort students will meet or exceed their individual MAPS growth target score.



		Levels I-III in 2016-2017 will demonstrate a 15 pt gain or greater on PARCC 2018.	
2016-17 Math Testing Cohort	See table above	80% of students scoring at Proficiency Levels I-III in 2016-2017 will demonstrate a 15 pt gain or greater on PARCC 2018.	55% of Math Test Cohort students will meet or exceed their individual MAPS growth target score.

Well-written goals help to set a bold, positive vision and establish a sense of urgency. They communicate and make visible to all stakeholders the intent of the plan.

**Guiding Question** – To what extent do summative and benchmark goals meet SMART criteria?

#### SMART Checklist

<b><u>Specific</u></b>	Is the goal clearly defined?	
<b><u>Measurable</u></b>	Are concrete criteria identified for measuring progress toward attainment of the goal?	
<b><u>Ambitious &amp; Attainable</u></b>	Does the goal stretch the school while still being attainable?	
<b><u>Relevant</u></b>	Does the goal relate to student learning and achievement? Is it data-based?	
<b><u>Time-bound</u></b>	Is the timeframe appropriate for accomplishment of the goal?	



### Step 3 – Identify Focus Areas

#### **Focus Areas & Guiding Questions –**

##### *1. Data-driven instruction*

There is a precise, systematic approach to improving student learning throughout the year. The cycle of DDI includes assessment, analysis and action.

##### Guiding questions –

- Are the district's and school's assessment strategies firmly in place? (formative, interim, and summative)
- How do teachers and leadership analyze and act on assessment data?
- Do teacher action plans include focused and targeted whole-group, small-group, and individual interventions?
- How effectively does school leadership hold teachers accountable to ensure effective instructional adjustment, interventions, and instructional feedback?

##### *2. Tier I interventions*

There are fluid, flexible interventions in place during Tier I (core) instruction for students not progressing as expected.

##### Guiding questions –

- How do you identify students in need of Tier I (core) interventions?
- How do you differentiate instruction based on the screening results, as well as the abilities and needs of all students in the core program?
- To what extent are Tier I (core) interventions successful in addressing student needs based on data?

<b>Focus Areas</b>	
<i>Focus Area:</i> What are the 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas (best practices – see pp. 3-5) that must be addressed to reach the student achievement goals?	<i>Data Connection:</i> What data analysis led you to identify this focus area? What quantitative and qualitative data led you to this focus area?
Data-Driven Instruction	Based on review of lesson plans and classroom observation data, teachers are not consistently utilizing data to inform their planning and instruction.
Tier 1 Interventions	Teacher lesson plans demonstrate this is a very weak area, with no evidence, despite the lesson plan having an intervention section, of differentiation for Tier 1.





	<p>NMTeach observations show this is repeatedly a weakness area for more than 90% of teaching staff.</p> <p>Lack of growth in scores for Level 1 and 2 students on state tests and short-cycle assessments demonstrate that the lower-level students are not receiving effective interventions to become more academically successful.</p>
--	--

#### Step 4 – Conduct Root Cause Analysis

#### **Guiding Questions –**

- What do you believe is at the heart of the problem for this focus area?
- What qualitative and quantitative evidence do you have to support this hypothesis?
- Would the problem/challenge have occurred if that cause had not been present?
- If the cause is corrected, will the problem/challenge reoccur?

<b>Root Cause Analysis Notes</b>		
<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Root Cause Hypothesis</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
Data-Driven Instruction	There is a lack of consistent focus on sustained, job-embedded PD at NAS-NM	There is a lack training for teachers
Tier 1 Intervention	There is a lack of uniform understanding of the concept of differentiated instruction and how to implement DI in planning and instruction	Evidence of DI is lacking in curriculum planning and lesson planning as well as classroom instruction



## 90-DAY PLAN

### Step 5 – Create Desired Outcomes & Define Critical Actions

#### **Guiding Questions for Setting Desired Outcomes –**

- What specific outcome do you want? What change in adult behaviors will be observable by the end of 90 days?
- How will you know when you have reached this goal? What will be different if you are successful in focusing on this area of practice? After 90 days, what changes in practice will be observed?

<b>Desired Outcomes</b>	
<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Draft Desired Outcome (<u>change in adult behaviors</u>)</i>
Data Driven Instruction	<p>All teachers will effectively implement the school wide extended response rubric once a week, use the PARCC writing response metric to align departmental understanding of what a successful written academic response will look like. In addition, through teachers tracking student growth in this area, teachers can differentiate instruction based on data.</p> <p>Once a month all teachers will administer a school-wide extended response with a common prompt, which will be used at the school level during monthly professional development sessions to align school academic language and product expectations, and to ensure that all teachers have a universal understanding of how students use academic language. This will create a whole-school focus that is data-driven with a common data set for all teachers to discuss and monitor.</p> <p>Teachers will utilize the learning Continuum tools offered as part of the NWEA MAPS assessment to align curriculum maps with targeted standards and where students fall within those standards. They will use the tools already in place effectively and routinely to create lesson plans and monitor student growth data monthly.</p>
Tier I Interventions	Teachers will have a unified concept and understanding of what Differentiated Instruction is and how to implement those strategies in their classrooms-using it to inform instruction on a daily basis to meet individual student academic needs regardless of level of proficiency.

#### **Focus Area: Data Driven Instruction**

##### **Desired Outcome:**

All teachers will effectively implement the school wide extended response rubric once a week, use the PARCC writing response metric to align departmental understanding of what a successful written



academic response will look like. In addition, through teachers tracking student growth in this area, teachers can differentiate instruction based on data.

### CRITICAL ACTIONS

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
September 8, 2017	Provide teachers with copy of PARCC writing rubric	PARCC rubric	Kaiya	All teachers
October 20, 2017	Calibrate teachers' understanding of rubric	Extended responses from each 4 <sup>th</sup> period class	All teachers	All teachers
October 20, 2017	Re-write rubric in student-friendly language	Reflection information from the calibration and PARCC rubric	Kaiya	All teachers
10-23-17 through 5-1-18	Begin weekly administration of Extended Responses	Student-friendly language rubric prompt	Teachers	Teachers All students
10-23-17 through 5-1-18	Weekly review, reflect, revise weekly extended responses by department	Student work	Teachers	Teachers
By 10-26-17 and ongoing through 5-8-18	Make rubric accessible to all students within every classroom	Student-friendly language rubric	Teachers	Teachers All students
Starting 1-8-18	Weekly writing prompts will be reviewed/approved by admin	Student-friendly language rubric Admin approved prompt	Teachers Admin	Teachers Admin

### Focus Area: Data Driven Instruction

Once a month all teachers will administer a school-wide extended response with a common prompt, which will be used at the school level during monthly professional development sessions to align school academic language and product expectations, and to ensure that all teachers have a universal understanding of how students use academic language. This will create a whole-school focus that is data-driven with a common data set for all teachers to discuss and monitor.

### CRITICAL ACTIONS

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
-----------------	--	--------------------------------	------------------------------	---------------------------



10/11/17	Administer common writing prompt in 4 <sup>th</sup> period	Common writing prompt provided by Admin	Admin	Teachers All students
10/20/17	Communicate and train staff on the writing rubric	Extended responses from each 4 <sup>th</sup> period class PARCC writing rubric	Eng. Dept	Teachers
10/20/17	Use PARCC rubric to assess extended responses in preparation for rubric calibration	Extended responses from each 4 <sup>th</sup> period class PARCC writing rubric	Ahrens	Teachers
October 20, 2017	Re-write rubric in student-friendly language	Reflection information from the calibration and PARCC rubric	Kaiya	All teachers
Monthly Starting 11-8-17 through 5-8-18	Monthly administration of the common writing prompt in 4 <sup>th</sup> period, Use student-friendly rubric to assess student extended responses and bring data for the calibration as a whole staff to monthly PD session	Extended responses from each 4 <sup>th</sup> period class Student-friendly writing rubric	Teachers	Teachers, Admin and All students

### Focus Area: Data Driven Instruction

**Desired Outcome:** Teachers will utilize the learning Continuum tools offered as part of the NWEA MAPS assessment to align curriculum maps with targeted standards and where students fall within those standards. They will use the tools already in place effectively and routinely to create lesson plans and monitor student growth data monthly.

### CRITICAL ACTIONS

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
10-16-17 – 11-6-17	Departmental PD to develop common understanding of how MAPs data informs planning and instruction in specific contents. Demonstrate through lesson plans how MAPs data is being	Learning Continuum information by teacher Lesson plans	Admin Ahrens	Admin Teachers Department Leads



	used on a consistent basis to modify planning and instruction to meet the growth needs of individual students			
11-13-17 – 5-8-18	Weekly, admin will check lesson plans for evidence of the use of MAPs data informing planning and provide feedback to teachers	Learning Continuum information by teacher Lesson plans	Admin	Admin Teachers Department Leads
On-going/monthly PD session	Admin will structure PD based on growth areas identified through weekly admin check ins and feedback on lesson plans with teachers	Identified growth areas – from feedback sessions	Admin	Admin Teachers

### Focus Area: Tier I Interventions

**Desired Outcome:** Teachers will have a unified concept and understanding of what Differentiated Instruction is and how to implement those strategies in their classrooms-using it to inform instruction on a daily basis to meet individual student academic needs regardless of level of proficiency.

### CRITICAL ACTIONS

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
10-20-17	Collect data from staff about their understanding of what differentiated instruction is and what it looks like in their planning, instruction and assessment	Data collection tool developed by admin	Admin	Teachers Admin
Ongoing during monthly PD sessions	Mini-workshops specific to differentiation for special ed students and differentiation for EL students	Lesson plans Identified students by class/teacher	Ileana Alex	Teachers
11-13-17 – 5-8-18	Weekly, admin will check lesson plans for evidence of differentiation in planning and assessment provide feedback to teachers	Lesson plans Identified students by class/teacher	Admin	Admin Teachers Department Leads

### Step 6 – Monitor Implementation



### Guiding Questions –

- What are the metrics, feedback, observations, etc. the core team will use to determine progress toward the desired outcome? What is the evidence of progress?
- How will you know the critical actions are having a positive impact?
- How might the plan be adjusted due to accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers?

