

## Appendix C, Charter Schools Moving Toward DASH Implementation





# The Albuquerque Sign Language Academy

## 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?
Raphael Martinez	Executive Director / Founder	Mr. Martinez is a co-founder of the school and has been the school's head administrator since 2011. In addition, Mr. Martinez is the father of a deaf student with multiple special needs and another child that is typically developing – both attend the ASLA. Mr. Martinez brings 25 years of experience having been a classroom teacher, athletics coach, and building administrator.
Jennifer Blythe	Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Ms. Blythe joined the ASLA team in the fall of 2016. She brings an array experience as a National Board Certified Special Ed. Teacher and the former head Special Ed. Administrator at Desert Ridge MS. She has been in education since 2002 and has an affinity for working with special needs children.



Leticia Archuleta	Director of Student Support	Ms. Archuleta has been with the ASLA since the 2012-2013 school year and oversees all student and family support systems. Ms. Archuleta is a Licensed Independent Social Worker by training and has 17 years experience as a school social worker and a private therapist. She previously worked with deaf students at McKinley Middle School and Del Norte High School within the APS deaf program.
Sara Ayres	Middle school Instructional Coach and Highest Leveled M.S Instructor (including gifted)	Ms. Ayres is a dual licensed K-12 teacher who is endorsed in Language Arts, Math and TESOL. Ms. Ayres has been at the ASLA since 2011 and currently teaches the highest level MS students in a cross-content block (LA, Math, Science, Social Studies).
Jeni King	Elementary School Instructional Coach and DHH Classroom Instructor (deaf)	Ms. King is a dual licensed elementary level teacher with a specialty in Deaf Education from The Rochester Institute of Technology and a TESOL endorsement. Ms. King has been a teacher at the ASLA since its opening and is considered the resident American Sign Language specialist at the school.
Therese Garcia	Elementary School Instructor, national board certified, Parent	Ms. Garcia is a dual licensed, TESOL endorsed, National Board Certified Teacher that works with K/1 students. Ms. Garcia has 13 years of teaching experience and previously taught in the APS Deaf Program before joining the ASLA team in 2014.
Kim Silva	Board President, co-founder, parent	Ms. Silva is a co-founder, current governing board president, and mother of a deaf son and hearing twins. Ms. Silva was a key player in the very beginning meetings in 2008 that brought the ASLA to life.
Yancey Ranspot	Parent, board member	Mr. Ranspot is a sitting board member and the father of a hard of hearing daughter that uses a baja hearing device. Mr. Ranspot has been instrumental in working with the school to develop an outdoor and environmental education program that connects to the US Forrest Service.
Paul Twitchell	Deaf parent of a hearing child	Mr. Twitchell is deaf parent of a hearing child who attends the ASLA. Mr. Twitchell is currently working on his PhD in Deaf Linguistics at the University of New Mexico. He has attended Gallaudett University and has worked in the neuro-studies department under renowned deaf researcher Dr. Laura Ann Petitto.

### 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.

### **Background and Historical Context:**

In 2013 The Albuquerque Sign Language Academy (ASLA) met with a representative group from PED that included Dr. Peter Goldschmidt, Dr. Cindy Gregory, and our (then) CSD Liaison Rachel Stofocik to discuss the applicability of the state's school grading formula on a school with the student demographics of the ASLA. It was determined at that time that the ASLA was not fairly served by the state's school grading formula due to the school's extraordinarily high special ed. population. The ASLA was given TBD status for a school grade as the PED and the ASLA worked to create an alternative system of school accountability.

Since this time, the school has been working to create a parallel system that will more fairly measure the unique population of the ASLA. This alternative system was reviewed, discussed, and agreed upon by the Public Education Commission (PEC) at the school's charter renewal contract negotiation, and is thus embedded in the school's charter renewal contract with its authorizer, the PEC. Additionally, during the work to create a parallel system of school accountability, the ASLA was directed by the PED to seek help from the UNM Center for Educational Policy and Research (CEPR). After numerous meetings and extensive consideration, Dr. Tom Dauphinee declined to engage the project citing in part:

*"... (Because New Mexico lacks) assessments (for students with disabilities) that reflect achievement with vertically differentiated performance expectations, it is not possible to accurately measure academic growth to guide instruction, evaluate teacher performance, and grade a school." (Entire letter attached separately.)*

The contextual basis for this determination is rooted in the idea that in 2013 the ASLA was deemed "unfairly graded" by a system built for the masses (thus the ASLA was given TBD status), yet as the school's student demographics becomes **more** skewed to the special education side, no credence was paid to the work of this alternative system for measuring student growth. Until this year, the ASLA has always been given TBA status after going through the "formal appeal process". In 2013, the school's special ed. population hovered at 53%; today that number is approaching 70% - the majority of whom have significant developmental delays and disabilities. The ASLA continues to work with contracted professionals in order to refine this parallel system of accountability that more fairly measures the growth of the ASLA's unique student population. Since that initial meeting with PED in 2013, PARCC has replaced the SBA, but it is still not normed to the needs of deaf, hard of hearing, and special needs children.

This is not to say that the ASLA does not have children who would be fairly measured by the PARCC. However, the combination of a high special education population coupled with a school with a TOTAL pollution of 100 students results in testing cohorts of 3-5 students for whom the PARCC is actually normed. Consequentially, any one student carries an inordinately high impact percentage of the cohort's overall performance.

### **Rationale of Alternate Grading System:**

In working (historically) with the NMPED Assessment Bureau, the PED CSD and the NM PEC, it was generally agreed upon that the PARCC does not fairly measure the majority of ASLA students. That is, because of the diverse needs of the ASLA student population, the use of other assessment instruments are better able to capture more nuanced growth in all of its students. Simply stated, the PARCC does not necessarily capture the gains that are significant to each individual student (as denoted in his/her IEP) as the parameters of proficiency outpace the student's need. As a result, the PEC had accepted a variety of SCAs (in the school's Charter Renewal Application) to measure student growth.

The goal of the ASLA is to improve the academic achievement of ALL students. Having gone through the charter renewal and contract negotiations in 2015, the ASLA established measurable goals for student achievement in reading for the 2015-2016 school year that are connected to the DRA2 short cycle assessment. The DRA2 was chosen because it was more sensitive in measuring student growth, and it was not as phonetically driven as DIBELS. This adjustment better



suited the ASLA's student population (deaf). The reading goals are based upon the ASLA's Charter mission and the SMART goals identified therein. The school's Governance Board, the Public Education Commission, and the NMPED Charter School Division had reviewed all goals and stood in agreement with all policies and procedure in place to achieve set goals. In addition, the ASLA had worked hand in hand with the NM PED Assessment Division to restructure and reconfigure various other short-cycle tests to better suit the needs of deaf and high-needs special education students. Normed short cycle tests for these (deaf) students do not currently exist in New Mexico.

It is important to note that the ASLA embraces a philosophy of sustained academic and social-emotional growth as many of its students have significant challenges. This holistic approach to student learning propels the students at the ASLA to achieve beyond most other system's expectations. In addition to the this adapted DRA2 short cycle, the ASLA also uses an American Sign Language Receptive assesement (ASLRT) developed out of the University of Manitoba and the Foundational Qualities of Student Success (FQSS) to monitor student growth. Again, all aforementioned assessments are written as charter-specific goals and are agreed upon by the PEC and NMPED Charter School Division.

As a result of the unique student population of the ASLA, and as reflected by the agreed-upon charter contract, the school is academically divided into five distinct cohorts with goals normed accordingly (descriptions attached seperately). For the sake of NM Dash and trying to adapt our charter school goals to its platform, we have attempted to represent the various cohorts within generally accepted educational grouping, i.e. special ed. - deaf, life skills and regular ed. By the same rationale, we have elected to omit our charter specific FQSS and ASLRT due to their disconnect from the academic compliance measures determined by the state. Nevertheless, both assessments are important measures of systems that are key to the ASLA's success.

### **Partnerships to Develop New Assessments:**

The ASLA has entered a formal partnership with Penn State University and the University of Minnesota (UMN) to act as a research partner in the development of short cycle reading assessments specifically designed for deaf students. These newly developed assessments were created by Penn State and UMN, and the ASLA was specifically chosen as a research site due to its unique student population and innovative program. The ASLA is currently the ONLY school test partner in the project.

Additionally, the ASLA is also involved in a formal partnership with Harvard University and McLean Hospital to adapt and develop a social-emotional assessment that is appropriate to use with students with special needs. Although the PEAR (partnership in education and resiliency) Project has been established, Harvard has taken special interest in the ASLA due to its unique situation and its self-developed FQSS assessment.

**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			
Cohort I – Grades K-4 (Regular Ed. and A/B Sp.Ed. Designation)	2016-17 DRA2 Results (EOY)	2017-18 DRA2 Goals (EOY)	Benchmark Goals: MOY Interim Assessment (February 2018)
Kindergarten	3 out of 6 on grade level	4 out of 6 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	4 out of 5 on grade level	5 out of 5 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2



2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	6 out of 9 on grade level	9 out of 9 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	9 out of 9 below grade level	6 out of 9 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	5 out of 10 on grade level	8 out of 10 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2
<b>Cohort I – Grades 5-8 (Regular Ed. and A/B Sp.Ed. Designation)</b>	<b>2016-17 NWEA MAPS Results (EOY)</b>	<b>2017-18 NWEA MAPS Goals (EOY)</b>	<b><u>Benchmark Goals:</u> MOY Interim Assessment (February 2018)</b>
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	0.0 Proficient	25% Proficient	Increase average grade level proficiency by 25% on MOY NWEA MAP
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	90% Proficient	100% Proficient	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY NWEA MAP
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	50% Proficient	60% Proficient	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY NWEA MAP
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	10% Proficient	20% Proficient	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY NWEA MAP

#### Student Achievement Goals

<b>Cohort I – Grades K-4 (Regular Ed. and A/B Sp.Ed. Designation)</b>	<b>2016-17 DRA2 Results (EOY)</b>	<b>2017-18 DRA2 Goals (EOY)</b>	<b><u>Benchmark Goals:</u> MOY Interim Assessment (February 2018)</b>
Kindergarten	3 out of 6 on grade level	4 out of 6 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	4 out of 5 on grade level	5 out of 5 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	6 out of 9 on grade level	9 out of 9 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	9 out of 9 below grade level	6 out of 9 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	5 out of 10 on grade level	8 out of 10 on grade level	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY DRA2
<b>Cohort I – Grades K-5 (Regular Ed. and Sp.Ed. Designation)</b>	<b>2016-17 STAR Math Results (EOY)</b>	<b>2017-18 STAR Math Goals (EOY)</b>	<b><u>Benchmark Goals:</u> MOY Interim Assessment (February 2018)</b>
Kindergarten	100% Proficient	100% Proficient	Maintain this proficiency on MOY STAR Math



1 <sup>st</sup> grade	100% Proficient	100% Proficient	Maintain this proficiency on MOY STAR Math
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	50% Proficient	80% Proficient	Increase average grade level proficiency by 20% on MOY STAR Math
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	50% Proficient	80% Proficient	Increase average grade level proficiency by 20% on MOY STAR Math
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	70% Proficient	90% Proficient	Increase average grade level proficiency by 20% on MOY STAR Math
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	10% Proficient	20% Proficient	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY STAR Math
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	10% Proficient	20% Proficient	Increase average grade level proficiency by 10% on MOY STAR Math
Sp.Ed. Cohort Designation of life skills, DHH, C or D	2016-17 IEP Goals (EOY)	2017-18 IEP Goals (EOY)	<u>Benchmark Goals</u> : MOY Assessment (February 2018)
1 <sup>st</sup> grade	60% Proficient	80% Proficient	This cohort includes those student who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation due to learning disabilities, language, or a significant hearing loss. These students are performing significantly below grade level and their academic progress is measured based on their IEP goals.
2 <sup>nd</sup> grade	60% Proficient	80% Proficient	This cohort includes those student who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation due to learning disabilities, language, or a significant hearing loss. These students are performing significantly below grade level and their academic progress is measured based on their