Focus Area: Data Driven Instruction		
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> All teachers will effectively implement the school wide extended response rubric once a week, use the PARCC writing response metric to align departmental understanding of what a successful written academic response will look like. In addition, through teachers tracking student growth in this area, teachers can differentiate instruction based on data.		
PROGRESS INDICATORS		
Indicator Date	Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals	Potential Adjustments
10-30-17	All students have received/have access to the student-friendly writing prompt rubric	N/A
Weekly 11-6-17 through 12-11-17	During Admin meetings by department check in that weekly writing prompts are being administered by all teachers and extended responses assessed with the student-friendly rubric and identify additional support needs by department	1:1 or small group calibration support of extended response scoring using the student-friendly rubric.
Beginning 1-8-18 weekly through 5-8-18	Writing prompts are included in lesson plans and are approved by Admin.	1:1 support to address growth needs regarding writing prompts and extended response scoring using the student-friendly rubric
Monthly 2-5-18 3-5-18 4-2-18 5-7-18	Evidence of weekly administration of writing prompts and evaluation of extended responses in every classroom. Evidence that the student-friendly rubric is used to evaluate each extended response. Evidence of student growth based on tracking of student scores on the weekly extended responses using the student-friendly rubric.	1:1 support to address growth needs regarding writing prompts and extended response scoring using the student-friendly rubric

### Focus Area: Data Driven Instruction

**Desired Outcome:**

Once a month all teachers will administer a school-wide extended response with a common prompt, which will be used at the school level during monthly professional development sessions to align school academic language and product expectations, and to ensure that all teachers have a universal understanding of how students use academic language. This will create a whole-school focus that is data-driven with a common data set for all teachers to discuss and monitor.

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
By 10-23-17	Calibration of school wide extended responses is complete and anchor extended responses identified for each level on the rubric. PARCC writing rubric is re-written in student-friendly language for use by all teachers moving forward.	N/A
Monthly 11-8-17 through 1-18-18	All teachers administer school-wide writing prompt. Data from analysis of extended responses used in full staff PD to check calibration of anchor extended responses at each level of the student-friendly rubric.	Adjustments/refinement of the student-friendly rubric and anchor extended responses
Monthly 2-5-18 3-5-18 4-2-18 5-7-18	Calibration of school wide extended responses is complete and anchor extended responses identified for each level on the rubric. PARCC writing rubric is re-written in student-friendly language for use by all teachers moving forward.	Adjustments/refinement of the student-friendly rubric and anchor extended responses
By 10-23-17	Calibration of school wide extended responses is complete and anchor extended responses identified for each level on the rubric. PARCC writing rubric is re-written in student-friendly language for use by all teachers moving forward.	N/A

**Focus Area: Data Driven Instruction****Desired Outcome:**

Teachers will utilize the learning Continuum tools offered as part of the NWEA MAPS assessment to align curriculum maps with targeted standards and where students fall within those standards. They will use the tools already in place effectively and routinely to create lesson plans and monitor student growth data monthly.

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
11-8-17	All departments participated in 4 mini-workshops to 1. Clarify and unify their	Based on feedback from teachers, provide 1:1 and/or small group





	understanding of the data provided by MAPs Learning Continuum. 2. Identified where, in their curriculum maps this the information from the Learning Continuum informs adjustments/modifications/additions/deletions from their curriculum. 3. Identified where these adjustments/modifications/additions/deletions are represented in their weekly/daily lesson plans.	PD to support growth in this area
Monthly 2-5-18 3-5-18 4-2-18 5-7-18	Review of curriculum maps, weekly/daily lesson plans and quarterly assessments for evidence of the use of the data from the Learning Continuum to inform planning and instruction.	Based on feedback from teachers, provide 1:1 and/or small group PD to support growth in this area
11-8-17	All departments participated in 4 mini-workshops to 1. Clarify and unify their understanding of the data provided by MAPs Learning Continuum. 2. Identified where, in their curriculum maps this the information from the Learning Continuum informs adjustments/modifications/additions/deletions from their curriculum. 3. Identified where these adjustments/modifications/additions/deletions are represented in their weekly/daily lesson plans.	Based on feedback from teachers, provide 1:1 and/or small group PD to support growth in this area
Monthly 2-5-18 3-5-18 4-2-18 5-7-18	Review of curriculum maps, weekly/daily lesson plans and quarterly assessments for evidence of the use of the data from the Learning Continuum to inform planning and instruction.	Based on feedback from teachers, provide 1:1 and/or small group PD to support growth in this area

### Focus Area: Tier I Interventions

#### Desired Outcome:

Teachers will have a unified concept and understanding of what Differentiated Instruction is and how to implement those strategies in their classrooms-using it to inform instruction on a daily basis to meet individual student academic needs regardless of level of proficiency.

#### PROGRESS INDICATORS

Indicator Date	Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals	Potential Adjustments
10-23-17	Data collected from staff regarding their understanding of what differentiated instruction is and what it looks like in their planning, instruction	N/A





	and assessment	
11-10-17 and 12-8-17	Staff will have completed two of the monthly mini workshops specific to differentiation in Special Ed and EL	Based on feedback from teachers, provide 1:1 and/or small group PD to support growth in this area
Between 11-10-17 and 12-8-17	Weekly checks of lesson plans by Admin for indicators of DI with respect to special education students and EL students with feedback for growth	Based on feedback from teachers, provide 1:1 and/or small group PD to support growth in this area
Monthly 2-5-18 3-5-18 4-2-18 5-7-18	Mini workshops each month on differentiation in special ed and EL. Focus areas of these workshops will be based on the feedback from teachers and admin	Change in focus of mini-workshops based on identified areas of support needed

*System to Monitor Implementation –*

**Guiding Questions –**

- How will the core team systematize implementation and monitoring of the plan?
- What is the procedure? What are the timelines? Who is responsible?

<b>System to Monitor Implementation</b>		
Procedure	Timelines	Person(s) Responsible
The NAS-NM DASH team will meet once a month to review the critical action plans for progress as indicated above. The DASH team will make adjustments to the 90-day plan as needed based on this review.	Once a month	NAS-NM DASH team

## New America School-New Mexico Governing Council

Wednesday October 11, 2017  
4:30 PM  
1734 Isleta Blvd  
Albuquerque, NM 87105

**Board Members Present:** Paul Rael (President), Margie Maestas, Rick Bela, Dominic Griego, Fred Silva (Secretary)

**Regrets:** Juan Vigil (President-Elect), Charlotte Archuleta (Treasurer)

**Staff:** Dominic DiFelice (Superintendent), Craig Cook (CBO), LaTricia Mathis (Principal), Mike Vigil, II (Business Manager)

### Minutes of the GC

1. Meeting called to order by Paul Rael at 4:42
2. Mission statement was read by Paul Rael
3. The students of the month presentation was substituted by The Charter Quality Awards and Attendance Challenge presentations in the Gym at the conclusion of the GC meeting.
4. Moved by Margie Maestas and seconded by Fred Silva that the agenda be approved. Votes: Unanimous.
5. Moved by Margie Maestas and seconded by Dominic Griego that the minutes of September 13, 2017 be approved. Votes: Unanimous.
6. Craig Cook began the finance reports ending 9/30/17 by indicating that Juan Vigil, Charlotte Archuleta and Lorella Lovato were unfortunately unable to attend the finance committee meeting in which reports are reviewed in detail. Reports were still reviewed in detail by himself, Mike Vigil and LaTricia Mathis. Mike Vigil reported that there were no significant items to mention on the revenue report. A BAR would be presented for the \$4,769 of unbudgeted revenues related to insurance recoveries received from copper theft. The expenditure report also yielded no items of significance that had not been discussed at the previous meetings. The lease line had the largest amount being over-budgeted, but there is a BAR for action to budget \$217,930 in lease reimbursement award. Craig mentioned that maintenance BARs would be presented at the next meeting to address negative line items related to salaries and benefits. Mike indicated that the 40<sup>th</sup> day report would show around 30 additional students beyond the original projections. This would result in an approximated additional \$225k of funding. In addition to this, the cash carryover projected in the initial budget was at \$393k but the draft financial statements from the audit were showing closer to \$493k. These items will provide significant increases to budget availability that can contribute to any remaining

new POs throughout the year, the hiring of an assistant principal, and continuing the trend of carrying a healthy cash carryover into the next fiscal year. The month of September 2017 had about \$90k more in expenditures than revenues for mainly 3 reasons. The first is that September is 1 of 2 months that has 3 payrolls instead of 2. The second reason is that September was the final month in paying the school's annual insurance risk premium. The final reason is that normally the school would have received the first quarter of its lease reimbursement money. However, delays in voting by the PSCOC have resulted in delays in getting funding to the schools. The only item to note on the outstanding POs report is the \$56k to Educational Technologies utilizing SB-9 funds for computer equipment which was approved at the September GC meeting. The bank reconciliation showed a balance with no variance of \$995,082.31. It was noted that about \$579k of this balance was in restricted funds mostly composed of HB-33 and SB-9. 4 BARs were presented for approval. BAR#0005 for Dual Credit Instructional Materials in the amount \$1,460. BAR #0006 in the amount of \$3,164 in student library funds. BAR #0007 to budget \$4,769 of insurance recovery revenue into the Maintenance & Repair line. And BAR #0008 to budget \$217,930 in lease reimbursement awarded by the PSFA. Moved by Margie Maestas and seconded by Dominic Griego that BARs 0005-0008 be approved as presented. Votes: Unanimous.

7. Given the school's D grade, it is required to submit an improvement plan. The principal is using the NM Dash as a template. Although this draft can be modified it require GC approval in draft form. LaTricia reviewed in detail the sections of the NM Dash and answered questions from the GC. Moved by Fred Silva and seconded by Dominic Griego that the NM Dash be approved as presented. Votes: Unanimous.
8. No dashboard was presented.
9. Principal report included
  - Current enrollment 350
  - 60 students in night program
  - Various options for GC training- a series by PED (no cost) and one by the Coalition (\$450/member)
  - GC members to email LaTricia as to preference
10. Public Input: None.
11. Next meeting November 8, 2017.
12. Meeting adjourned at 5:40 pm.

---

Secretary, GC



**From:** [PSB, PED, PED](#)  
**To:** [MPorter@newamericasschoolnm.org](mailto:MPorter@newamericasschoolnm.org)  
**Cc:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [Martinez, Severo, PED](#); [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**Subject:** New Americas School Las Cruces - NM DASH Feedback Tool  
**Date:** Thursday, November 02, 2017 12:23:28 PM  
**Attachments:** [NAS-LC Feedback Tool.docx](#)

---

Good Afternoon,

Upon review of your 90 Day Plan, it **has met** the requirements for submission to the online NM Dash system (13 or greater indicators in solid progress, 3 or fewer in Limited Progress, and 0 not Evident).