			IEP goals.
3 <sup>rd</sup> grade	60% Proficient	80% Proficient	This cohort includes those student who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation due to learning disabilities, language, or a significant hearing loss. These students are performing significantly below grade level and their academic progress is measured based on their IEP goals.
4 <sup>th</sup> grade	70% Proficient	80% Proficient	This cohort includes those student who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation due to learning disabilities, language, or a significant hearing loss. These students are performing significantly below grade level and their academic progress is measured based on their IEP goals.
5 <sup>th</sup> grade	70% Proficient	80% Proficient	This cohort includes those student who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation due to learning disabilities, language, or a significant hearing loss. These students are performing significantly below grade level and their academic progress is measured based on their IEP goals.
6 <sup>th</sup> grade	70% Proficient	80% Proficient	This cohort includes those student who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation due to learning disabilities, language, or a significant hearing loss. These students are performing significantly below grade level and their academic progress is measured based on their IEP goals.
7 <sup>th</sup> grade	7% Proficient	80% Proficient	This cohort includes those student who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation due to learning disabilities, language, or a significant hearing loss. These students are performing significantly below grade level and their academic progress is measured based on their IEP goals.
8 <sup>th</sup> grade	70% Proficient	80% Proficient	This cohort includes those student who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation due to learning disabilities, language, or a significant



			hearing loss. These students are performing significantly below grade level and their academic progress is measured based on their IEP goals.
--	--	--	---

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

<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?
Observation and Feedback cycles	<p>Prior to the 2017-2018 school year, several teachers were marked as minimally effective but never given an opportunity to receive effective feedback.</p> <p>Based on a survey that was given to the staff, 90% of the staff was unaware of the NM teach Domains and what it was they were being evaluated on.</p> <p>ASLA clinical team members “push” into the classroom and deliver their services in the classroom instead of a pull out model. 100% of the clinical team had no idea what the NM teacher evaluation looked like. Since this is the basic construct of our day to day, we felt like it was imperative for the clinical team to learn what went into the teacher evaluation system especially since they are in the classrooms during observations.</p>
Collaboration	<p>At ASLA, our clinical team (SLPs, OTs, PTs, SWs all “push into” the classroom). Clinical team members were going into classrooms not knowing what the lesson plan for the day was. They were often left out of the planning process altogether and the collaboration with teachers was negligible.</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?

Root Cause Analysis Notes		
<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Root Cause Hypothesis</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
Observation and Feedback cycles	There was an ineffective system in place to have constructive conversations about feedback from observations.	Evidences via classroom observations and lesson plans. Staff's working knowledge of CCSS varies.
	Teachers did not receive training on expectations outlined by NM teach.	The teacher observations were down in previous years
Collaboration	Although our teachers participated in weekly mandated collaboration meetings with their teaching cohort, EAs, and clinical team, these meetings were not well structured nor connected to the domains.	Through survey and discussion it was discovered that teachers, EAs, nor therapists were not aware of the NM Teach Domains nor the logistics of evaluation.



## 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**

<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Draft Desired Outcome (<u>change in adult behaviors</u>)</i>
Observation and Feedback cycle	Each teacher will receive at least 1 non-evaluative administrative walkthrough with documented feedback BEFORE EACH evaluative observation. Each teacher will then receive their evaluative observation (twice a year) using the NM teach rubric and will be video recorded. This video will be used for feedback on what was observed and ultimately used to improve overall teaching performance.
Collaboration	<p>Weekly collaboration meetings on Monday afternoon during built-in POD time with clinical team members will result in co-planned lessons that incorporate and align academic goals with therapeutic goals and utilize best practices described in the NM Teach rubric. This meeting is deliberately planned and lead by the either the Director of Curriculum and Instruction or the Director of Student Support, or both.</p> <p>Weekly collaboration and planning meetings on Tuesday afternoon during built-in POD time with educational assistants will result in a seamless delivery of instruction where the EA becomes an active participant in the lesson.</p> <p>Weekly collaboration meetings on Thursday afternoon during built-in POD time where teachers work with their teacher teams (primary or intermediate) to discuss and plan thematic units/projects/lessons/data that promote horizontal and vertical alignment.</p>



### 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>				
<b>Increased teacher performance through effective feedback and evaluation.</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b>				
<b>Increase quality of instruction through a system of meaningful walkthroughs, filmed observations and differentiated coaching.</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>
January 15, 2018	Schedule monthly professional development meetings	Calendar	Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Admin Team, teachers, ancillary team, educational assistants
Schedule by January 22, 2018	Develop calendar for non-evaluative walkthroughs and feedback meetings.	Calendar	Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Admin Team, teachers, ancillary team, educational assistants
By February 28, 2018	Conduct walkthroughs and have feedback meetings	Calendar	Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Admin Team, teachers, ancillary team
By April 30, 2018	Conduct formal observations and have feedback meetings	Calendar and ipad	Director of Curriculum and	Admin and teachers



			Instruction	
--	--	--	-------------	--

**Focus Area:****Data Driven Instruction****Desired Outcome:****Increase the understanding of available data and it's use to drive instruction.****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 January 15, 2018	Weekly POD meetings will have time for NM teach Domains	NM teach rubric and Domains	Director of Curriculum and Instruction	Admin and certified staff
By January 30, 2018	Teachers will meet weekly during POD time to go over weekly lesson plans with clinical team and EAs	NWEA & I-station data,	Director of Curriculum and Instruction,	Admin., certified clinical team and EA 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>Improved teacher practice</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> <b>Each teacher will receive 1 on 1 feedback from non-evaluative principal walkthrough visits.</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>		
Week of January 15, 2018	Directors will schedule general periods of time when walkthroughs will occur during the spring semester.	As needed		
Ongoing	Walkthrough folders will be kept in the Director of Curriculum and 's office for documentation and to refer back on throughout the semester.	As needed		

<b>Focus Area:</b> <b>Data Driven Instruction</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> <b>Each teacher will increase their knowledge and use of student data to drive instruction and will be evidences in more differentiated instruction both individually and in group instruction.</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>		
By January 15, 2018	After school POD meetings to go over walkthrough and formal observations expectations. This will be an on-going task.	As needed		

<b>Focus Area:</b>
--------------------



<b>Desired Outcome:</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>		

#### *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>		
<b>Procedure</b>	<b>Timelines</b>	<b>Person(s) Responsible</b>
Weekly meetings with teachers to discuss walkthroughs, observations, and feedback	Beginning January 15, 2018	Director of Curriculum and Instruction and teachers
Weekly meetings with teachers and clinical team to collaborate for the week	Beginning January 15, 2018	Director of Curriculum and Instruction, teachers, and Clinical Team
Weekly meetings with teachers and EAs to collaborate for the week	Beginning January 15, 2018	Director of Curriculum and Instruction, teachers and EAs
At the end of the first 90 day plan the core team will meet to review the plan, make adjustments, and discuss implementation for the next term.	May 2018	Director of Curriculum and Instruction





## Supporting Documents

- UNM CEPR Letter
- ASLA Cohorts - Reading and Math Goals

**Albuquerque Sign Language Academy  
Center for Education Policy and Research Project Summary  
February 12, 2015**

We deeply appreciate the opportunity to work with ASLA on their assessment design and implementation project. However, after investigation of the parameters of the proposed project as well as serious discussion of possible outcomes, we have determined that it is not possible for CEPR to engage in this project. We would like to provide you with our reasons for this decision:

1. Best practices in educational assessment design, development and administration dictate that a formal procedure be followed that results in a thoroughly tested product with evidence of internal and external validity as well as reliability. We do not believe it is possible for CEPR to engage best practices with the ASLA population for the following reasons: a) the extreme diversity of the multiply-disabled student population at ASLA precludes the use of normative procedures in any form - thus attempts at grouping students is difficult, if not, impossible; b) several new assessments developed for ASLA have been adapted from assessments designed for general education students, thereby invalidating critical assumptions about their content, administration, scoring, and performance benchmarking; c) these assessments have been developed without alternative content standards - indeed, none now exist in New Mexico, and without such standards it is not possible to develop a vertically articulated curriculum and deliver instruction with consistency. Without those standards, it is not possible to develop assessments and evaluate their alignment and the appropriateness of modified administration, scoring, and performance benchmarking procedures; d) further, lacking assessments that reflect achievement with vertically differentiated performance expectations, it is not possible to accurately measure academic growth to guide instruction, evaluate teacher performance, and grade a school; e) a behavioral assessment used by ASLA to measure growth in certain character traits also lacks a framework of state content standards, particularly to represent developmental expectations for multiply disabled students. Without that framework, it is not possible to develop additional forms of assessments and standardize administration and scoring procedures. There are no indications that development of such standards will be undertaken in the future. Yet, these are necessary steps to developing an educational system that integrates instruction and measurement of achievement, and it will require considerable resources to develop such a system.
2. Our investigation has led us to the conclusion that the best way forward for ASLA is to simply administer the already developed (7) tests and measures that have been identified (ASL Receptive Test, ASL Expressive Test, Functional Academic Modified Assessment, "Grit" assessment, Foundational Quality for Student Success, Developmental Reading Assessment-2,

Mathematics End of Course assessment) to students in the school and that this data be provided to NMPED. It is clear that M. Kim Johnson, a contract consultant, is quite capable of overseeing this process. Since almost every instrument that is intended for use has undergone some form of adaptation, either in content or in administration procedures, there is no chance of submitting these results to deeper statistical manipulations. As such, the data for each student should be plotted in a year-to-year fashion and a simple growth pattern plotted for each student that is submitted as a report to NMPED.

3. It appears as if NMPED has already approved the use of the battery of performance assessments and administration procedures that ASLA proposed to measure student achievement at ASLA. Therefore, it is unclear exactly what else CEPR could offer to this process. We do not believe that we are value-added in that we cannot validate, standardize or otherwise enhance the overall process given the limitations of population diversity, adapted instruments, and non-standardized administration procedures that appear to be essential when attempting to measure student performance.
4. We can propose that an attempt at creating sub-grouping of students at, and across, grade and ability levels as a starting point. These subgroupings may be constructed of: past test/assessment results, age, grade, IEP status, etc. The process of creating these subgroupings would be to create as many as appropriate given the data indicators used for the student population. Then, the specified set of assessments is administered individually, with data reported both individually as well as by subgroup. While this type of data cannot claim generalizability or extensibility, it can provide a basic look at an aggregation of student performance based on a set of group characteristics. An example of the matrix that might be used to collect the data is attached (see Attachment A). This would represent a first step in an extensive process of developing content standards and a valid assessment system for ASLA.

## Yearly ASLA Cohort Reading and Math Goals

	Reading Goal	Math Goal
Standard Cohort Reg., A, B Grades K-4	DRA2	STAR Math
This cohort includes those students who receive no special education services or those special education students who are given an A or B level designation. This cohort is able to take designated SCA with little or no accommodations.	<b>Exceeds Standard:</b> 80% or more of students taking the DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 20% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level.	<b>Exceeds Standards:</b> 80% or more of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .8 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window..
	<b>Meets Standard:</b> 70%-79% of students taking the DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 20% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level.	<b>Meets Standards:</b> 70% - 79% of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .8 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window..
	<b>Does Not Meet Standard:</b> 60%-69% of students taking the DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 20% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level..	<b>Does Not Meets Standards:</b> 60% - 69% of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .8 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window..
	<b>Falls Far Below Standard:</b> 59% or less of students taking the DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 20% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level.	<b>Falls Far Below Standards:</b> 59% or below of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .8 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window..
	<b>NOTE: K-4 will demonstrate yearly growth on the DRA2.</b>	<b>NOTE: From the time that a student takes the test in the fall, to the time it is again delivered in the spring, there is an expected 8 months of growth which translates to .8</b>

## Yearly ASLA Cohort Reading and Math Goals

	Reading Goal	Math Goal
Standard Cohort Reg., A, B Grades 5-8	NWEA <i>MAP</i>	STAR Math
This cohort includes those students who receive no special education services or those special education students who are given an A or B level designation. This cohort is able to take designated SCA with little or no accommodations.	<b>Exceeds Standards:</b> 80% or more of students taking the NWEA SCA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 3.5 points per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.	<b>Exceeds Standards:</b> 80% or more of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .8 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b>Meets Standards:</b> 70% - 79% of students taking the NWEA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 3.5 points per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.	<b>Meets Standards:</b> 70% - 79% of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .8 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window..
	<b>Does Not Meets Standards:</b> 60% - 69% of students taking the NWEA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 3.5 points per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.	<b>Does Not Meets Standards:</b> 60% - 69% of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .8 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b>Falls Far Below Standards:</b> 59% or below of students taking the NWEA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 3.5 points per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.	<b>Falls Far Below Standards:</b> 59% or below of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .8 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b>NOTE: A Scale Score of 3.5 is the recommended growth for students within a year according to NWEA</b>	<b>NOTE: From the time that a student takes the test in the fall, to the time it is again delivered in the spring, there is an expected 8 months of growth which translates to .8</b>

## Yearly ASLA Cohort Reading and Math Goals

	Reading Goal	Math Goal
Standard Cohort Special Ed. C/D Grades K-4	DRA2	STAR Math
This cohort includes those students who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation. This cohort is able to take designated SCA with significant accommodations as mandated by their IEP.	<b><u>Exceeds Standard:</u></b> 80% or more of students taking the DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 10% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level	<b><u>Exceeds Standards:</u></b> 80% or more of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .4 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b><u>Meets Standard:</u></b> 70%-79% of students taking the DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 10% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level	<b><u>Meets Standards:</u></b> 70% - 79% of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .4 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b><u>Does Not Meet Standard:</u></b> 60%-69% of students taking the DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 10% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level.	<b><u>Does Not Meets Standards:</u></b> 60% - 69% of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .4 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b><u>Falls Far Below Standard:</u></b> 59% or less of students taking the DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 10% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level.	<b><u>Falls Far Below Standards:</u></b> 59% or below of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .4 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b><u>NOTE:</u></b> The students who are C and D level, excluding FAMA, have significant disabilities and therefore have an adjusted scale score expectation as their processing and expression of language is impacted. Based on previous years, 54% of all students	<b><u>NOTE:</u></b> The students who are C and D level, excluding FAMA, have significant disabilities and therefore have an adjusted scale score that represents one half a years growth.

## Yearly ASLA Cohort Reading and Math Goals

	Reading Goal	Math Goal
<b>Standard Cohort Special Ed. C/D Grades 5-8</b>	<b>NWEA MAPS</b>	<b>STAR Math</b>
This cohort includes those students who receive special education services and are given a C or D level designation. This cohort is able to take designated SCA with significant accommodations as mandated by their IEP.	<b>Exceeds Standards:</b> 80% or more of students taking the NWEA SCA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 2 points per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.	<b>Exceeds Standards:</b> 80% or more of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .4 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b>Meets Standards:</b> 70% - 79% of students taking the NWEA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 2 points per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.	<b>Meets Standards:</b> 70% - 79% of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .4 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b>Does Not Meets Standards:</b> 60% - 69% of students taking the NWEA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 2 points per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.	<b>Does Not Meets Standards:</b> 60% - 69% of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .4 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window.
	<b>Falls Far Below Standards:</b> 59% or below of students taking the NWEA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 2 points per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.	<b>Falls Far Below Standards:</b> 59% or below of students taking the STAR Math SCA will demonstrate a grade level equivalency of .4 or more growth in the year short cycle assessment window..
	<b>NOTE: The students who are C and D level, excluding FAMA, have significant disabilities and therefore have an adjusted scale score expectation as their processing and expression of language is impacted.</b>	<b>NOTE: The students who are C and D level, excluding FAMA, have significant disabilities and therefore have an adjusted scale score expectation as their processing and expression of language is impacted. Based on previous years, 54% of all students given the DRA2 did not</b>

## Yearly ASLA Cohort Reading and Math Goals

	Reading Goal	Math Goal
<b>Functional Academic Modified Assessment (FAMA) Cohort</b>	<b>Modified DRA2</b>	<b>State Approved Singapore Math-Based (SMB) taken at functional</b>
This cohort consists of students who receive special education services due to language and/or hearing impairments AND are performing significantly under grade level.	<b>Exceeds Standard:</b> 80% or more of students taking the Modified DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 10% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level.	<b>Exceeds Standard:</b> 80% or more of students taking the Modified SMB SCA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 5 points growth per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.
	<b>Meets Standard:</b> 70%-79% of students taking the Modified DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 10% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level.	<b>Meets Standard:</b> 70%-79% of students taking the Modified SMB SCA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 5 points growth per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.
	<b>Does Not Meet Standard:</b> 60%-69% of students taking the Mod. DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 10% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level.	<b>Does Not Meet Standard:</b> 60%-69% of students taking the Modified SMB SCA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 5 points growth per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.
	<b>Falls Far Below Standard:</b> 59% or less of students taking the Mod. DRA2 SCA will demonstrate an increase of 10% or more in accuracy or progress to the next grade level.	<b>Falls Far Below Standard:</b> 59% or less of students taking the Modified SMB SCA will demonstrate an increased scale score of 5 points growth per academic year until they achieve and maintain proficiency.
	<b>NOTE:</b> The DRA2 is modified for this group of students because it includes a timed fluency component that is not applicable to students that are translating the English based test into ASL, their native language.	<b>NOTE:</b> The Singapore Math SCA is a newly developed assessment. The 5 points represent a 13% growth on the assessment.



## Yearly ASLA Cohort Reading and Math Goals

	Reading Goal	Math Goal
Life Skills Cohort Grades K-12	NCSC	NCSC
This cohort consists of students who qualify for special education services under the category of "intellectually disabled".	Currently there is no Short Cycle Assessment developed for this cohort. Historically this group has taken the NM Alternative Proficiency Assessment (NMAPA), however this assessment has been replaced with the National Center and State Collaborative Assessment (NCSC). Baseline data does not exist that would inform appropriate growth measures.	Currently there is no Short Cycle Assessment developed for this cohort. Historically this group has taken the NM Alternative Proficiency Assessment (NMAPA), however this assessment has been replaced with the National Center and State Collaborative Assessment (NCSC). Baseline data does not exist that would inform appropriate growth measures.



**From:** [Martinez, Severo, PED](#)  
**To:** [Lucci, Michele](#)  
**Cc:** [Bennett Anderson, Deborah](#); [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#); [Peterson, Elisabeth, PED](#)  
**Subject:** RE: McCurdy Charter School Revised NM DASH Plan  
**Date:** Monday, January 29, 2018 4:20:33 PM  
**Attachments:** [90-day Plan Feedback Tool for MCS- 9.6.17.docx](#)

---

Good Afternoon,

Attached please find the feedback for you 90 day plan. Please know that this review is for sole feedback purposes to strengthen your plan. Your governing body will give your plan final approval. Please let me know if you have any further questions.

Severo

---

**From:** Michele Lucci [<mailto:mlucci@mcsk12nm.org>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, January 25, 2018 3:47 PM  
**To:** Martinez, Severo, PED  
**Cc:** Bennett Anderson, Deborah; Pelayo, Icela, PED; DelRosario, Baylor, PED; Poulos, Katie, PED; Southworth, Margaret, PED; Peterson, Elisabeth, PED  
**Subject:** Re: McCurdy Charter School Revised NM DASH Plan

Hello Mr. Martinez,

Thank you very much. We look forward to the feedback.

Sincerely,  
Michele Lucci  
Director  
McCurdy Charter School  
505-692-6090  
Fax: 505-692-6095  
Website: <http://mcsk12nm.org>

On Jan 25, 2018, at 3:22 PM, Martinez, Severo, PED  
<[Severo.Martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:Severo.Martinez@state.nm.us)> wrote:

Good Afternoon,

I have been assigned to review your feedback tool for your 90 day plan. Please allow a few days for review. You should hear back from me by COB on January 30<sup>th</sup>.

Severo

---

**From:** Michele Lucci [<mailto:mlucci@mcsk12nm.org>]  
**Sent:** Friday, January 12, 2018 2:41 PM  
**To:** Martinez, Severo, PED

**Cc:** Bennett Anderson, Deborah; Pelayo, Icela, PED; DelRosario, Baylor, PED; Poulos, Katie, PED; Southworth, Margaret, PED

**Subject:** McCurdy Charter School Revised NM DASH Plan

Dear Mr. Martinez,

Attached please find the revised McCurdy Charter School NM DASH plan. We look forward to receiving your feedback.

Sincerely,

Michele Lucci

Director

McCurdy Charter School

505-692-6090

Fax: 505-692-6095

Website: <http://mcsk12nm.org>



District: MCS  
School:  
Date:  
Completed By:

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

**For PED use only**  
NM PED Calibration Review  
Date: 1.29.2018  
Reviewer Code: Severo M.

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

For PED use only		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
15	1	0

<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	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 is <b>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.	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:**

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



<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	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>	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</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:**

Goals seem to be very ambitious, but if Core team feels they are attainable, then they do meet SMART criteria.

<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	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:**

<sup>2</sup> For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://www.ped.state.nm.us/ped/AssessmentEvalDocs/2017-2018%20Assessment%20Calendar.pdf>



<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 Root Cause Statement	Each focus area has a clear statement 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> statement 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</b> statement of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Evidence to support	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:**

<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	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	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	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</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	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	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:**

In critical actions, state how the change in adult behaviors will be seen at the end of the 90 day period. End of 90 days should get you closer to that Desired Outcome. If you are planning to have bi weekly meetings with teachers, how will you lead in to making this happen. Maybe 30 days in, you are meeting with them monthly, then leading to more frequent meetings.

<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

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





--

**From:** [Michele Lucci](#)  
**To:** [Martinez, Severo, PED](#)  
**Cc:** [Bennett Anderson, Deborah](#); [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**Subject:** McCurdy Charter School Revised NM DASH Plan  
**Date:** Friday, January 12, 2018 2:41:09 PM  
**Attachments:** [DASH Plan revised 1.12.18.docx](#)  
[ATT00001.htm](#)

---

Dear Mr. Martinez,

Attached please find the revised McCurdy Charter School NM DASH plan. We look forward to receiving your feedback.