Attached you will find the feedback tool with your ratings, per step. Please keep in mind that your plan met the requirements, but the reviewer has still included some feedback on how to improve your plan. Please bring your revised plan to Implementation and Monitoring training I which you have signed up for. At this training you will receive your login to NM DASH and begin to input your plan into the online system.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact Severo Martinez at [severo.martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:severo.martinez@state.nm.us).

Best,

Patricia "Kitty" Montoya  
NMPED  
505-827-3671



NM PED Calibration Review  
Date: 10/23/17  
Reviewer Code: 002

## New Mexico 90-day Plan Offline Planning Process Workbook Feedback Tool

District: NAS-LC  
School:  
Date:  
Completed By:

To enter into DASH...		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
13 or greater/ of 16	3 or fewer of 16	0

Your plan (as reviewed by your district designee):		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident

PED review:		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
14	2	0

### Overall comment:

A PED reviewer has reviewed this plan and provided feedback on any indicators marked Limited Progress or Not Evident. Please consider the feedback provided below each indicator rated less than Solid Progress when creating the Spring 2018 90-day Plan. Spring 2018 90-day plans will be due online in early January 2018.

The PED reviewer finds that this Offline Planning Process Workbook meets the minimum criteria of 13 or greater of 16 indicators Solid Progress and no Not Evident. The plan is ready to be entered online in NM DASH.

### NM PED Reviewer comments in RED

<u>Step 1 – Build Core Team</u>	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
Diverse backgrounds and viewpoints NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress.	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders likely to bring different viewpoints to discussions and a clear rationale for selection is provided.	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders and a rationale for selection is provided.	The core team consists of principal, district representative, and/or teachers or instructional leaders. A rationale for selection may or may not be provided.	Shows lack of attempt or action OR No district representative

				is identified.
Representation <sup>1</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress.	The core team has <b>full representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	The core team has representation from <b>two of the following</b> : across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and</b> community.	The core team has <b>limited representation</b> from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), <b>and/or</b> community.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<b>Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:</b> Core team reflects all stakeholders.				
<b>Step 2 – Analyze Data &amp; Set Student Achievement Goals</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Summative goals NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	In addition to the indicators for solid progress, <b>an optional third goal has been identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in both ELA <b>and</b> math <b>using the most recent available baseline data.</b>	Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Benchmark goals <sup>2</sup> NM PED Review Determination: Limited Progress	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to the <b>most current interim assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress are <b>clearly</b> articulated in both ELA and math, <b>align with summative goals, and are connected to interim or formative assessment data.</b>	Benchmark goals to monitor progress <b>are articulated</b> in both ELA <b>and/or</b> math.	Shows lack of attempt or action
SMART: Specific, Measurable, Ambitious & Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria <b>and create a sense of focus and urgency towards action.</b>	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>all</b> SMART criteria.	Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy <b>4 or fewer</b> SMART criteria.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<b>Step 2 Reflections and Feedback:</b> Achievement goals have been identified in ELA and Math and reflect SMART goals. To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Benchmark goals: Consider breaking the yearly goal into benchmarks throughout the school year so that teachers are able to use data driven instruction. If you give NWEA 3 times a year, identify those dates and expected growth. Teachers can then use				

<sup>1</sup> Title I schools shall assure meaningful input and involvement of stakeholders listed in Section 1118(b)(2) of ESSA Guidance

<sup>2</sup> For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://ped.state.nm.us/assessmentaccountability/assessmentevaluation/2015/Test%20Graph%202016.pdf>

this data to provided RtI, intervention, and/or reteach.

<b>Step 3 – Focus Areas</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
High leverage and aligned <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	The 2-3 <b>highest-leverage</b> focus areas selected are aligned to <b>deep</b> data analysis and include qualitative <b>and</b> quantitative evidence.	The 2-3 focus areas selected are <b>aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative evidence.</b>	2-3 focus areas <b>are selected.</b>	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 3 Reflections and Feedback:**

Focus Areas are aligned to data analysis. NAS-LC might consider using quantitative data in addition to qualitative data as evidence for choosing Focus Areas. Quantitative data will be helpful when writing goals and measuring progress through out the 90-day plan.

<b>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Clear hypothesis <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each focus area has a clear hypothesis of the <b>deepest</b> underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges <b>that will result in a substantial reduction of the performance challenge.</b>	<b>Each</b> focus area has a <b>clear</b> hypothesis of the <b>underlying root cause</b> or causes of school performance challenges.	<b>Some or all</b> of the focus areas <b>have a hypothesis</b> of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Evidence to support <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative <b>and</b> quantitative data <b>and are supported by evidence.</b>	Root causes seem to have been <b>generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data.</b>	Root causes are identified, but <b>are not connected</b> to data analysis.	Shows lack of attempt or action

**Step 4 Reflections and Feedback:**

Each Focus Area has a clear hypothesis and analysis of data. NAS-LC might consider using quantitative data to support Root Cause analysis.

<b>Step 5 – Desired Outcomes &amp; Critical Actions</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – observable changes in adult behavior <b>NM PED Review</b> <b>Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying the specific observable change(s) in adult behaviors, <b>which creates focus and urgency toward action.</b>	<b>Each focus area has</b> a 90-day desired outcome <b>identifying specific observable change(s)</b> in adult behavior.	Desired outcomes <b>do not</b> identify specific observable changes in adult behavior.	Shows lack of attempt or action



<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – specific focus on student achievement <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Each desired outcome is specific in focus and <b>should logically result in</b> increased student achievement.	<b>Each</b> desired outcome is <b>specific</b> and <b>there is a clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	The desired outcomes <b>lack specificity</b> about the observable changes in adult behavior. There is <b>no clear connection</b> between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – sense of urgency toward action <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	For each focus area, critical actions <b>promote a sense of urgency toward</b> addressing root cause(s) and achieving the desired outcome.	<b>For each focus area</b> , critical actions <b>address clear underlying root cause(s)</b> and <b>are connected to</b> achieving the desired outcome.	It is <b>not clear</b> how critical actions will result in achieving the desired outcome in 90 days.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – person(s) responsible for completing actions <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	Responsibility for action items are <b>strategically owned</b> by various school/district individuals.	<b>Each</b> critical action <b>identifies</b> a person responsible.	It is <b>not clear</b> who is responsible for completing each critical action.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<i>Critical Actions</i> – timelines and resources <b>NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress</b>	All critical actions have a clear timeline and identify resources needed to support them, <b>including funding sources.</b>	<b>All</b> critical actions have a <b>clear</b> timeline and identify resources needed to support them.	Critical actions <b>do not identify</b> timelines and/or needed resources.	Shows lack of attempt or action

#### **Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:**

Desired Outcomes and Critical Actions meet definition of solid progress. however Desired Outcomes might be better stated in specific observable statements and with a connection to student achievement. Example: At the end of the 90-day plan, 100% of teachers will demonstrate the understanding and use of curriculum maps and all lesson plans will show evidence of alignment to CCSS and reflective of PARCC – like questions to improve student achievement.

<b><u>Step 6 – Monitor Implementation</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Progress Indicators <b>NM PED Review Determination:</b>	<b>Strategically selected</b> progress indicators identify the metrics and evidence used to measure progress	<b>All</b> progress indicators <b>identify the metrics and evidence</b> used to measure progress toward desired	<b>Some</b> progress indicators have been identified, and they <b>may or may not include</b> metrics or evidence used to	Shows lack of attempt or action

Limited Progress	toward desired outcomes and goals.	outcomes and goals.	measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	
Potential Adjustments to the 90-day Plan NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	For <b>all</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>and</b> unanticipated barriers.	For <b>most</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers.	For <b>some</b> progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress <b>or</b> unanticipated barriers.	Shows lack of attempt or action
System to Monitor NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	The system to monitor implementation <b>clearly details</b> the procedure, timelines, and persons responsible.	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.</b>	The system to monitor implementation <b>identifies one or more of the following:</b> the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.	Shows lack of attempt or action
<b>Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:</b> To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Progress Indicators: please include specific metrics and evidence to be used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals. . NAS-LC please consider using the 30/60/90 day reflective guides available on DASH resource site to help focus monthly core team meetings.				

District:  
School:  
Date:  
Completed By:



**New Mexico 90-day Plan  
Offline Planning Process Workbook**

## **ANNUAL PLAN**

### **Step 1 – Build Core Team**

With district support, the school leader(s) identify critical members to bring together as a team to co-construct the school vision for dramatic change and establish a 90-day Plan that will increase achievement for all students.

#### **Guiding Questions –**

- ✓ District Level:
  - To what extent does the district representative need to be involved in the planning process?
  - Should Core Teams look the same at every school?
- ✓ School Level:
  - To what extent does the Core Team represent diverse backgrounds and viewpoints, in order to consider challenges from many perspectives?
    - Are there representatives from across grade levels?
    - Is the group representative of the student body and community?
    - Is the Core Team the same as the school leadership team?
    - Are the strongest teacher-leaders on the Core Team?

#### **Core Team Notes**

Team Member	Position	<u>Rationale:</u> What strengths/perspective does this person bring to the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school's current reality?
Jennifer Garcia Kozlowski	GC Member, District Representative	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GC member for 3 years; Treasurer, Finance committee</li> <li>• Account Manager, Las Cruces Sun-News</li> <li>• President, The Junior League Las Cruces Inc.</li> <li>• Native New Mexican</li> <li>• Community Activist</li> <li>• Attended alternative high school</li> </ul>
Margarita Porter	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Only principal at NAS since inception in 2012</li> <li>• Selected all staff members</li> <li>• Turnover in staff has been below 30% threshold every year</li> <li>• 5 year renewal was granted by PEC unanimously</li> <li>• Daughter has attended NAS-LC since 9<sup>th</sup> grade, now in her senior year</li> <li>• Previous experience as an Instructional Manager for 5 years at Albuquerque Public School in Language and</li> </ul>



		<p>Cultural Equity Department</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First year NAS-LC was rated a D, previously a C school for first 5 years</li> </ul>
Janae Graves	ELA/ ESL teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Has been teaching in the American public schools for only two years</li> <li>• Has only taught at the New America School</li> <li>• Scored Effective during the first official year of teaching</li> <li>• Highly qualified to teach ELA, French and is TESOL certified</li> <li>• Taught ESL in Africa for 2 years</li> <li>• Only one year experience administering Map, PARCC</li> <li>• Full inclusion</li> </ul>
Christy Jo Serna	Math teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Taught at NAS-LC in the evenings, part-time (adults) for the last 4 years</li> <li>• Taught in public schools for 16 years in the middle and high school</li> <li>• Has worked across the state with other teachers as a staff developer on Math and Pedagogy development while working with students, Mc2 for NMSU</li> <li>• Has been through different teaching styles and changes for what is best for students.</li> <li>• Exemplary on NMTeach</li> <li>• Full inclusion classroom</li> </ul>
Dawn Catanach	Math teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 35 years of teaching experience</li> <li>• Level Three-A Certification with endorsements in secondary mathematics, special education, and TESO</li> <li>• PED/PSB training in the use of data-driven instruction</li> <li>• Highly Effective on NMTeach</li> <li>• Full inclusion classroom</li> <li>• Taught self-contained special education for 8 years</li> </ul>
Victoria Fisk	Social Studies Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6<sup>th</sup> year teaching at New America School</li> <li>• 2015 NM Charter School Teacher of the Year</li> <li>• Recognized by ENGAGE New Mexico for Championing Education for Students</li> <li>• 85% average EOC passing rate for two years in a row</li> <li>• Student Council Sponsor</li> <li>• Board member Anti-bullying Coalition, Dona Ana Humane Society</li> <li>• Effective on NMTeach</li> </ul>
Lorynn Guerrero	ELA Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• English Teacher for 11 years</li> <li>• TESOL Endorsed</li> <li>• Highly Effective on NMTeach rating</li> <li>• Knowledge of the Standardized Testing Requirements</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Staff member of New America for three years</li> </ul>
Dominic DiFelice	Curriculum Developer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 43 years in education</li> <li>• Last 27 years as superintendent</li> <li>• Charter superintendent since 2006</li> <li>• Former teacher, assistant principal and principal</li> <li>• Areas of expertise include assessment practices, curriculum review, development and implementation</li> </ul>

## **Step 2 – Analyze Data & Set Student Achievement Goals**

With the Core Team, analyze student achievement data (e.g. interim assessment results, common formative assessments, student work samples, summative results). Through deep data analysis and reflection, set up to 3 Summative Student Achievement Goals. The goals should be clear and satisfy SMART criteria.

Once Summative Goals have been established, set Benchmark Goals to monitor progress toward Summative Goals. Benchmark Goals should be clearly articulated in both ELA and math (and for an optional third goal), align with summative goals, and be connected to the most current interim or formative assessment data. Benchmark Goals should also satisfy SMART criteria.

### **Data Analysis Notes**

Percent proficient is the sum of levels 4 and 5 combined. New America School Las Cruces had 11% proficient in English language arts and 2% proficient in math in the school year 17. The core team at NAS-LC believes a 10% increase is realistic and ambitious while still creating a sense of urgency.

On PARCC, 89% were not proficient in ELA, 98% are not proficient in math. For math, ~90% score a level 1 or 2 and in reading, ~70% scored a 1 or 2 in math.

Gap analysis of PARCC data shows an alarming 2% in math proficiency. The trends show that students are not moving toward proficiency. There were no students in levels 4 or 5 in Algebra I or Algebra II.

Gap analysis of PARCC data shows English 9 and English 11 had no students at level 5.

The core team agrees that the interim assessment, MAP is not at all aligned with PARCC and to the common core standards, but the results will be used as the metric for benchmark progress. A 10% increase on meeting the goals at each grade level set by NWEA, will give some information if the students are on track to make gains on the PARCC.

The core team understands that more time to collaborate and focus on creating common assessment



containing more rigorous questions that mimic PARCC and through common instructional strategies cross content will benefit students.

**Guiding Question** – Given the most recent student achievement data, what goals will create a sense of focus and urgency toward actions to increase student achievement?

Student Achievement Goals			
Grade/Subject Area	2017 PARCC Results	2018 PARCC Goals	<u>Benchmarks:</u> How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals?  <i>Using MAP fall to spring goal, the number of students meeting the set goal by NWEA will increase by 10%.</i>
9 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	5% prof (1)	15% (3)	By March of 2018, there will be increase from 30% meeting goal to 40% meeting expected growth as set by NWEA.
10 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	17% prof (5)	27% (10)	By March of 2018, there will be an increase from 12.5% meeting goal to 22.5% meeting expected growth as set by NWEA.
11 <sup>th</sup> Grade ELA	13% prof (7)	23% (13)	By March of 2018, there will be an increase from 20% meeting goal to 30% meeting expected growth as set by NWEA..
Algebra I	0	10% (5)	By March of 2018, of the 9 <sup>th</sup> graders taking Map test, there will be an increase from 18% meeting goal to 28% meeting expected growth as set by NWEA.
Geometry	2% (1)	12% (5)	By March of 2018, of the 10 <sup>th</sup> graders taking Map test, there will be an increase from 25% meeting goal to 35% meeting expected growth as set by NWEA.
Algebra II	0	10% (2)	By March of 2018, of the 9 <sup>th</sup> graders taking Map test, there will be an increase from 42% meeting goal to 53% meeting expected growth as set by NWEA.



### SMART Checklist

<b>Specific</b>	Is the goal clearly defined?	
<b>Measurable</b>	Are multiple concrete criteria identified for measuring progress toward attainment of the goal?	
<b>Ambitious</b>	Does the goal stretch the school while still being attainable?	
<b>Relevant</b>	Does the goal relate to student learning and achievement? Is it data-based?	
<b>Time-bound</b>	Is the timeframe appropriate for accomplishment of the goal?	

### **Step 3 – Identify Focus Areas**

Following deep data analysis and reflection on qualitative and quantitative evidence, the Core Team identifies the 2-3 highest-leverage Focus Areas (selected from the 10 that appear below) that will increase student achievement for all students. Focus Areas are best practices that will increase achievement for all students and narrow the scope for Root Cause Analysis, Desired Outcomes, and Critical Actions.

Possible evidence sources to consider include: observation data (evaluative or non-evaluative), lesson/unit plans, student surveys, interim assessment results, common formative assessment results, student work samples, summative results.

### **Focus Areas & Guiding Questions –**

#### *1. Standards Alignment*

All grade levels have identified essential standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- How do you ensure that the Tier I (core) curriculum and instruction is aligned with the CCSS and is being implemented with fidelity?
- Do you have a scope and sequence aligned to the CCSS?

#### *2. Tier I (core) instruction*

There is a dedicated block of time devoted to providing core instruction to all students aligned with grade level standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- What percent of your students are achieving grade-level expectations or making significant growth? If at least 80% are not attaining proficiency, what are you doing to ensure that your school is making significant progress toward this goal?
- What evidence do you have that the level of rigor of the tasks students perform during the lesson is aligned to the rigor of the CCSS?



### 3. *Data-driven instruction*

There is a precise, systematic approach to improving student learning throughout the year. The cycle of DDI includes assessment, analysis and action.

#### Guiding questions –

- Are the district's and school's assessment strategies firmly in place? (formative, interim, and summative)
- How do teachers and leadership analyze and act on assessment data?
- Do teacher action plans include focused and targeted whole-group, small-group, and individual interventions?
- How effectively does school leadership hold teachers accountable to ensure effective instructional adjustment, interventions, and instructional feedback?

### 4. *Tier I interventions*

There are fluid, flexible interventions in place during Tier I (core) instruction for students not progressing as expected.

#### Guiding questions –

- How do you identify students in need of Tier I (core) interventions?
- How do you differentiate instruction based on the screening results, as well as the abilities and needs of all students in the core program?
- To what extent are Tier I (core) interventions successful in addressing student needs based on data?

### 5. *Observation and feedback cycles*

Principal and other instructional leaders devote time daily to non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and provide face-to-face feedback to teachers in a timely manner.

#### Guiding questions –

- Are frequent and regular non-evaluative walkthroughs built into the leaders' schedules?
- Do leaders give face-to-face direct feedback to teachers focused on specific action steps for improvement?
- To what extent do leaders hold teachers accountable to translate feedback into practice?

### 6. *Collaboration*

Teachers have time during the week to work together to promote student success.

#### Guiding questions –





- What evidence do you have that your teacher teams work together weekly to analyze data, share strategies, plan collaboratively, and debrief the outcomes of instruction?
- How do school leaders support and hold teacher teams accountable?

### 7. *Ongoing, job embedded professional development*

Teacher professional development is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance student learning.

#### Guiding questions –

- Describe the process for identifying and providing job-embedded, ongoing, professional development informed by the teacher evaluation system.
- How is professional development for teachers tied to student needs as identified by assessment data?

### 8. *Tier II (SAT) process*

There is a system in place to provide strategic and individualized support to students for whom Tier I instruction and interventions have proven insufficient.

#### Guiding questions –

- What criteria does the SAT team use to identify students in need of TIER II support?
- To what extent are Tier II interventions successful at addressing skill gaps to allow students to master CCSS? What specific research-based interventions are provided?
- Is progress monitoring frequent enough to ensure fluidity and that the RtI process is working?

### 9. *School leadership and systems*

There is a school leadership framework that supports increasing and sustaining student achievement.

#### Guiding questions –

- Is there a school leadership team in place comprised of key instructional leaders?
- To what extent does the leadership team focus on data-driven instruction, observation and feedback, standards-aligned planning and instruction, and job-embedded professional development?

### 10. *School culture*

All students, staff and stakeholders are aware that student achievement is the top priority of school.

#### Guiding questions –



- Do students receive the continual message that nothing is as important or engaging as learning?
- How do consistent minute-by-minute systems and procedures support a student culture focused on achievement?
- How does leadership monitor and maintain a positive student and staff culture?