Sincerely,  
Michele Lucci  
Director  
McCurdy Charter School  
505-692-6090  
Fax: 505-692-6095  
Website: <http://mcsk12nm.org>



**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?
Michele Lucci	Director, McCurdy Charter School	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hired as Director for McCurdy Charter School at the end of the 2017 school year.</li> <li>- 27 year background working with students with special needs as a teacher and as an administrator including an Executive Director of Special Education.</li> <li>- Strongly believes that all children can learn when given the opportunity and necessary support.</li> </ul>
Donna Wollman	MCS Dean of Students	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Hired as Dean of Students of McCurdy Charter School at the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year.</li> <li>- 22 years in elementary education, including a K/1 &amp; a 1/2, a dual language 4th grade.</li> <li>- Experience as a math interventionist, and also worked for Title 1.</li> <li>- Experience with federal funding allocations</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Helped open two K-6 Charter Schools in Albuquerque in the early 2001s.</li> </ul>
Bernadette French	Elementary Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- First grade teacher who wants to be an active participant in helping our school move forward and be successful.</li> <li>- Experience and training in the Baldrige method of data</li> <li>- 18 years of experience teaching 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grade along with 3 years as a Read To Lead Instructor and Reading Interventionist.</li> <li>- Masters in Administrative Leadership</li> </ul>
Sarah Tario	Secondary Language Arts Teacher	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Test Coordinator and an ELA teacher at McCurdy Secondary in her fourth year at the school.</li> <li>- Parent of a student who currently attends McCurdy and qualifies for Special Education services.</li> <li>- Part of the AVID team and an active supporter of the program.</li> <li>- Has worked with both elementary and secondary teachers in her role as test coordinator</li> <li>- Currently pursuing an administrative license</li> </ul>
Delores Salazar	Secondary Student Counselor	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Has been in education for 20 years.</li> <li>- Has served as a classroom teacher for 7 years and currently has been a guidance counselor for 13 years.</li> <li>- Parent to three children, one of which is a 10th grader at MCS.</li> <li>- Has knowledge of the families served by MCS and is eager to help MCS become a high performing school.</li> </ul>
Nancy O'Bryan	Treasurer, MCS Governance Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 30+ year veteran of public schools as a teacher</li> <li>- 9 years as Taos Charter School Director, which has always been a high performing school.</li> <li>- Governance Board member</li> </ul>
Deborah Bennett Anderson	Chairperson, MCS Governance Board	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Chairperson of the MCS Governance Board</li> <li>- Has been associated with the school since its inception as a founding member</li> <li>- Retired engineer; driven to use systems analysis to problem solving, and brings a strong desire to see the school succeed through student achievement.</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 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.

### Data Analysis Notes

Analysis of the 2017 PARCC data sent to MCS shows that, of the students participating, there is a significant need for additional math and ELA support. There is very low proficiency in both areas, school wide.

- No grade level performed better than 20% proficient in ELA
- No grade level performed higher than 10% proficient for math.

GRADE	Attempted	PROFICIENT	ELA	MATH	PROFICIENT
3	41	8	19.5	3	7.3
4	41	3	7.3	2	4.9
5	39	2	5.1	2	5.1
6	44	3	6.8	1	2.3
7	43	8	18.6	4	9.3
8	43	6	14.0	2	4.7
9	43	6	14.0		
10	47	11	23.4		
11	44	12	27.3		
alg I	46	2	4.3		
Geom	43	2	4.7		
alg II	56	1	1.8		

\*PARCC data only 2016 & 2017

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017.0
Read/ELA	KN				65.8	54.5
Read/ELA	1			64.7	55.0	54.5
Read/ELA	2			62.1	64.7	54.5
Read/ELA	3	64.10%	20.5 <2		5.4	19.4
Read/ELA	4	36.80%	45.2	7.1	2.3	9.6
Read/ELA	5	43.20%	41.5	15	24.4	9.4
Read/ELA	6	29.20%	45.8	12.8	33.3	6.5
Read/ELA	7	36.20%	42.0	14.3	13.6	14.4
Read/ELA	8	45.70%	42.0	10.4	13.3	14.4
Read/ELA	9	18.20%	17.1	19.4	18.2	24.4
Read/ELA	10	38.70%	23.5	10.5	28.1	24.4
Read/ELA	11			15.4	44.4	40.4
Read/ELA	12					

Analysis of multi-year proficiency and PARCC data available from PED/Assessment/Accountability website reveals a variety of results that are difficult to compare,

probably because of different testing formats, proficiency results listed as ranges to be averaged and non-standardized results



*PARCC data only 2016 & 2017			2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Math	KN						
Math	1	Text					
Math	2						
Math	3		43.60%	25.6	2.4	10.8	9.9
Math	4		7.90%	35.7	4.8	2.3	9.7
Math	5		22.70%	24.4	2.5	12.2	4.7
Math	6		22.90%	18.8	2.1	16.7	10.4
Math	7		27.70%	20.0	7.1	4.5	5.0
Math	8		10.90%	18.0	6.5	15.6	4.7
Math	H2		12.50%	19.5	<2	2.3	4.9
Math	H3		16.70%	26.5	5.6	6.3	5.0
Math	11				16.7	9.4	
Math	12						
		PARCC practice					
		Alg I	look at available MAP data: consider pre algebra				
		Alg II	look at available MAP data				
		Geom	look at available MAP data				

Successmaker data after 6 wks		
% of students performing at Grade Level		
	Reading	Math
1	68	
2	69	60
3	55	62
4	38	40
5	39	37
6	13	0.06

SuccessMaker data has been acquired since the beginning of the FY18 school year. Initial placement

**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?

**MCS Student Achievement Goals:** The Core Team assessed the Proficiency and PARCC data over the past 5 years, noting the generally downward trend in cohort proficiency, especially with the advent of PARCC testing. The Core Team then evaluated the SuccessMaker Initial Placement data, which indicates whether a student is performing at, below or above his/her grade level in reading and math. Considering the percentage of students performing at their grade level, in concert with the PARCC data, the Core Team decided on summative goals of a minimum 36% increase over the 2017 PARCC score in ELA/ reading and a minimum 40% increase over the 2017 PARCC score in math. The summative goals are ambitious, yet the Core Team felt attainable given the analysis of previous year's data, by cohort.

### Student Achievement Goals

Grade/Subject Area	2016-2017 PARCC	2017-2018 PARCC	Benchmark Goals: How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student
--------------------	-----------------	-----------------	--



	Results	Goals	achievement goals?
Grade 3 ELA/Reading	19.4	55.4	Successmaker: 55% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 4 ELA/Reading	9.6	55.4	Successmaker: 55% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 5 ELA/Reading	9.4	45.6	Successmaker: 46% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 6 ELA/Reading	6.5	45.4	Successmaker: 46% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 7 ELA/Reading	14.4	42.5	Successmaker: 43% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 8 ELA/Reading	14.4	50.4	Successmaker: 51% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 9 ELA/Reading	24.4	50.4	MAPS Spring norms: 50% of students meet or exceed the spring norm scores for grade level
Grade 10 ELA/Reading	24.4	60.4	MAPS Spring norms: 61% of students meet or exceed the spring norm scores for grade level
Grade 11 ELA/Reading	40.4	60.4	MAPS Spring norms: 61% of students meet or exceed the spring norm scores for grade level
Grade 3 Math	9.9	49.9	Successmaker: 50% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 4 Math	9.7	49.9	Successmaker: 50% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 5 Math	4.7	49.7	Successmaker: 50% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 6 Math	10.4	44.7	Successmaker: 45% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 7 Math	5.0	50.4	Successmaker: 51% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 8 Math	4.7	45.0	Successmaker: 45% of students show a monthly placement level increase of .10
Grade 9 Math	4.9	44.7	MAPS Spring norms: 45% of students meet or exceed the spring norm scores for grade/subject level
Grade 10 Math	5.0	44.9	MAPS Spring norms: 45% of students meet or exceed the spring norm scores for grade/subject level
Grade 11 Math	9.4	50	MAPS Spring norms: 50% of students meet or exceed the spring norm scores for grade level

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?
Standards/Curriculum Alignment	There is a lack of evidence of consistent instructional use of Common Core State Standards (CCSS) in lessons plans, or historical documents verifying specific inservice training to target the daily use of CCSS to drive instructional methods and assessments. MAPs and PARCC data show low achievement on CC skills and competencies.
Data-driven Instruction	There is a lack of evidence that teachers were using ongoing data analysis to inform instruction.



#### 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>
Standards/Curriculum Alignment	There is limited evidence elementary and secondary curriculum align consistently to Common Core State Standards (CCSS) standards, or that CCSS being used with fidelity school-wide.	<b>Common Core</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School-wide, there is inconsistent evidence that overall teaching was aligned to Common Core.</li> <li>• There was a lack of training on curriculum alignment to Common Core standards.</li> <li>• There is minimal evidence that sufficient instructional time was aligned to CCSS.</li> <li>• There were insufficient materials available for teaching and learning, and definitely not enough materials to support Core Knowledge and other CCSS aligned strategies and curriculums.</li> <li>• The Core Knowledge curriculum was only partially implemented in grades K-5, and not implemented at all in grades 6-8.</li> <li>• It is unclear whether blocks of teaching time were sufficient for student success</li> <li>• There is no evidence that teachers were systematically meeting to discuss curriculum</li> </ul>



		<p>and Common Core alignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear whether teachers were being evaluated for using Common Core</li> <li>• There were no Standards-based report cards</li> <li>• There is minimal evidence that Common Core Standards were part of lesson plans and objectives for the day.</li> <li>• Evidence seems to indicate that CCSS was not being implemented routinely, school-wide.</li> <li>• It is unclear whether testing and re-teaching was occurring as necessary, based on qualitative and quantitative data.</li> <li>• There is no evidence of vertical alignment to verify that skills are building.</li> </ul>
Data-driven Instruction	<p>There is unclear evidence to support which data was being used to drive instruction, how the data was being used by teachers and administration, and if student formative and summative achievement data influenced teaching, re-teaching, strategies, and policies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear how teachers and administrators were systematically and consistently analyzing student achievement data</li> <li>• It is unclear to what extent data was being used to modify and strengthen teaching.</li> <li>• There is lack of evidence that collaboration time was scheduled in a consistent manner</li> <li>• There is no evidence that the administration was being held accountable for assessing student success</li> </ul>



## 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>
Standards/Curriculum Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• At the end of the 90 day plan, 100% of instructional staff use CCSS to design instruction, as evidenced by references in daily lesson objectives posted in classrooms, teacher lesson plans, walkthroughs and observations, and/or formative and summative assessments (inclusive of SuccessMaker, MAPS, I-station and PARCC).</li> <li>• At the end of the 90 day plan, 100% of instructional staff provide evidence of re-teaching standards when student assessment shows a lack of understanding.</li> <li>• By the end of the 90 day plan, administration has given support to 100% of instructional staff by providing professional development in CCSS implementation and expectations, resources and materials to support CCSS in the classroom, and one-to-one coaching to help instructional staff improve regular use of CCSS in classroom instruction.</li> </ul>
Data-driven Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• By the end of the 90 day plan, 100% of instructional staff will have evidence of regular use of formative and summative assessment data (inclusive of SuccessMaker, MAPS, I-station and classroom assessments) to monitor and adjust student progress to benchmark goals.</li> <li>• By the end of the 90 day plan, 100% of instructional staff will participate in staff, grade level, and/or goal team meetings to discuss, monitor, and adjust instructional strategies based on student progression towards benchmark goals.</li> <li>• By the end of the 90 day plan, administration will have implemented bi-weekly data dialog meetings and protected collaboration time for</li> </ul>



	100% of instructional staff.
--	------------------------------

*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: Standards/Curriculum Alignment</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome: As listed in Step 5</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>
1/27/2018-6/7/2018	Provide training for aligning and using CCSS	Time, training materials	M. Lucci, D. Wollman	Admin Teachers
1/27/2018 – 6/7/2018	Implement dedicated instructional time for CCSS	Walkthrough and Lesson Plans verification	Admin Teachers	Admin Teachers
1/27/2018-6/7-2018	Teachers use curriculum aligned to CCSS with fidelity	Walkthrough and Lesson Plans verification	Admin	Admin Teachers
1/27/2016-	Teachers use technology to	Walkthrough and	Admin	Admin





6/7/2018	improve instruction, reinforce learning, and gather data.	Lesson Plans verification		Teachers
4/5/2018 6/7/2018	Teachers use Common Core standards to evaluate students on formal progress reports and report cards	CC standards based reports cards and progress reports.	Admin	Admin Teachers
1/27/2018- 6/7/2018	Teachers post CCSS-based objectives regularly, aligned to a lessons or units	CCSS guidelines and training	Teachers	Teachers
1/27/2018- 6/7/2018	Administration monitors classroom CCSS objectives and provide guidance to instructional staff when objectives are unclear or missing	Walkthroughs Evaluations	Admin	Admin
1/27/2018- 4/1/2018	Implement a Department-designated PARCC practice day: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELA practices PARCC during weeks 1/2 of the month,</li> <li>• math practices during 2/4.</li> </ul> Instructors host at least one practice session during that time frame.	Technology and time	Test coordinator (S. Tario) Teachers Admin	Admin Teachers DTC
5/1/2018- 6/7/2018	Develop the 2018-2019 Master Schedule with consideration of the best class offerings based on student need and performance, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• extend class time blocks;</li> <li>• offer remediation courses as needed;</li> <li>• offer more honors courses for students who are excelling.</li> </ul>	Master Schedule	Admin	Admin Teachers
5/1/2018- 6/7/2018	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop a required placement assessment for Algebra I, II, Geometry and high level math courses</li> </ul>	Assessment development skills	Admin	Admin Math teachers