Focus Areas	
<i>Focus Area:</i> What are the 2-3 highest-leverage Focus Areas (best practices – see pp. 3-5) that must be addressed to reach the student achievement goals?	<i>Data Connection:</i> What quantitative and qualitative data led you to these Focus Areas? How do you know that these are the highest-leverage areas of focus?
Standard Alignment	<p>Classroom walkthroughs indicate that teachers are not using curriculum as rigorous as PARCC.</p> <p>Curriculum maps and common assessments were not being used to guide content teachers.</p> <p>Principal did not review curriculum maps for alignment.</p> <p>Curriculum maps were not aligned to EOC or CCSS.</p> <p>Classroom walkthroughs indicated there is not enough consistency in instructional strategies.</p>
Data Driven Instruction	<p>Teachers do not use data to drive curriculum instruction and professional development decisions.</p> <p>Assessment practices are not consistent from teacher to teacher.</p> <p>Assessment instruments used to judge student progress are not as rigorous as those on standardized assessments used by the state.</p> <p>Teachers' assessment results are not being discussed for deeper data analysis. Post conversations are not happening to reveal areas of concern.</p> <p>Teachers are not using short cycle assessments (MAP) to better inform curriculum planning instructional practices.</p> <p>The principal needs to examine assessment practices to ensure that tests align with all areas of Bloom's taxonomy.</p>



#### **Step 4 – Conduct Root Cause Analysis**

After identifying 2-3 high-leverage Focus Areas in Step 3, the Core Team engages in Root Cause Analysis to zero in on the deepest underlying cause or causes of school performance challenges that, if resolved, result in elimination or substantial reduction of the performance challenge. Ideally one root cause will be identified to address the performance challenge for each Focus Area, however, two closely linked root causes may be identified based on deep qualitative and quantitative analysis.

Resources: Fishbone template, 5 Whys Guidance, Role Play Script

#### **Guiding Questions –**

- What do you believe is at the heart of the problem for this focus area?
- What qualitative and quantitative evidence do you have to support this hypothesis?
- Would the problem/challenge have occurred if that cause had not been present?
- If the cause is corrected, will the problem/challenge reoccur?
- 

<b>Root Cause Analysis Notes</b>		
<i>Focus Area (selected in Step 3)</i>	<i>Root Cause Statement</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
Standards Alignment	<p>Teachers are not being held accountable for maintaining a high level of critical thinking or questioning.</p> <p>No consistent accountability for alignment of CCSS.</p>	<p>Lesson plans were not reviewed for high level rigor or alignment to CCSS.</p> <p>Quarterly assessments in the same course were different from teacher to teacher.</p> <p>There was not enough consistency with walkthrough feedback to teachers regarding the lack of rigor in classes.</p> <p>Curriculum maps were not assessed by the principal for alignment.</p>
Data Driven Instruction	<p>There has been no focus on data-driven instruction and standards alignment.</p> <p>Teachers are not using short cycle assessments (MAP) to better inform instructional practices.</p>	<p>PLC was not being used effectively to guide instruction based on assessments given to students.</p> <p>Assessments were not being evaluated for rigor or PARCC like questioning.</p> <p>MAP information was not being used</p>



		regularly to inform instruction.  Teachers are not analyzing any assessments to identify areas to teach and re-teach.
--	--	---

## 90-DAY PLAN

### Step 5 – Create Desired Outcomes & Define Critical Actions

#### *Create Desired Outcomes:*

Based on each Root Cause Analysis, the Core Team identifies a 90-day Desired Outcome for each Focus Area. Specifically, the team identifies the *change in adult behaviors* that will result in increased student achievement in math and reading.

Then, the Core Team determines the Critical Actions that need to be taken in order to achieve the Desired Outcomes.

#### **Guiding Questions for Setting Desired Outcomes –**

- What is it you are hoping to achieve?
- What specific outcome do you want?
- What is the most important problem you want to solve?
- What does this goal look like for you?
- How will you know when you have reached this goal?
- Are there any barriers that might keep you from reaching this goal?
- Can you see yourself achieving this?

Desired Outcomes	
Focus Area	<i>Draft Desired Outcome (change in adult behavior):</i> What is the Desired Outcome? What will be different if you are successful in focusing on this area of practice? After 90 days, what changes in practice will be observed?
Standards Alignment	Curriculum maps and lesson plans will be aligned to the CCSS and will be reflective of PARCC-like questions.
Data driven instruction	Use of MAP, our short cycle assessment and quarterly assessments will be used to inform daily instruction.



### *Define Critical Actions:*

After identifying the Desired Outcomes (changes in adult behaviors), the Core Team determines the Critical Actions that will promote a sense of urgency toward addressing root cause(s) and achieving each Desired Outcome.

### **Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Options) –**

- What are some possible ways to achieve...?
- What will you do to move yourself closer to the goal?
- What have you done in similar situations in the past?
- What is something you have never tried?
- What else?

### **Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Decisions) –**

- What stands out for you?
- Which would be most impactful?
- What exactly will you do?
- Who will be involved?
- Who will be responsible?
- What obstacles do you need to address in order to get this done?
- What support/resources will you need to make this happen?

<b>Focus Area:</b> Standards alignment				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Each teacher will receive weekly non-evaluative feedback on lesson plans and walkthroughs that reflect PARCC like questions and alignment with CCSS.				
<b>CRITICAL ACTIONS</b>				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
November-December, 2017	Principal will conduct weekly walkthroughs with feedback that focuses on rigor and use of PARCC-like questions and structured responses.  Principal will facilitate 1:1 feedback meeting with each teacher for at least 10 minutes every three weeks.	Calendar with dates for feedback meetings. These will also be included in Monday Memo.  Lesson plan template  List of CCSS standards for each content area.	Principal	Certified staff  Principal



	<p>Principal will review and provide feedback to teachers on lesson plans every week.</p> <p>Focus on alignment to state standards. Principal will have a list of CCSS and mark off for each teacher the standard being taught to ensure fidelity to the standards.</p>	<p>PARCC like model questions.</p> <p>CEE template for structured responses.</p>		
January-March, 2018	<p>Principal will conduct weekly walkthroughs with feedback that focuses on rigor and use of PARCC-like questions and structured responses.</p> <p>Principal will facilitate 1:1 feedback meeting with each teacher for at least 10 minutes every two weeks.</p> <p>Principal will review and provide feedback to teachers on lesson plans every week. Focus on alignment to state standards.</p> <p>Focus on alignment to state standards. Principal will have a list of CCSS and mark off for each teacher the standard being taught to ensure fidelity to the standards.</p>	<p>Calendar with dates for feedback meetings. These will also be included in Monday Memo.</p> <p>CEE template for structured responses.</p> <p>Lesson plan template</p> <p>Copy of state standards to check for alignment.</p> <p>CCSS standards</p> <p>PARCC like model questions.</p>	Principal	Principal  Certified staff
March –May, 2018	<p>Principal will conduct weekly walkthroughs with feedback that focuses on rigor and use of PARCC-like questions and structured responses.</p> <p>Principal will review and provide feedback to teachers</p>	<p>Lesson plans</p> <p>EOC for each content area.</p>	Principal	Principal  Certified Staff



	<p>on lesson plans every week. Focus on alignment to state standards.</p> <p>Principal will begin to review lesson plans and curriculum maps to align with EOC and finals.</p>			

**Focus Area:** Data-Driven Instruction

**Desired Outcome:** Map and short cycle assessment will be used to adjust lesson plans and areas of teaching.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
October 29, 2017	<p>PLC will focus on reviewing PARCC assessment evidence charts provided by PED. Teachers will analyze the areas in which the students scored the lowest as compared to the state.</p>	<p>PED analysis Evidence Charts</p> <p>Sheryl White (PED PARCC)</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Certified Staff</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>S. White</p>
November 3, 2017	<p>PLC will complete an analysis on quarter one assessment results to identify teacher area re-teaching and refocusing.</p> <p>Teachers will review Map data to identify areas that may be</p>	<p>Assessments</p> <p>Assessment results</p> <p>State standards</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Certified Staff</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>S. Beery</p>



	similar to PARCC assessment from Oct. 29.			
December 1, 2017	<p>PLC will focus on reviewing quarter two assessments to ascertain if they are aligned with Blooms higher order thinking and a variety of questions.</p> <p>Review quarter 3 curriculum maps for alignment with state standards.</p>	<p>Bloom's chart</p> <p>Sandy Beery (staff developer)</p> <p>State standards</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Certified Staff</p>	Principal, teachers
January 5, 2018	<p>PLC will complete an analysis on quarter two assessments results to identify teacher area re-teaching and refocusing.</p> <p>Development of quarter 3 assessments that mirror PARCC assessments.</p>	<p>Assessments</p> <p>Assessment results</p> <p>State standards</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Certified Staff</p> <p>S. Beery</p>	
January 26, 2018	<p>PLC will focus on reviewing and finalizing quarter 3 finals to be aligned with Blooms higher order thinking and a variety of questions.</p> <p>RE-evaluate common core standards to align with PARCC areas of concern.</p>	<p>Assessments</p> <p>Assessment results</p> <p>State standards</p> <p>Blooms</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Certified Staff</p> <p>S. Beery</p>	
March 9, 2018	<p>PLC will focus on reviewing quarter four assessments to ascertain if they are aligned with Blooms higher order thinking and a variety of questions.</p> <p>RE-evaluate common core standards to align with PARCC areas of concern.</p>	<p>Bloom's chart</p> <p>Sandy Beery (staff developer)</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Certified Staff</p>	<p>Principal</p> <p>Teachers</p> <p>S. Beery</p>
April 10, 2018	Review Map second window of assessments to see growth and	<p>Bloom's chart</p> <p>Principal</p>	Principal	Principal





	alignment.		Certified Staff	Teachers
--	------------	--	-----------------	----------

### **Step 6 – Monitor Implementation**

After creating a Desired Outcome for each Focus Area and defining the Critical Actions, the Core Team strategically selects Progress Indicators – the metrics and evidence that will be used to measure progress toward the Desired Outcomes and Goals. The Core Team identifies how the plan might be adjusted due to accelerated progress and unanticipated barriers.

The Core Team, then, also devises a system to Monitor Implementation of the plan.

#### **Guiding Questions –**

- What are the metrics, feedback, observations, etc. the core team will use to determine progress toward the desired outcome?
- How will you know the Critical Actions are having a positive impact?
- What is the evidence of progress?
- How might the plan be adjusted due to accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers?
- How will the Core Team systematize implementation and monitoring of the plan?

<b>Focus Area:</b> Standards alignment		
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Each teacher will receive weekly non-evaluative feedback on lesson plans and walkthroughs that reflect PARCC like questions and alignment with CCSS.		
<b>PROGRESS INDICATORS</b> <b>(should be aligned with Critical Actions developed in Step 5)</b>		
<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
11/6/17	Copies of Lesson plans with responses returned to teachers Indication of CEE on lesson plans	Teachers need to highlight CEE and teachers need more PD on CEE
11/13/17	Teachers will receive a list of CCSS for their content. The principal will review to make certain it is aligned with lesson plans.	Copies of CCSS to teachers
11/27/17	Teachers will receive their first round of face-to-	Coaching needs to be more



	face feedback cycles and make adjustments	focused, short and concise
12/4/17	Lesson plans are due to indicate CEE and CCSS	Coaching needs to happen with teachers who are struggling
12/11/17	Continuing with the indications on the CCSS form with a checkmark or date of the instruction.	

**Focus Area: Data-Driven Instruction**

**Desired Outcome:** Map and short cycle assessment will be used to adjust lesson plans and areas of teaching.

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**  
(should be aligned with Critical Actions developed in Step 5)

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
10/29/17	Teachers can identify 5 areas that are in need of improvement for teaching	Teachers have more than 5 areas of need
11/3/17	Map data provides teachers with information that helps them identify students who need more learning.	Map data is too broad. Map scores do not give teachers important information
12/1/17	Quarter 2 assessments are complete and have a variety of PARCC like questions.	Rewriting assessments to reflect PARCC
1/5/18	Teachers complete an analysis of Quarter2 assessments to identify what areas of CCSS were not met or mastered.	Lesson plans need to reflect CCSS according to the Q2 results.

**System to Monitor Implementation**

**Monthly:**

- Principal will meet with the superintendent to follow-up on lesson plans and CCSS alignment.
- Principal will meet with Core Team to revisit the plan and progress. The Core Team will make any necessary recommendations for the 90-day second cycle.

**Mid-Year:**

- Core team will share out the success of the 90 day plan and take input for revisions necessary for the next 90days.



--

**New America School-Las Cruces**

Governing Council

Thursday, October 10, 2017

5:00 PM

207 S. Main

Las Cruces NM

**Board Members Present:** Fernando Macias, Toby Rue (Vice-President), Oscar Juarez, Susie Kimble (President)

**Regrets:** Jennifer Garcia Kozlowski (Treasurer), Martha Valdez (Secretary)

**Staff Present:** Margarita Porter, Dominic DiFelice, Kyle Hunt, Veronica Gonzalez,

**Minutes of the GC**

1. The meeting was called to order at 5:00 pm by Susie Kimble
2. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.
3. The mission statement was read by Susie Kimble
4. Moved by Fernando Macias and seconded by Toby Rue that the agenda be approved. Votes: Unanimous.
5. Minutes of September 21, 2017 were tabled until next week's meeting.
6. The principal explained in detail the NM Dash. Questions regarding some specifics of the plan were addressed. The plan provides a blueprint for ensuring curriculum alignment and that data driven instruction be the school's main areas of focus. Moved by Fernando Macias and seconded by Toby Rue that the NM Dash be approved as presented. Votes: Unanimous.
7. The principal was directed at the last board meeting to seek feedback from staff on what they need to improve student achievement. Margarita outlined three main priorities that staff needed.
  - An Educational Assistant in the areas of Language Arts and Science
  - Instructional materials
  - PD in the area of differentiation

There was considerable discussion as to what the staff wants and what the school needs to increase student performance. It was decided to table this item until next week's meeting to give the principal more time to reflect whether monies are in the budget to support the second and third priorities and to revisit the area of need for the Ed Assistant.
8. Public Input: None
9. Adjournment 6:24 pm

Next Meeting will be held at 5:00 pm on Tuesday October 19, 2017 at New America School 207 S. Main, Las Cruces, NM.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_  
Martha Valdez, Secretary



**New America School-Las Cruces  
Special Board GC Meeting**

**Tuesday October 10, 2017**

**207 S. Main St.**

**Las Cruces, NM 88001**

**5:00-6:30 PM**

*Our Mission:  
To empower new  
immigrants, English  
language learners and  
academically  
underserved students  
with the educational  
tools and support they  
need to maximize their  
potential, succeed and  
live the  
American Dream.*

**Agenda**

- a) Call to order
- b) Pledge of Allegiance
- c) Mission Statement

**Action Items**

- 1. Approval of the agenda
- 2. Approval of the minutes of September 21, 2017
- 3. Discussion and action on identified school priorities
- 4. Discussion and action on NM DASH.
- 5. Public Input
- 6. Adjournment

If you are an individual with a disability who is in need of a reader, amplifier, qualified sign language interpreter, or any other form of auxiliary aid or service to attend or participate in the hearing or meeting, please contact [ddifelice@newamericaschool.org](mailto:ddifelice@newamericaschool.org) at least one week prior to the meeting or as soon as possible. Public documents, including the agenda and minutes, can be provided in various accessible formats. Please contact [ddifelice@newamericaschool.org](mailto:ddifelice@newamericaschool.org) if a summary or other type of accessible format is needed.





**New Mexico  
DASH**  
DATA, ACCOUNTABILITY,  
SUSTAINABILITY, HIGH ACHIEVEMENT  
Educational Plan for Student Success

**Tierra Encantada Charter School  
State Authorized Charter Schools (PEC)**

**December 08, 2017**

**Core Team**

Daniel Pena - District  
Daniel Pena - Principal

Content Area	Grade(s)	Last Year's Results					This Year's Goals	Benchmark Goals
English Language Arts	7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th	Overall Performance on MAP:					The goal is to raise scores in ELA by a total of 40%.	Students will take NWEA/MAPS 3 times (minimum) per year to check progress. Administered October, January, March. Progress per test window will show improvement of 10%-15% to reach a maximum of 45% goal.
		Grade	Lo	Lo-Avg	Avg	Hi-		
		Avg	Hi					
		8 (7)	47%	10%	19%			
		15%	8%					
		9 (8)	59%	20%	10%			
		7%	5%					
		10 (9)	36%	27%	27%			
		0%	9%					
		11 (10)	40%	19%	19%			
		12%	10%					
		12 (11)	35%	32%	18%			
		7%	7%					

Content Area	Grade(s)	Last Year's Results	This Year's Goals	Benchmark Goals																														
Mathematics	7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th	<p>Overall Performance on MAP:</p> <table> <tr> <th>Grade</th><th>Lo</th><th>Lo-Avg</th><th>Avg</th><th>Hi-</th></tr> <tr> <td>8 (7)</td><td>41%</td><td>23%</td><td>16%</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>9 (8)</td><td>49%</td><td>23%</td><td>17%</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>10 (9)</td><td>50%</td><td>25%</td><td>15%</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>11 (10)</td><td>48%</td><td>26%</td><td>12%</td><td></td></tr> <tr> <td>12 (11)</td><td>45%</td><td>30%</td><td>12%</td><td></td></tr> </table>	Grade	Lo	Lo-Avg	Avg	Hi-	8 (7)	41%	23%	16%		9 (8)	49%	23%	17%		10 (9)	50%	25%	15%		11 (10)	48%	26%	12%		12 (11)	45%	30%	12%		The goal is to improve proficiency levels in math by 40% minimum.	Students will take NWEA/MAPS 3 times (minimum) per year to check progress. Administered October, January, March. Progress per test window will show improvement of 10%-15% to reach a maximum of 45% goal.
Grade	Lo	Lo-Avg	Avg	Hi-																														
8 (7)	41%	23%	16%																															
9 (8)	49%	23%	17%																															
10 (9)	50%	25%	15%																															
11 (10)	48%	26%	12%																															
12 (11)	45%	30%	12%																															



**FOCUS AREA: Data-driven instruction**

**Desired Outcome:** Lesson Plans detailing focused areas as targeted by current data. (A new lesson plan format may be needed) New intervention program designed by data driven instruction on Fridays. Pre and Post data driven instruction for Friday School. Currently, there is no intervention program at TECS. PLC will be utilized to begin the process of creating intervention.

**Root Cause(s):** Focus is heavy on Expeditions with no PD on data analysis and data driven instruction. If expeditions and project based instruction is well planned - data trends follow effectively.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<b>Timeline (start/end dates)</b>	<b>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</b>	<b>Resources Needed / Source</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Person(s) Involved</b>
08/25/2017 - 08/25/2017	Professional Development - plotting student data and create a data wall	PARCC Data	Daniel Pena	all staff
09/08/2017 - 09/08/2017	Professional Development - Data Analysis - Targeted student data	PARCC data	Daniel Pena	all staff
09/15/2017 - 09/15/2017	Professional Development - Engagement in the active classroom	EL Education	Daniel Pena	all staff
09/22/2017 - 09/22/2017	Professional Development - Working with students with disabilities	Special education department/staff	Daniel Pena	all staff
10/06/2017 - 10/06/2017	Data analysis - identifying needs per groups	PARCC data	Daniel Pena	all staff
10/13/2017 - 10/13/2017	Learning Targets	Staff Resources	Daniel Pena	all staff
10/20/2017 - 10/20/2017	Test Security Training	PED Test Security Powerpoints and info	Daniel Pena	All staff

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<b>Timeline (start/end dates)</b>	<b>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</b>	<b>Resources Needed / Source</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>	<b>Person(s) Involved</b>
10/27/2017 - 10/27/2017	Understanding and working with SAT.	Special Education Dept	Daniel Pena	All staff

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

<b>Indicator Date</b>	<b>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome</b>	<b>Potential Adjustments</b>
10/31/2017	LT included on lesson plans	New PD
01/19/2018	Friday School Intervention	Later Start Date

**FOCUS AREA: Tier I (Core) instruction**

**Desired Outcome:** Learning Targets posted in every classroom

**Root Cause(s):** All classes will have LT posted with clear expectations for all classes. Strategies utilized will consist of small group instruction available for all and frequent checks for understanding.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

Timeline (start/end dates)	Critical Action to Address Root Cause & Achieve Desired Outcome	Resources Needed / Source	Person(s) Responsible	Person(s) Involved
08/14/2017 - 08/14/2017	Prof Development - plotting student data - Data Wall	PARCC Data	Daniel Pena	All Staff
10/27/2017 - 10/27/2017	Prof Development - Data analysis (targeted)	PARCC Data	Daniel Pena	All Staff
09/15/2017 - 09/15/2017	Professional Development - Engagement in the Active Classroom	EL Education	Daniel Pena	All Staff
09/22/2017 - 09/22/2017	Working with Students with Disabilities - professional development	Special Education Department	Daniel Pena	All staff

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

Indicator Date	Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome	Potential Adjustments
11/16/2017	Learning targets posted in all rooms	Adjust for SMART goals

**FOCUS AREA: Observation and feedback cycles**

**Desired Outcome:** "Actionable" outcomes from feedback to teachers. Meet quarterly with teachers to discuss growth and areas for improvement.