**Focus Area: Data-driven Instruction**

**Desired Outcome: As listed in Step 5**

**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>
1/27/2018-6/7/2018	Administration schedules and monitors regular data dialog meetings & collaboration time	Time	Admin	Admin Teachers
1/27/2018-6/7/2018	Provide targeted remediation for K-8 through SuccessMaker which uses ongoing data collection to adjust instruction.	Time Training on Successmaker	Teachers Admin	Admin Teachers
1/27/2018-6/7/2018	K-12 teachers monitor formative and summative data to drive instruction, provide RtI, re-teach, and or provide other interventions	Technology Time Support and training from admin	Teachers	Admin Teachers
1/27/2018-6/7/2018	Minimum 1 CCSS focused assessment tracked weekly in PowerSchool with evidence of re-teaching as necessary, based on data	CCSS and Powerschool training Admin	Teachers Admin (monitor and support)	Teachers
5/1/2018-6/7/2018	Evaluate effectiveness of curriculum and programs used to provide data (for example, MAPS, SuccessMaker, etc)	Feedback from staff, surveys, meeting time, data trends	Admin	Admin, Gov. Board, 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?

### **Focus Area: Standards/Curriculum Alignment**

### **Desired Outcome: As listed in Step 5**

#### **CRITICAL ACTIONS**

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root</i>	<i>Resources</i>	<i>Person(s)</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
-----------------	--	------------------	------------------	---------------------------



	<i>Cause &amp; Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Needed/Source</i>	<i>Responsible</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>		
02/1/2018	Common core standards training scheduled	Extension of time to coordinate with trainers; PD days may need to be adjusted based on urgent needs. Consider integrating CCSS training in regular staff meetings or data dialogs. Provide online training, which has more flexibility in scheduling.		
4/1/2018	Monitor for implementation of dedicated CCSS instructional time; monitor for posted objectives	Additional training for staff who do not have evidence of CCSS during instructional time. Schedule 1 to 1 coaching for struggling staff. Re-evaluate as school year approaches conclusion.		
4/1/2018	Evaluate/monitor curriculum and CCSS alignment	Use PD time to discuss curriculum shortfalls and plan for vertical alignment. Provide a lesson plan template so that evidence can be provided with consistency if it is inconsistent.		
04/10/2018	Review CCSS report cards	Additionally training on aligned PowerSchool and report cards Template available to print reports in PowerSchool so that reports are consistent across grades/subjects		
04/02/2018	PARCC practice days implemented	Provide paper tests if technology is not available for all classes.		
05/10/2018	Master Schedule is under development	Schedule specific time to meet with departments or grade levels to address needs. Dedicate staff or other collaboration time to master schedule.		
05/30/2018	Math Placement Assessment developed and ready for use	Provide example placement tests. Consider using data from tests already in place (MAPS, Successmaker, etc) in combination with class grades. Instead of an		



		assessment, consider using a placement rubric
--	--	---

**Focus Area: Data-driven Instruction**

**Desired Outcome: As listed in Step 5**

**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>
05/01/18	Weekly documentation of data dialogue meetings	Reschedule meetings to best match with teacher schedules and needs. Document electronically. Revisit effectiveness of meetings if they are consistently off topic or missed by staff.
04/01/2018	Monitor progress towards benchmark goals; evaluate evidence of remediation based on data	Additional training for SuccessMaker. Schedule dedicated remediation time.
04/01/2018	Lesson plan documentation of data driven instruction, RtI, re-teaching, and/or other interventions	Create a common expectation of what documentation to provide to clear up confusion. Provide support to staff struggling with documentation requirements. Repository for evidence may be required to track the documentation.
4/10/2018 & 6/10/2018	Weekly CCSS assessment evidence reflected report cards or progress reports	Reports may be confusing to students, parents, and staff. Reports may not be consistent across grade levels. Support and retraining of teachers who are not meeting the requirement may be required. New staff may not be familiar with PowerSchool or CCSS.
6/7/2018	Student achievement data from assessment programs, surveys and feedback completed for	Reviewing effectiveness of programs may not be possible



	review	until more assessment data has been received.
--	--------	---

*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		
Procedure	Timelines	Person(s) Responsible
Monthly update meetings: DASH team meets to review and make adjustments as necessary to ongoing critical actions	2/1/18 – 6/18, Monthly	DASH team members
Midpoint review: Progress review with staff	Midpoint of implementation	All instructional staff and administration
End of 90 day review: DASH team meets to assess progress and plan for next cycle	6/2018	DASH team

**From:** Pelayo, Icela, PED  
**To:** [Lucci, Michele](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Annual Site Visit Scheduled February 26th, 2018  
**Date:** Friday, January 12, 2018 9:28:00 AM

---

Dear Ms. Lucci:

I'm glad we were able to touch base this morning via phone. We'll be on the look-out for the second submission of the NMDASH plan for additional PSB feedback. If you send me your GC minutes, I will have those uploaded to WebEPSS for you.

Thanks,  
Icela

Icela Pelayo, PhD, Deputy Director  
Options for Parents and Families Division  
New Mexico Public Education Department  
300 Don Gaspar Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
o: 505.827.6532  
c: 505.695.8683  
[icela.pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:icela.pelayo@state.nm.us)  
<http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/index.html>

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

---

**From:** Pelayo, Icela, PED  
**Sent:** Monday, January 08, 2018 4:42 PM  
**To:** Lucci, Michele  
**Subject:** RE: Annual Site Visit Scheduled February 26th, 2018

Dear Ms. Lucci:

If your school is implementing the NMDASH system, then it would take the place of the Improvement Plan. However, I do have additional clarifications.

I have a copy of the McCurdy's workbook received by PSB on 10/16/2017 and the PSB feedback tool dated 10/25/2017. At that time, the school's submitted NMDASH plan was reviewed by PSB, which identified 9 areas as "Solid Progress", 5 areas as "Limited Progress" and 2 areas as "Not Evident." The feedback for the school plan doesn't meet the criteria for being granted access to enter the plan into the online system.

To enter the plan into NMDASH online, the PSB's feedback (per the tool) would have had to indicate 13 (or more of the 16) as "Solid Progress" with none rated as "Not Evident." According to PSB, the school did not resubmit its plan (prior to the NM DASH trainings for Charter Schools which indicate that McCurdy staff was in attendance) for additional feedback, and to date, the school has not

entered its plan online.

If you are implementing the NMDASH plan, as submitted on 10/16/2017, please ensure that the governing-body approved NMDASH plan, governing body minutes at which the plan was approved, and feedback tool (from PSB) is uploaded to WebEPSS for the 2017-2018 school year to indicate NM DASH would be used instead of the Improvement Plan. The PED site team will be evaluating the school's implementation of either its Improvement Plan or NM DASH plan.

Thanks,  
Icela

Icela Pelayo, PhD, Deputy Director  
Options for Parents and Families Division  
New Mexico Public Education Department  
300 Don Gaspar Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
o: 505.827.6532  
c: 505.695.8683  
[icela.pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:icela.pelayo@state.nm.us)  
<http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/index.html>

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

---

**From:** Michele Lucci [<mailto:mlucci@mcsk12nm.org>]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 08, 2018 10:15 AM  
**To:** Pelayo, Icela, PED  
**Subject:** Re: Annual Site Visit Scheduled February 26th, 2018

Hello Ms.Pelayo,

Thank you very much. We are currently involved in the NMDASH plan. I was under the impression that that was in place of our improvement plan. Is that correct?

Thank you,  
Michele Lucci  
Director  
McCurdy Charter School  
505-692-6090  
Fax: 505-692-6095  
Website: <http://mcsk12nm.org>

On Jan 4, 2018, at 5:55 PM, Pelayo, Icela, PED <[Icela.Pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:Icela.Pelayo@state.nm.us)> wrote:

Dear Ms. Lucci:

I hope you are well. I wanted to follow up Megan's email and provide additional information as you prepare for the upcoming site visit next month.

Please note that for schools that have earned a D or F on the latest school grade reporting, the school's implementation of its required Improvement Plan will also be monitored and evaluated on the upcoming site visit. The Site Visit Guidance Document has been updated to reflect this, see attached.

If the school's Improvement Plan (which must be approved by its Governing Body) has not yet been uploaded into WebEPSS, please do so as soon as possible.

Please be aware that School Improvement Plans—including information on schools that have submitted Improvement Plans and on schools that have not met their requirements to submit Improvement Plans—will be presented to the PEC on or before their February 9, 2018 meeting.

Thank you,  
Icela

Icela Pelayo, PhD, Deputy Director  
Options for Parents and Families Division  
New Mexico Public Education Department  
300 Don Gaspar Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
o: 505.827.6532  
c: 505.695.8683  
[icela.pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:icela.pelayo@state.nm.us)  
<http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/index.html>

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

---

**From:** Shannon, Megan, PED  
**Sent:** Wednesday, January 03, 2018 3:05 PM  
**To:** Lucci, Michele  
**Cc:** Pelayo, Icela, PED; DelRosario, Baylor, PED; Woerner, Karen, PED  
**Subject:** RE: Annual Site Visit Scheduled February 26th, 2018

Dear Ms. Michelle Lucci:

The agenda for our upcoming site visit on Tuesday, February 26th, 2018 is attached. Also attached is an additional guidance document to help you and your team prepare for this visit.

We look forward to our visit!



Thank you,  
M.

*Megan S. Shannon*

Charter Schools Authorizing Practices Coordinator  
Options for Parents and Families Division  
New Mexico Public Education Department  
300 Don Gaspar Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
o: 505.827.4135  
c: 575.650.3640  
[megan.shannon@state.nm.us](mailto:megan.shannon@state.nm.us)  
<http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/index.html>

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

---

**From:** Pelayo, Icela, PED  
**Sent:** Friday, September 01, 2017 5:52 PM  
**To:** Lucci, Michele <[mlucci@mcsk12nm.org](mailto:mlucci@mcsk12nm.org)>  
**Subject:** <Please Review Date>: Annual Site Visit Scheduled

Dear Ms. Michelle Lucci:

We hope your school year has gotten off to a great start!

Your charter school's annual site visit is scheduled for Monday, February 26, 2018.

Site visits are scheduled earlier in the school year to accommodate the need for multiple visits to some schools that are new, applying for renewal, or requiring two annual visits as specified in its contract. To minimize travel-related expenses incurred by the state, site visits are grouped for schools in the same geographic area (excluding those located in Albuquerque or Santa Fe). Additionally, we anticipate this schedule will allow the PED Charter Schools team to provide reporting to schools in a more timely manner.

**Please review your school's scheduled site visit date(s) and contact me no later than Friday, September 8, 2017 if you believe you need to discuss the date of the scheduled site visit(s).**

In the design of the schedule, we have taken into consideration potential scheduling conflicts, important deadlines, and possible activities in the academic calendar. While we will do our best to accommodate your request, we may not be able to do so. Please keep in mind the PED is required to conduct annual site visits to all 62 state-authorized schools, not including new, renewal, and multiple site visits for those school that required them. Your flexibility and patience is greatly appreciated.

We will be sending the site visit protocol for your review soon, and further information as your site visit date approaches.

If you have any questions, please contact me directly. My contact information is contained my email signature below. We look forward to seeing you on site in the coming months.

In partnership,

Icela

Icela Pelayo, PhD, Deputy Director  
Options for Parents and Families Division  
New Mexico Public Education Department  
300 Don Gaspar Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
o: 505.827.6532  
c: 505.695.8683  
[icela.pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:icela.pelayo@state.nm.us)  
<http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/index.html>

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

<2017-2018 Site Visit Guidance Document\_R.pdf>

**From:** [PSB, PED, PED](#)  
**To:** [Lucci, Michele](#); [Bennett Anderson, Deborah](#)  
**Cc:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [Martinez, Severo, PED](#); [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**Subject:** McCurdy Charter School - NM DASH Feedback Tool  
**Date:** Thursday, November 02, 2017 12:06:23 PM  
**Attachments:** [McCurdy Feedback Tool.docx](#)

---

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

**From:** [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**To:** [Bennett Anderson, Deborah](#); [French Bernadette](#)  
**Cc:** [Lucci, Michele](#); [PSB, PED, PED](#); [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [O'Bryan, Nancy](#); [Wollmann Donna](#); [Tario Sarah](#); [Salazar Delores](#)  
**Subject:** RE: McCurdy Charter  
**Date:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:29:40 AM  
**Attachments:** [McCurdy Charter School DASH Workbook rec"d 10.16.17.docx](#)

---

Just an FYI to All~

I inserted Ms. French's comments into the Workbook before forwarding it along to Patricia Montoya at Priority Schools to be logged. I identified the comments as having come from Ms. French and used a **blue** font to distinguish them from the rest of the plan (see attached).

You may or may not choose to include the comments in your final draft plan, after hearing back from the Priority Schools Bureau's reviewer, but I thought the comments pertinent to the review of the plan so inserted them in it.

~Meghan

Margaret (Meghan) Southworth  
Priority Schools Bureau  
300 Don Gaspar Rm #121  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
(505) 827-6472  
[Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us](mailto:Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us)

---

**From:** Deborah Bennett [mailto:[dbennettanderson@gmail.com](mailto:dbennettanderson@gmail.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, October 17, 2017 9:19 AM  
**To:** French Bernadette  
**Cc:** Lucci, Michele; PSB, PED, PED; Southworth, Margaret, PED; Pelayo, Icela, PED; O'Bryan, Nancy; Wollmann Donna; Tario Sarah; Salazar Delores  
**Subject:** Re: McCurdy Charter

Colleagues:

If Ms French is referring to the statement in the "data connection" box of the "Focus Areas" of Step 3, then she may have found a statement that the Core Team might want to modify in the next revision of the Plan.

Regards,  
Deborah Bennett Anderson

On Oct 16, 2017, at 8:11 PM, Bernadette Tixier-French <[btffrench@mcsk12nm.org](mailto:btffrench@mcsk12nm.org)> wrote:

I have also updated my profile and I added comments to Deborah. These are the comments that I sent to Deborah.

In the Focus Area of Curriculum Alignment, it states that our curriculum was not aligned to Common Core.

The elementary was using Reading Street up until our adoption of Amplify Core Knowledge. Reading Street was aligned to Common Core and lesson plans did include the alignment of Core Standards.

We also used MAP data Student Goals Worksheet to drive our Parent Teacher Conferences.

Bernadette French

On Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 7:39 PM, Michele Lucci <[mlucci@mcsk12nm.org](mailto:mlucci@mcsk12nm.org)> wrote:  
Good Evening,

Attached please find the the updated NMDASH plan for McCurdy Charter School. Please disregard the earlier version. We appreciate your comments and suggestions.

Sincerely,  
Michele Lucci  
Director  
McCurdy Charter School  
[505-692-6090](tel:505-692-6090)  
Fax: [505-692-6095](tel:505-692-6095)  
Website: <http://mcsk12nm.org>



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

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

District: McCurdy Charter  
School  
School:  
Date: 10/16/17  
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
9	5	2

### Overall Comment:

The PED reviewer finds that this Offline Planning Process Workbook has 9 indicators Solid Progress, 5 Limited Progress, and 2 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

<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
--	--	---	---	---------------------------------

**Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:**

Core team reflects all school stakeholders. McCurdy Charter, in the development of future 90-day plans, might consider using a bulleted format with objective experience and education descriptors as opposed to subjective narrative information.

<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:**

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Benchmark goals: As the Spring, 2018 plan is developed, please articulate benchmark goals to monitor progress such as interim or formative assessment data that will be analyzed through out the school year to be sure students are on track to meet

<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. Scores through out the school year provide teachers with information to drive instruction, provide RtI, re-teach, and/or provide other interventions. Additionally, the Student Achievement Goal chart indicates an increase from 19.4% proficient to 90.5% proficient in 1 year for 3 grade ELA. McCurdy may wish to reconsider the likelihood of attaining a 71.1% increase in 1 year. (All subsequent grade goals for proficiency seem unlikely to be attained in 1 year and all exceed the 20% increase listed – except for Grade 11 ELA.)

<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 NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	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:**

The reviewer encourages McCurdy to consider including quantitative statements as evidence. More detail at this level will add clarity in development of next steps.

<b>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Clear hypothesis NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	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 NM PED Review Determination: Solid Progress	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. Please consider gathering evidence in the form of quantitative data so that the next 90-day plan and workbook revisions contain quantitative data in addition to qualitative data. Example: 10% of teachers have evidence of curriculum alignment with common core state standards in their lesson plans.

<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: Limited 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: 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: 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: 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
<b>Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>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</li> </ul>				

will have evidence of data analysis from a short cycle assessment given to students and 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 Actions-timelines and resources: McCurdy should consider more specific dates in order to show a sense of urgency in completing the identified goals. The Timelines listed are vague and difficult to monitor. Start and end dates are recommended.

<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: Not Evident	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: Not Evident	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 on the Workbook for the indicator Progress Indicators: identify the metrics to be used to measure progress toward the desired outcomes and goals.

To meet Solid Progress on the Workbook for the indicator Potential Adjustments to the 90-day plan: identify potential adjustments to goals based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers. What are your quick wins that can show school wide progress on the 90-day plan? Example: While you have 3-1-18 as the indicator date for “records of technology use”, you may find that indicator completed by December 1, 2017 and therefore you have met one of your goals. An adjustment might be a change in completion date or modify the goal based on the discovery that just a record of technology use doesn’t ensure that the use of technology is providing a deep and meaningful experience for students and that it is tied to the learning goal. More information may be needed.

To meet Solid Progress on the Workbook for the indicator System to Monitor, please identify the procedure, timeline and person(s) responsible for the Monitoring.

McCurdy, 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**

## **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?
Michele Lucci	Director, McCurdy Charter School	Ms Lucci was hired as Director for McCurdy Charter School at the end of the 2017 school year. She has a 27 year background working with students with special needs as a teacher and as an administrator including an Executive Director of Special Education. Ms. Lucci strongly believes that all children can learn when given the opportunity and necessary support.
Donna Wollman	MCS Dean of Students	Ms Wollman was hired as Dean of Students of McCurdy Charter School at the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year. She brings a wealth of administrative experience to the school and strongly advocates student achievement.
Bernadette French	Elementary Teacher	Ms. French is a first grade teacher who wants to be an active participant in helping our school move forward and be successful. Her experience and training in the Baldrige method of data will be useful in helping move through the process. Mrs. French has 18 years of experience teaching



		1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> grade along with 3 years as a Read To Lead Instructor and Reading Interventionist. She also has her Masters in Administrative Leadership
Sarah Tario	Secondary Language Arts Teacher	Ms Tario is the Test Coordinator and an ELA teacher at McCurdy Secondary in her fourth year at the school. She is the parent of a student who currently attends McCurdy and qualifies for Special Education services. Ms Tario is part of the AVID team and an active supporter of the program. She has worked with both elementary and secondary teachers in her role as test coordinator and is pursuing an administrative license, a process that has brought exposure to many different facets of the school.
Delores Salazar	Secondary Student Counselor	Ms Salazar has been the Guidance Counselor for secondary students at McCurdy Charter School for the past 4 years. She brings an intimate understand of the students, their proficiencies and their shortfalls.
Nancy O'Bryan	Treasurer, MCS Governance Board	Ms. O'Bryan is a 30+ year veteran of public schools as a teacher, with 9 nine of those years as Taos Charter School Director. TCS has always been a high performing school.
Deborah Bennett Anderson	Chairperson, MCS Governance Board	Ms Bennett Anderson is Chairperson of the MCS Governance Board, and has been associated with the school since its inception as a founding member. As a retired engineer, she is driven to use systems analysis to problem solving, and brings a strong desire to see the school succeed thru student achievement.

### 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.

#### **Data Analysis Notes**

Analysis of the 2017 PARCC data sent to MCS shows that, of the students participating, there is a significant need for additional math and ELA support. There is very low proficiency in both areas, school wide.

- No grade level performed better than 20% proficient in ELA



- No grade level performed higher than 10% proficient for math.

GRADE	Attempted	PROFICIENT	ELA	MATH	PROFICIENT
3	41	8	19.5	3	7.3
4	41	3	7.3	2	4.9
5	39	2	5.1	2	5.1
6	44	3	6.8	1	2.3
7	43	8	18.6	4	9.3
8	43	6	14.0	2	4.7
9	43	6	14.0		
10	47	11	23.4		

*\*PARCC data only 2016 & 2017*

		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017.0
Read/ELA	KN				65.8	54.5
Read/ELA	1			64.7	55.0	54.5
Read/ELA	2			62.1	64.7	54.5
Read/ELA	3	64.10%	20.5	<2	5.4	19.4
Read/ELA	4	36.80%	45.2	7.1	2.3	9.6
Read/ELA	5	43.20%	41.5	15	24.4	9.4
Read/ELA	6	29.20%	45.8	12.8	33.3	6.5
Read/ELA	7	36.20%	42.0	14.3	13.6	14.4
Read/ELA	8	45.70%	42.0	10.4	13.3	14.4
Read/ELA	9	18.20%	17.1	19.4	18.2	24.4
Read/ELA	10	38.70%	23.5	10.5	28.1	24.4
Read/ELA	11			15.4	44.4	40.4
Read/ELA	12					

Analysis of multi-year proficiency and PARCC data available from PED/Assessment/Accountability website reveals a variety of results that are difficult to compare,

probably because of different testing formats, proficiency results listed as ranges to be averaged and non-standardized results





*PARCC data only 2016 & 2017		2013	2014	2015	2016	2017
Math	KN					
Math	1 Text					
Math	2					
Math	3	43.60%	25.6	2.4	10.8	9.9
Math	4	7.90%	35.7	4.8	2.3	9.7
Math	5	22.70%	24.4	2.5	12.2	4.7
Math	6	22.90%	18.8	2.1	16.7	10.4
Math	7	27.70%	20.0	7.1	4.5	5.0
Math	8	10.90%	18.0	6.5	15.6	4.7
Math	H2	12.50%	19.5 <2		2.3	4.9
Math	H3	16.70%	26.5	5.6	6.3	5.0
Math	11			16.7	9.4	
Math	12					
PARCC practice						
Alg I	look at available MAP data: consider pre algebra					
Alg II	look at available MAP data					
Geom	look at available MAP data					

  

Successmaker data after 6 wks		
% of students performing at Grade Level		
	Reading	Math
1	68	
2	69	60
3	55	62
4	38	40
5	39	37
6	13	0.06

SuccessMaker data has been acquired since the beginning of the FY18 school year.