**Root Cause(s):** TECS is highly focused on Project Based Learning and utilized TECS designed teacher evaluation. NMTEACH focuses on classroom instruction, data, and professional growth. TECS created their own teacher evaluation that aligned to EL Education standards with focus on peer observation and evaluation. The previous evaluation tool did not align with NMTEACH.

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

Timeline (start/end dates)	Critical Action to Address Root Cause & Achieve Desired Outcome	Resources Needed / Source	Person(s) Responsible	Person(s) Involved
09/29/2017 - 09/29/2017	NMTEACH Rubrics-Walk Through Reports	NM TEACH RUBRICS	Daniel Pena	All Staff
08/28/2017 - 05/17/2018	Weekly Walk Throughs conducted	NM TEACH RUBRICS	Daniel Pena	All Staff
10/23/2017 - 12/15/2017	Round 1 observation with identified areas for improvement	NM TEACH RUBRICS	Daniel Pena	All Teaching staff
12/04/2017 - 12/15/2017	Teacher Follow up Conferences (done quarterly)	NM TEACH RUBRICS	Daniel Pena	All Teaching Staff

**PROGRESS INDICATORS**

Indicator Date	Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome	Potential Adjustments
12/15/2017	Evidence of the need for any growth plans	PDP reviews



**New Mexico 90-day Plan  
Offline Planning Process Workbook**

## ANNUAL PLAN

### Step 1 – Build Core Team

With district support, the school leader(s) identify critical members to bring together as a team to co-construct the school vision for dramatic change and establish a 90-day Plan that will increase achievement for all students.

### **Guiding Questions –**

✓ District Level:

- To what extent does the district representative need to be involved in the planning process?
- Should Core Teams look the same at every school?

✓ School Level:

- To what extent does the Core Team represent diverse backgrounds and viewpoints, in order to consider challenges from many perspectives?
  - Are there representatives from across grade levels?
  - Is the group representative of the student body and community?
  - Is the Core Team the same as the school leadership team?
  - Are the strongest teacher-leaders on the Core Team?

### **Core Team Notes**

Team Member	Position	<u>Rationale:</u> What strengths/perspective does this person bring to the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school's current reality?
Daniel Pena	Director	Former principal who has worked in dual language program. Familiar with state accountability system and experience with turnaround in another district. First charter experience but brings numerous years of administrative experience.
Kristen Encinias	Academic Counselor	Respected among TECS staff, familiar with family, students and school community. Understands turnaround practices and data.
Angela Esquibel-Martinez	Special Education Coordinator	Understands needs of individual students and learning needs. Understands turnaround process and the need to include data when panning for students in need of intervention.
Hana Partrick	Project Based Education Coordinator	Experienced in project based learning, coaches teachers with best practices involving project based learning and the tie to student achievement.





Denette Martinez	Math	Understands data and interpretation for individual student learning. Respected by staff and community.
Ramon Asiain	Science	Knowledgeable on the use of data and the use for intervention.
Rebecca Casaus	Science	Knowledgeable on the use of turnaround principals, concepts and data.
Ken Baumann	English	Understands individual needs of students, project based learning,

### Step 2 – Analyze Data & Set Student Achievement Goals

With the core team, analyze student achievement data (e.g. interim assessment results, common formative assessments, student work samples, summative results). Through deep data analysis and reflection, set summative student achievement goals for ELA and math. An optional third goal may be identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates).

Once summative goals have been established, set benchmark goals to monitor progress toward summative goals. Benchmark goals should be clearly articulated in both ELA and math (and for an optional third goal), align with summative goals, and be connected to the most current interim or formative assessment data.

**Guiding Question** – Given the most recent student achievement data, what summative and benchmark goals will create a sense of focus and urgency towards action to increase student achievement?

Student Achievement Goals						
Grade/Subject Area	2016-2017 MAP Results					2017-18 Map Goals
Reading	Overall Performance on MAP:					40%
	Grade	Lo	Lo-Avg	Avg	Hi-Avg	
	8 (7)	47%	10%	19%	15%	
	9 (8)	59%	20%	10%	7%	
	10 (9)	36%	27%	27%	0%	
	11 (10)	40%	19%	19%	12%	
	12 (11)	35%	32%	18%	7%	
Math	Overall Performance on MAP:					40%
	Grade	Lo	Lo-Avg	Avg	Hi-Avg	
	8 (7)	41%	23%	16%	18%	
	9 (8)	49%	23%	17%	9%	
						<b>Benchmark Goals:</b> How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals?  Students will take NWEA/MAPS 3 times (minimum) per year to check progress. Administered October, January, March. Progress per test window will show improvement of 10%-15% to reach a maximum of 45% goal.  Students will take NWEA/MAPS 3 times (minimum) per year to check progress.



	10 (9)	50%	25%	15%	10%	0%		Administered October, January, March. Progress per test window will show improvement of 10%-15% to reach a maximum of 45% goal.
	11 (10)	48%	26%	12%	12%	2%		
	12 (11)	45%	30%	12%	9%	3%		

Well-written goals help to set a bold, positive vision and establish a sense of urgency. They communicate and make visible to all stakeholders the intent of the plan.

**Guiding Question** – To what extent do summative and benchmark goals meet SMART criteria?

SMART Checklist		
<b><u>Specific</u></b>	Is the goal clearly defined?	
<b><u>Measurable</u></b>	Are concrete criteria identified for measuring progress toward attainment of the goal?	
<b><u>Ambitious &amp; Attainable</u></b>	Does the goal stretch the school while still being attainable?	
<b><u>Relevant</u></b>	Does the goal relate to student learning and achievement? Is it data-based?	
<b><u>Time-bound</u></b>	Is the timeframe appropriate for accomplishment of the goal?	





### Step 3 – Identify Focus Areas

Following deep data analysis and reflection on qualitative and quantitative evidence, the core team identifies the 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas that will increase student achievement for all students. Focus areas are best practices that will increase achievement for all students and narrow the scope for root cause analysis, desired outcomes, and critical actions.

Possible evidence sources to consider include: observation data (evaluative or non), lesson/unit plans, student surveys, interim assessment results, common formative assessment results, student work samples, summative results.

### **Focus Areas & Guiding Questions –**

#### *1. Standards Alignment*

All grade levels have identified essential standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- How do you ensure that the Tier I (core) curriculum and instruction is aligned with the CCSS and is being implemented with fidelity?
- Do you have a scope and sequence aligned to the CCSS?

#### *2. Tier I (core) instruction*

There is a dedicated block of time devoted to providing core instruction to all students aligned with grade level standards.

#### Guiding questions –

- What percent of your students are achieving grade-level expectations or making significant growth? If at least 80% are not attaining proficiency, what are you doing to ensure that your school is making significant progress toward this goal?
- What evidence do you have that the level of rigor of the tasks students perform during the lesson is aligned to the rigor of the CCSS?

#### *3. Data-driven instruction*

There is a precise, systematic approach to improving student learning throughout the year. The cycle of DDI includes assessment, analysis and action.

#### Guiding questions –

- Are the district's and school's assessment strategies firmly in place? (formative, interim, and summative)
- How do teachers and leadership analyze and act on assessment data?
- Do teacher action plans include focused and targeted whole-group, small-group, and individual interventions?





- How effectively does school leadership hold teachers accountable to ensure effective instructional adjustment, interventions, and instructional feedback?

#### 4. *Tier I interventions*

There are fluid, flexible interventions in place during Tier I (core) instruction for students not progressing as expected.

##### Guiding questions –

- How do you identify students in need of Tier I (core) interventions?
- How do you differentiate instruction based on the screening results, as well as the abilities and needs of all students in the core program?
- To what extent are Tier I (core) interventions successful in addressing student needs based on data?

#### 5. *Observation and feedback cycles*

Principal and other instructional leaders devote time daily to non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and provide face-to-face feedback to teachers in a timely manner.

##### Guiding questions –

- Are frequent and regular non-evaluative walkthroughs built into the leaders' schedules?
- Do leaders give face-to-face direct feedback to teachers focused on specific action steps for improvement?
- To what extent do leaders hold teachers accountable to translate feedback into practice?

#### 6. *Collaboration*

Teachers have time during the week to work together to promote student success.

##### Guiding questions –

- What evidence do you have that your teacher teams work together weekly to analyze data, share strategies, plan collaboratively, and debrief the outcomes of instruction?
- How do school leaders support and hold teacher teams accountable?

#### 7. *Ongoing, job embedded professional development*

Teacher professional development is grounded in day-to-day teaching practice and is designed to enhance student learning.

##### Guiding questions –

- Describe the process for identifying and providing job-embedded, ongoing, professional development informed by the teacher evaluation system.



- How is professional development for teachers tied to student needs as identified by assessment data?

#### 8. *Tier II (SAT) process*

There is a system in place to provide strategic and individualized support to students for whom Tier I instruction and interventions have proven insufficient.

##### Guiding questions –

- What criteria does the SAT team use to identify students in need of TIER II support?
- To what extent are Tier II interventions successful at addressing skill gaps to allow students to master CCSS? What specific research-based interventions are provided?
- Is progress monitoring frequent enough to ensure fluidity and that the RtI process is working?

#### 9. *School leadership and systems*

There is a school leadership framework that supports increasing and sustaining student achievement.

##### Guiding questions –

- Is there a school leadership team in place comprised of key instructional leaders?
- To what extent does the leadership team focus on data-driven instruction, observation and feedback, standards-aligned planning and instruction, and job-embedded professional development?

#### 10. *School culture*

All students, staff and stakeholders are aware that student achievement is the top priority of school.

##### Guiding questions –

- Do students receive the continual message that nothing is as important or engaging as learning?
- How do consistent minute-by-minute systems and procedures support a student culture focused on achievement?
- How does leadership monitor and maintain a positive student and staff culture?



Focus Areas	
<i>Focus Area:</i> What are the 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas (best practices – see pp. 3-5) that must be addressed to reach the student achievement goals?	<i>Data Connection:</i> What data analysis led you to identify this focus area? What quantitative and qualitative data led you to this focus area?
3. Data-driven instruction	Evidence in our recent report card indicates 3% math and 9% reading proficiency. Data has not been used effectively to drive instruction. (2014-16 data: 2% math proficiency – 14% reading proficiency).
2. Tier I (core) instruction	Low proficiency rates indicate students need intensive intervention – high and low performing. Students attend Monday – Thursday; staff needs to analyze data closely to create intervention on Fridays effectively. Teacher will receive professional development on Tier 1 intervention in September and ongoing. Professional development also needed in unpacking content standards and carry on through PLC. Data discussions in PLC will be ongoing to provide more differentiated instruction within the classroom.
5. Observation and feedback cycles	Focus on observation and feedback has been lacking as evident by data trend from 2015-16 SY to 2016-17 SY. Effective feedback is necessary to improve instruction and engage students. Teacher evaluations were completed in 2016-17 school year (previously, TECS did not use NMTEACH observation protocol.)





### Step 4 – Conduct Root Cause Analysis

After identifying 2-3 high-leverage focus areas, the core team engages in thoughtful root cause analysis to zero in on the deepest underlying cause or causes of school performance challenges that, if resolved, result in elimination or substantial reduction of the performance challenge.

Resources: Fishbone template, 5 Whys Guidance, Role Play Script

### **Guiding Questions –**

- What do you believe is at the heart of the problem for this focus area?
- What qualitative and quantitative evidence do you have to support this hypothesis?
- Would the problem/challenge have occurred if that cause had not been present?
- If the cause is corrected, will the problem/challenge reoccur?

Root Cause Analysis Notes		
<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Root Cause Hypothesis</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
3.Data-driven instruction	Focus is heavy on Expeditions with no PD on data analysis and data driven instruction. If expeditions and project based instruction is well planned – data trends follow effectively.	Expeditions are well planned with end projects showing proficiency (passages/SLC's) test proficiency (PARCC) data is low. Teachers will create formative assessments (on LT's) to check for understanding and mastery.
2.Tier I (core) instruction	All classes will have LT posted with clear expectations for all classes. Strategies utilized will consist of small group instruction available for all and frequent checks for understanding.	PARCC results showed a “backward” growth in the Highest performing and Lowest performing subgroups.
5.Observation and feedback cycles	TECS is highly focused on Project Based Learning and utilized TECS designed teacher evaluation. NMTEACH focuses on classroom instruction, data, and professional growth. TECS created their own teacher evaluation that aligned to EL Education standards with focus on peer observation and evaluation. The previous evaluation tool did not align with NMTEACH.	PARCC showed no improvement in “Current Standing” for the 2015 – 2017 school years combined. Feedback did not include next steps and use of data to drive instruction.



## 90-DAY PLAN

### Step 5 – Create Desired Outcomes & Define Critical Actions

#### Create Desired Outcomes:

Based on each thoughtful root cause analysis, the core team creates a 90-day Desired Outcome for each focus area. Specifically, the team identifies the **change in adult behaviors** that will create focus and urgency towards action that would logically result in increased student achievement in math and reading.

#### Guiding Questions for Setting Desired Outcomes –

- What specific outcome do you want? What change in adult behaviors will be observable by the end of 90 days?
- How will you know when you have reached this goal? What will be different if you are successful in focusing on this area of practice? After 90 days, what changes in practice will be observed?

Desired Outcomes	
Focus Area	Draft Desired Outcome ( <u>change in adult behaviors</u> )
3.Data-driven instruction	Lesson Plans detailing focused areas as targeted by current data. (A new lesson plan format may be needed) New intervention program designed by data driven instruction on Fridays. Pre and Post data driven instruction for Friday School. Currently, there is no intervention program at TECS. PLC will be utilized to begin the process of creating intervention.
2.Tier I (core) instruction	All classroom with posted LT with pre/post tests.
5.Observation and feedback cycles	“Actionable” outcomes from feedback to teachers. Meet quarterly with teachers to discuss growth and areas for improvement.

#### Define Critical Actions:

After identifying the desired outcomes (change in adult behaviors), the core team determines the critical actions that will promote a sense of urgency toward addressing root cause(s) and achieving each desired outcome.

#### Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Options) –

- What are some possible ways to achieve...?
- What will you do to move yourself closer to the goal?
- What have you done in similar situations in the past?
- What is something you have never tried?
- What else?





### Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Decisions) –

- Which would be most impactful?
- What exactly will you do?
- Who will be involved? How are critical actions strategically owned by various school/district individuals?
- What obstacles do you need to address in order to get this done?
- What support/resources will you need to make this happen?

#### Focus Area:

#### 3.Data-driven instruction

#### Desired Outcome:

**Lesson Plans detailing focused areas as targeted by current data. (A new lesson plan format may be needed)**

CRITICAL ACTIONS				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
August 2017	Prof Development – plotting student data – Data Wall	PARCC data	Pena/Encinias	All teachers
September 2017	Prof Development – Data analysis (targeted)	Detailed PARCC data	Pena/Encinias	All Teachers
September 2017	Prof Development – Engagement in the Active Classroom	E.L. Education	E.L. Education	All Staff – including admin
September 2017	Working with students with Disabilities	PARCC Data/SPED Rosters	Pena/Esquibel	All Staff
October 2017	Intervention Friday School	Data/Rosters	Pena/Encinias	Teaching Staff
October 2017	Intervention Rosters	PARCC Data Analysis	Pena/Encinias/Staff	All Staff
October 2017	Data Driven Instruction Evidence in Lesson Plans	PARCC Data/Lesson Plans	Pena	All Teaching Staff
October 2017	Observation – walk through analysis	Walk through reports	Pena	All Teaching Staff

**Focus Area:****2.Tier I (core) instruction****Desired Outcome:**

**New intervention program designed by data driven instruction on Fridays. Pre and Post data driven instruction for Friday School**

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
August 2017	Prof Development – plotting student data – Data Wall	PARCC data	Pena/Encinias	All teachers
September 2017	Prof Development – Data analysis (targeted)	Detailed PARCC data	Pena/Encinias	All Teachers
September 2017	Prof Development – Engagement in the Active Classroom	E.L. Education	E.L. Education	All Staff – including admin
September 2017	Working with students with Disabilities	PARCC Data/SPED Rosters	Pena/Esquibel	All Staff
October 2017	Intervention Friday School	Data/Rosters	Pena/Encinias	Teaching Staff
December 2017	Pre-Post intervention assessment tests	Pre-post assessment data results	Pena	Teaching Staff

**Focus Area:****5.Observation and feedback cycles****Desired Outcome:**

**“Actionable” outcomes from feedback to teachers. Meet quarterly with teachers to discuss growth and areas for improvement.**

**CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
September 2017	NMTEACH Rubrics PD – Walk Through Protocol	NM TEACH Rubrics	Pena	All Teaching Staff
September 2017	Weekly Walk Through conducted	NM TEACH Rubrics	Pena	All Teaching Staff
October	Quarterly Teacher Conferences	NM TEACH Rubrics/Walk Through Reports	Pena	All Teaching Staff
October	Round 1 Observation with identified areas for improvement from walk-through reports – PGP for those needing intensive growth	NM TEACH Rubrics/Walk Through Reports	Pena	All Teaching Staff





December	Quarterly Teacher Conferences PGP Follow Up	NM TEACH Rubrics/Walk Through Reports	Pena	All Teaching Staff
February	Quarterly Teacher Conferences PGP Conferences and Follow-up	NM TEACH Rubrics/Walk Through Reports	Pena	All Teaching Staff
April 2017	Quarterly Teacher Conferences PGP Follow up 2018-2019 recommendations	NM TEACH Rubrics/Walk Through Reports	Pena	All Teaching Staff

### Step 6 – Monitor Implementation

After creating a desired outcome for each focus area and defining the critical actions, the core team strategically selects progress indicators – the metrics and evidence that will be used to measure progress toward the desired outcomes and goals. The core team identifies how the plan might be adjusted due to accelerated progress and unanticipated barriers.

### **Guiding Questions –**

- What are the metrics, feedback, observations, etc. the core team will use to determine progress toward the desired outcome? What is the evidence of progress?
- How will you know the critical actions are having a positive impact?
- How might the plan be adjusted due to accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers?

<b>Focus Area:</b> <b>3.Data-driven instruction</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> <b>Lesson Plans detailing focused areas as targeted by current data. (A new lesson plan format may be needed)</b>				
<b>CRITICAL ACTIONS</b>				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.				
<b>PROGRESS INDICATORS</b>				
<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>		
October 31, 2017	Formal Lesson Plan Review Discovery Data Review	ReCalibrate for individual staff members PGP possibilities		





December 15, 2017	Formal Lesson Plan Review Data Review	ReCalibrate for individual staff members PGP review/exit
-------------------	--	---

<b>Focus Area:</b> <b>2.Tier I (core) instruction</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> <b>New intervention program designed by data driven instruction on Fridays. Pre and Post data driven instruction for Friday School</b>				
CRITICAL ACTIONS				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.				
PROGRESS INDICATORS				
<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>		
October 31, 2017	Friday School Attendance Data Pre Test Data Review	Roster Adjustments (after school interventions?)		
December 15, 2017	Friday School Attendance Data Review Post Data Review	Roster Adjustments (Exit criteria)		

<b>Focus Area:</b> <b>5.Observation and feedback cycles</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> <b>"Actionable" outcomes from feedback to teachers. Meet quarterly with teachers to discuss growth and areas for improvement.</b>				
CRITICAL ACTIONS				
<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
Progress Indicators should be aligned to Critical Actions, which were developed in Step 5.				
PROGRESS INDICATORS				
<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome and Goals</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>		
October 31	Quarterly Teacher Conference – areas of growth and data	PGP		
December 15	Quarterly Teacher Conferences – Areas of growth and data	PGP (Exits?)		



The core team clearly details a system to monitor implementation of the plan including a procedure, timelines, and person(s) responsible.

**Guiding Questions -**

- How will the core team systematize implementation and monitoring of the plan?
- What is the procedure? What are the timelines? Who is responsible?

System to Monitor Implementation		
Procedure	Timelines	Person(s) Responsible
Updates on each Focus Area presented (general) at Cabinet	Monthly	Pena



New Mexico 90-day Plan  
Tierra Encantada Charter School

A large, stylized blue ink signature, likely belonging to the President, is written over a horizontal line.

President

A blue ink signature, likely belonging to the Secretary, is written over a horizontal line.

Secretary

Vote: 6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain

Adopted: January 11, 2018

Governance Council Policy