Initial placement

**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?

**MCS Student Achievement Goals:** The Core Team assessed the Proficiency and PARCC data over the past 5 years, noting the generally downward trend in cohort proficiency, especially with the advent of PARCC testing. The Core Team then evaluated the SuccessMaker Initial Placement data, which indicates whether a student is performing at, below or above his/her grade level in reading and math (NOTE: IP for 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grades are not yet complete). Considering the percentage of students performing at their grade level, in concert with the PARCC data, the Core Team decided on summative goals of 36% increase over the 2017 PARCC score in ELA/ reading and a 40% increase over the 2017 PARCC score in math. The summative goals are ambitious, yet the Core Team felt attainable, especially with a 20% benchmark increase at EOY 2018.

Student Achievement Goals			
Grade/Subject Area	2016-2017 PARCC Results	2017-2018 PARCC Goals	Benchmark Goals: How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals?



Grade 3 ELA/Reading	19.4	90.5	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 4 ELA/Reading	9.6	55.4	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 5 ELA/Reading	9.4	45.6	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 6 ELA/Reading	6.5	45.4	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 7 ELA/Reading	14.4	42.5	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 8 ELA/Reading	14.4	50.4	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 9 ELA/Reading	24.4	50.4	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 10 ELA/Reading	24.4	60.4	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 11 ELA/Reading	40.4	60.4	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 3 Math	9.9	49.9	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 4 Math	9.7	49.9	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 5 Math	4.7	49.7	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 6 Math	10.4	44.7	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 7 Math	5.0	50.4	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 8 Math	4.7	45.0	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 9 Math	4.9	44.7	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 10 Math	5.0	44.9	EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results
Grade 11 Math			EOY 20% increase in proficiency based on PARCC results

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 to 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?
Standards/Curriculum Alignment	<p>There is no evidence of instructional use of Common Core standards in lessons plans or historical documents verifying inservice training. MAPs and PARCC data show low achievement on CC skills and competencies.</p> <p>Comment from B. French: The elementary was using Reading Street up until our adoption of Amplify Core Knowledge. Reading Street was aligned to Common Core and lesson plans did include the alignment of Core Standards.</p>
Data-driven Instruction	<p>There is no evidence that teachers were using ongoing data analysis to inform instruction. There is no evidence that teachers used inservice time to look at data.</p> <p>Comment from B. French: We also used MAP data Student Goals Worksheet to drive our Parent Teacher Conferences.</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>
Standards/Curriculum Alignment	There is no evidence that either the Core Knowledge curriculum for elementary or Paideia methodology for secondary were aligned to Common Core standards, nor that they were being used with fidelity in general.	<b>Common Core</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• School-wide, there is no evidence that overall teaching was aligned to Common Core.</li> <li>• There was a lack of training on curriculum alignment to Common Core standards.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that sufficient instructional time was aligned school-wide to curriculum or Common Core.</li> <li>• There was a lack of training for staff on the Core Knowledge curriculum in elementary grades and the Paideia methodology in secondary grades.</li> <li>• There were insufficient materials available for teaching and learning, and definitely not enough materials to support Core Knowledge</li> <li>• There is no evidence that Core Knowledge curriculum was consistently aligned to Common Core. The Core Knowledge curriculum was only partially implemented in grades K-5, and not implemented at all in grades</li> </ul>



		<p>6-8.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear whether blocks of teaching time were sufficient for student success</li> <li>• There is no evidence that teachers were systematically meeting to discuss curriculum and Common Core alignment</li> <li>• It is unclear whether teachers were being evaluated for using Common Core</li> <li>• There were no Standards-based report cards</li> <li>• There is no evidence that Common Core Standards were part of lesson plans and objectives for the day</li> <li>• It is unclear whether teachers were going back to evaluate if the standard/objective was met.</li> <li>• Likewise, it is unclear whether testing and re-teaching was occurring as necessary, based on qualitative and quantitative data.</li> <li>• There is no evidence of vertical alignment to verify that skills are building.</li> </ul>
Data-driven Instruction	There is no evidence to support which data was being used for evaluations, how the data was being used, and if the data evaluations results influenced teaching.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence to demonstrate that teachers and administrators were systematically and consistently analyzing student test data</li> <li>• It is unclear to what extent data was being used to modify and strengthen teaching.</li> <li>• There is no evidence that collaboration time was scheduled in a consistent manner</li> <li>• School-wide, there is little evidence that the administration was holding teachers accountable for data analysis, teaching methodologies and student achievement</li> </ul>



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no evidence that the administration was being held accountable for assessing student success</li> <li>• It is unclear to what extent, and how well, educational and administrative programs and processes were operational and useful.</li> <li>• It is unclear to what extent data was being used to assess teaching competency, or to support struggling teachers or mentor new teachers.</li> </ul>
--	--	--





## 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>
Standards/Curriculum Alignment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Core Knowledge curriculum and Paideia methodology are aligned by teachers to Common Core standards across all grade levels</li> <li>• Staff is trained on Common Core standards and its alignment to curriculum</li> <li>• Instructional time is protected in the Master Schedule</li> <li>• Special Ed curriculum is aligned curriculum and to common core and taught with fidelity</li> <li>• Technology is used to improve instruction</li> <li>• Administration supports and holds teachers accountable for implementation and fidelity of time use (walkthroughs)</li> </ul>
Data-driven Instruction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teachers understand and use data provided from SuccessMaker and other short-cycle assessments such as MAP</li> <li>• Regular data dialog meetings &amp; collaboration time is routinely scheduled               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Intervention time provided for K-8:</li> <li>• Intervention class 9-11</li> <li>• Administration facilitates data meetings and holds teachers accountable for participation</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Technology is used to pull and track data</li> </ul>

#### *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: Standards/Curriculum Alignment				
Desired Outcome: As listed in Step 5				
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>
monthly	Provide training for aligning and using CC standards	Time	Admin	Admin Teachers
daily, ongoing	Protect instructional time for curriculum	Walkthrough and Lesson Plans verification	Admin Teachers	Admin Teachers
ongoing	Master schedule: fidelity from teachers and administration	Walkthrough and Lesson Plans verification	Admin Teachers	Admin Teachers
ongoing	Teachers use Special Ed curriculum aligned to Common Core with fidelity	Walkthrough and Lesson Plans verification	Admin	Admin Teachers
daily	Teachers use technology to improve instruction, reinforce learning, and gather data.	Walkthrough and Lesson Plans verification	Admin	Admin Teachers
Tri-weekly and quarterly	Teachers use Common Core standards to evaluate students	CC standards based reports	Admin	Admin Teachers



		cards and progress reports.		
Daily	Ensure that targeted Core Knowledge standards are aligned with targeted Common Core standards	Lesson plans	Teachers	Teachers
Pre-PARCC testing	Implement a Department-designated PARCC practice day: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ELA practices PARCC during weeks 1/2 of the month,</li> <li>• math practices during 2/4.</li> <li>• Instructors host at least one practice session during that time frame.</li> </ul>	Technology and time	Admin	Admin Teachers
EOY	Develop the 2018-2019 Master Schedule with consideration of the best class offerings based on student need and performance, such as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• extend class time blocks;</li> <li>• offer remediation courses as needed;</li> <li>• offer more honors courses for students who are excelling.</li> </ul>	Master Schedule	Admin	Admin Teachers
EOY	Develop a required placement assessment for Algebra I, II, Geometry and high level math courses	Assessment development skills	Admin	Admin Teachers

**Focus Area: Data-driven Instruction**

**Desired Outcome: As listed in Step 5**

**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>
weekly	Administration schedules regular data dialog meetings & collaboration time	Time	Admin	Admin teachers
daily	Provide targeted remediation for K-8 through SuccessMaker which uses ongoing data collection to adjust instruction.	Time	Teachers	Admin Teachers



weekly	K-12 teachers use technology to pull and track data, support instruction and reinforce learning	Technology	Teachers	Admin 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: Standards/Curriculum Alignment</b>				
<b>Desired Outcome: As listed in Step 5</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>		
020118	Common core standards training scheduled			
030118	Alignment of common core standards demonstrated in lesson plans			
030118	Records of Technology use available			
040118	PARCC practice days have been used			
041518	Master Schedule is under development			
041518	Math Placement Assessment developed and ready for use			

<b>Focus Area: Data-driven Instruction</b>
--

**Desired Outcome: As listed in Step 5****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>
050118	Weekly documentation of data dialogue meetings	
050118	Weekly documentation of technology use	
050118	Lesson plan documentation of targeted remediation	

*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>



**From:** [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**To:** [Vicenti, Stephanie](#)  
**Cc:** [Peterson, Elisabeth, PED](#); [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#)  
**Subject:** RE: NM DASH Workbook and Feedback Tool for Six Directions Indigenous School  
**Date:** Monday, January 29, 2018 5:06:43 PM  
**Attachments:** [Six Directions 90-day Plan Feedback Tool \(MS\) 1.29.2018.docx](#)  
[Six Directions Offline Planning Process Workbook rec'd 11.8.17.docx](#)

---

Good Afternoon Principal Vicenti~

Attached please find my completed Feedback Tool for your NM DASH Offline Planning Process and Workbook. Please remember, the purpose of my review was to provide feedback and not to approve or disapprove of the plan. The overall results of my review shows 10 success criteria as Solid Progress, 5 as Limited Progress and 1 as Not Evident. That said, you will be able to advance many of the success criteria from Limited to Solid Progress with just a few revisions.

Please do not hesitate to reach out if I can provide any further clarification.

Best,  
~Meghan

cc: Icela Pelayo  
Elisabeth Peterson

Margaret (Meghan) Southworth  
Priority Schools Bureau  
300 Don Gaspar Rm #121  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
(505) 827-6472  
[Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us](mailto:Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us)

---

**From:** Southworth, Margaret, PED  
**Sent:** Friday, January 26, 2018 10:57 AM  
**To:** Vicenti, Stephanie  
**Cc:** Peterson, Elisabeth, PED; Martinez, Severo, PED; Poulos, Katie, PED; Pelayo, Icela, PED  
**Subject:** FW: NM DASH Workbook and Feedback Tool for Six Directions Indigenous School

Director Vicenti~  
Apparently I used the wrong email address for you when I sent the email below earlier this morning. I apologize and hope this one makes it to you!  
~Meghan

Margaret (Meghan) Southworth  
Priority Schools Bureau  
300 Don Gaspar Rm #121  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
(505) 827-6472  
[Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us](mailto:Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us)

---

**From:** Southworth, Margaret, PED  
**Sent:** Friday, January 26, 2018 10:27 AM  
**To:** 'Stephanie Vicenti'  
**Cc:** Peterson, Elisabeth, PED; Martinez, Severo, PED ([Severo.Martinez@state.nm.us](mailto:Severo.Martinez@state.nm.us)); Poulos, Katie, PED ([Katie.Poulos@state.nm.us](mailto:Katie.Poulos@state.nm.us)); Pelayo, Icela, PED  
**Subject:** NM DASH Workbook and Feedback Tool for Six Directions Indigenous School

Good Morning Director Vicenti~

I have been assigned to review your NM DASH Offline Planning Process Workbook and Feedback Tool for Six Directions Indigenous School. Please allow a few days for review. You should hear back from me by EOB Tuesday, January 30th.

Best~  
~Meghan

Margaret (Meghan) Southworth  
Priority Schools Bureau  
300 Don Gaspar Rm #121  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
(505) 827-6472  
[Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us](mailto:Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us)





**District:**  
**School:** Six Directions  
**Indigenous School**  
**Date:** 11-08-17  
**Completed By:** Tamarah  
**Pfeiffer, Ph.D Board Member**

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

**For PED use only**  
**NM PED Calibration Review**  
**Date:** Jan. 29, 2018  
**Reviewer Code:** MS

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

For PED use only		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident
10 (2 Exemplary)	5	1

<b><u>Step 1 - Build Core Team</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
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</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>	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:**

The rationale you have provided for your Core Team members is thoughtful and specific. It believe you have chosen a team likely to bring bring diverse viewpoints, backgrounds and expertise to engage in rich conversation, always putting students first. I would consider Step 1 to be Exemplary in that respect.

Representation across grade levels (and content areas) isn't as strong because you are lacking a rationale for Tara Partow. STEM and STEAM seem to be well represented. The same is true for subgroups of students and community. I would like to know more about Ms. Partow's background and expertise.

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



<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	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</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:**

I'm a little confused by your data analysis notes. You offer some disaggregation by levels on the PARCC assessment in ELA and Math, but then say you did not have access to PARCC data from the 2016-2017 school year because this was the first year your school was open? Where did the PARCC scores come from, then?

Looking at your 2016-2017 data another way, proficiency rates are 22% in Math and 14% in ELA, overall. Your summative PARCC goals might be more meaningful to stakeholders if you couch them this way - rather than setting goals based on average scaled scores. For example, on the 2016-2017 6<sup>th</sup> grade ELA PARCC, 18% scored at level 4 (which is considered proficient) and none of them scored at level 5. Half of them were at level 2. If your goal is to increase by 15% that makes your 2017-2018 goal 33% proficient in ELA at 6<sup>th</sup> grade. You might also consider setting goals within the cohort in terms of numbers of student at each level. For example, 0% at level 1, 25% at level 2 and so on.

What we want you to do for the Benchmark goals is actually set SMART goals for student growth as measured by the NWEA midyear. For example, from BOY to MOY on the NWEA, 100% of students will meet their individual growth goal. Because the benchmark goals aren't articulated as clearly as the summative goals, this area shows limited progress. The Measurable and Time-bound SMART criteria haven't been met for the benchmark goals.

<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	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:**

The data connections you mention for your choice of Focus Areas are all quantitative: PARCC, NWEA and Formative Assessments. Did you look at any sources of qualitative data or evidence to ground yourself in the school's current reality? For example, disaggregated NMTEACH data from last year or trends in teacher practice around data driven instruction and Tier II interventions?

This step is asking about the quantitative and qualitative data analysis that led you to these Focus Areas. What you have provided is more of a description of what you hope to accomplish in each Focus Area.

That said, your plan still demonstrates Solid Progress because the criteria calls for qualitative **and/or** quantitative data analysis.

<b>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
Clear Root Cause Statement	Each focus area has a clear statement 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> statement 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</b> statement of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Evidence to support	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:**

Well done. I see more references to both quantitative and qualitative data here. Your statements and evidence seem to have been generated through thoughtful 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	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	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	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	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	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:**

Your Desired Outcomes are not written as specific, observable, measurable changes in adult behavior. For example, can you ‘observe’ commitment to a continuum of learning? Can you ‘measure’ understanding of comprehensive data analysis. An increase in Grade Level Proficiency by 20 points in Math and ELA isn’t a change in what the adults at the school are doing. It’s your summative student achievement goal – the result of the changes in adult behavior.

You should be able to re-write your Desired Outcomes as observable, measurable changes. For example, Tier II Intervention could be rewritten as: Core teachers will use purposeful small group instruction in reading and math during Study Hall that focuses on review and remediation of skills, deficits, pre-teaching and re-teaching. Core teachers will develop Tier II Intervention plans that address individual student needs as identified by interim assessments and provide multiple opportunities for students to practice and receive immediate corrective feedback. I’m not real clear on who will be providing the interventions – teachers or EAs?

Although your Desired Outcomes lack specificity, what you describe for each of your Focus Areas does have a clear connection to increasing student achievement.



Some of your Critical Actions are not as clear as they could be. For example: “Standards Based Grading.” Does this mean you will develop a system of standards based grading by September 20th or does it mean teachers will have assigned standards based grades to students using a system already developed by that date? Standards based grading seems to be a Critical Action for both Data Driven Instruction and Tier II Intervention? The EAs will be providing the interventions in Study Hall but teachers will assign the grades? That is unclear to me.

Your Critical Actions should be clear and specific enough that someone unfamiliar with the plan could step in and follow them. If I were a new Principal at the school, I’m not sure I would know how to “build and facilitate an environment of learning and collaboration by utilizing teacher strengths to reach beyond the classroom.” All that is to be accomplished by September 25<sup>th</sup>?

In some instances, it isn’t clear who the person responsible for a Critical Action is. “Teachers and Administration” is pretty much everyone, isn’t it? Who will be responsible for making sure the Action is accomplished?

<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

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

The metrics and evidence are not clearly identified for some of the Progress Indicators. For example: “Student led conferences and using data to drive learning.” What exactly will you be measuring here? Do you mean, “Students will use data in student led conferences to describe their own learning and growth”? Another Progress Indicator says, “Reading and Math Intervention Groups.” Do you mean, “Grade level Reading and Math intervention groups will be created in ELA and math”? “Classroom walk throughs and feedback” should also be specific and measurable. How many walkthroughs will each teacher have received by October 4<sup>th</sup>? How and when will they have received feedback following a walkthrough? Remember, someone unfamiliar with the plan should be able to step in mid-semester and understand what needs to be done.

The System to Monitor has not been completed – shows lack of attempt or action.



--

**From:** [Stephanie Vicenti](#)  
**To:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Feedback on NM DASH plan?  
**Date:** Friday, January 12, 2018 10:07:55 AM

---

Hi!

I was just going to leave you a voicemail. Yes I would love your feedback. But I also do need to upload my documents not only to the EPSS website, but one other place as well. I did get it approved but need to upload the documents requested of me. Thanks

On Fri, Jan 12, 2018 at 10:02 AM, Pelayo, Icela, PED <[Icela.Pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:Icela.Pelayo@state.nm.us)> wrote:

Dear Ms. Vicenti:

I hope you are well. I called and left you a voicemail.

I am coordinating with PSB for state-authorized charter schools that would like (additional) feedback on their NM DASH plans. The PED received your NMDASH plan on November 8, 2017 (date of last training) after the October 16, 2017 due date and so it was not reviewed by the PSB at that time. However, I do believe the school was granted log-in access to the NM DASH site.

At this time, if your school would still like feedback from the PSB on its NM DASH plan, please let me know and I can facilitate that.

Thanks,

Icela

Icela Pelayo, PhD, Deputy Director

Options for Parents and Families Division

New Mexico Public Education Department

[300 Don Gaspar Avenue](#)

[Santa Fe, NM 87501](#)

o: 505.827.6532

c: [505.695.8683](tel:505.695.8683)

[icela.pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:icela.pelayo@state.nm.us)

<http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/index.html>

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

--

Stephanie Vicenti  
Head Administrator  
Six Directions Indigenous School  
505-863-1900  
[stephanie@sixdirectionsschool.org](mailto:stephanie@sixdirectionsschool.org)



**From:** Pelayo, Icela, PED  
**To:** [Vicenti, Stephanie](#)  
**Cc:** [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#); [Woerner, Karen, PED](#); [Shannon, Megan, PED](#)  
**Subject:** Upcoming Scheduled Annual Site Visit - March 7, 2018  
**Date:** Thursday, January 04, 2018 10:26:00 PM  
**Attachments:** [2017-2018 Site Visit Guidance Document R.PDF](#)  
[Six Directions Site Visit Agenda.pdf](#)

---

Dear Ms. Vicenti:

I hope 2018 is getting off to a great start! The agenda for our upcoming site visit on March 7, 2018 is attached.

Please note that for schools that have earned a D or F on the latest school grade reporting, the school's implementation of its required Improvement Plan will also be monitored and evaluated on the upcoming site visit. Also attached is an additional guidance document to help you and your team prepare for this visit.

If the school's Improvement Plan (which must be approved by its Governing Body) has not yet been uploaded into WebEPSS, please do so as soon as possible.

Please be aware that School Improvement Plans—including information on schools that have submitted Improvement Plans and on schools that have not met their requirements to submit Improvement Plans—will be presented to the PEC on or before their February 9, 2018 meeting.

Please let us know if you have any questions. We look forward to our visit.

Thank you,  
Icela

Icela Pelayo, PhD, Deputy Director  
Options for Parents and Families Division  
New Mexico Public Education Department  
300 Don Gaspar Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
o: 505.827.6532  
c: 505.695.8683  
[icela.pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:icela.pelayo@state.nm.us)  
<http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/index.html>

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

---

**From:** Pelayo, Icela, PED  
**Sent:** Friday, September 01, 2017 5:52 PM

**To:** Vicenti, Stephanie

**Subject:** <Please Review Date>: Annual Site Visit Scheduled

Dear Ms. Stephanie Vicenti:

We hope your school year has gotten off to a great start!

Your charter school's annual site visit is scheduled for Wednesday, March 7, 2018.

Site visits are scheduled earlier in the school year to accommodate the need for multiple visits to some schools that are new, applying for renewal, or requiring two annual visits as specified in its contract. To minimize travel-related expenses incurred by the state, site visits are grouped for schools in the same geographic area (excluding those located in Albuquerque or Santa Fe). Additionally, we anticipate this schedule will allow the PED Charter Schools team to provide reporting to schools in a more timely manner.

**Please review your school's scheduled site visit date(s) and contact me no later than Friday, September 8, 2017 if you believe you need to discuss the date of the scheduled site visit(s).**

In the design of the schedule, we have taken into consideration potential scheduling conflicts, important deadlines, and possible activities in the academic calendar. While we will do our best to accommodate your request, we may not be able to do so. Please keep in mind the PED is required to conduct annual site visits to all 62 state-authorized schools, not including new, renewal, and multiple site visits for those school that required them. Your flexibility and patience is greatly appreciated.

We will be sending the site visit protocol for your review soon, and further information as your site visit date approaches.

If you have any questions, please contact me directly. My contact information is contained my email signature below. We look forward to seeing you on site in the coming months.

In partnership,

Icela

Icela Pelayo, PhD, Deputy Director  
Options for Parents and Families Division  
New Mexico Public Education Department  
300 Don Gaspar Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
o: 505.827.6532  
c: 505.695.8683  
[icela.pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:icela.pelayo@state.nm.us)  
<http://ped.state.nm.us/ped/index.html>

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

**From:** [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**To:** [PSB, PED, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#)  
**Subject:** NM DASH Workbook and Feedback Tool for Six Directions Indigenous School Attached  
**Date:** Thursday, November 09, 2017 11:35:44 AM  
**Attachments:** [Six Directions 90-day Plan Feedback Tool \(TF\) rec"d 11.8.17.docx](#)  
[Six Directions Offline Planning Process Workbook rec"d 11.8.17.docx](#)

---

Margaret (Meghan) Southworth  
Priority Schools Bureau  
300 Don Gaspar Rm #121  
Santa Fe, NM 87501  
(505) 827-6472  
[Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us](mailto:Margaret.Southworth@state.nm.us)

District:  
School:  
Date:  
Completed By:

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

**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?

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?
Lane Towery	Dean of Operations	Mr. Towery brings the perspective of being the school founder, with intimate knowledge of the original charter application and mission of the school. His support in planning to ensure tactical decisions are being made in alignment with the strategic imperatives and core values of the school. Mr. Towery's familiarity with the reading curriculum, can support planning for reading instruction specifically.
David Glanville	Math Teacher	Mr. Glanville has extensive knowledge of the high school common core standards both before and during its implementation. He has 8 years of curriculum development and alignment experience.



Karen Harker	Ashiwi Studies	Ms. Harker is from the Indigenous Zuni Tribe, where she is able bring different perspectives of Native Language and culture into the classroom. Her extensive knowledge of the Zuni curriculum that focuses on the culture, tradition and language lay a strong foundation for learning. Her experience in curriculum development has played a major role in the strong foundation of learning at SDIS
Alanna Purdy	STEAM Teacher	Alanna has 8 years experience in curriculum development and instruction, a Level II teaching license, and her MA in Secondary Education with a focus on Science instruction. Her expertise extends to culturally responsive instruction, project-based learning, STEAM and design thinking, and science assessment and data-driven instruction.
Tara Partow	ELA Teacher	
Renee Cleveland	Parent	Renee brings the perspective of a founding staff member and a parent. As an AmeriCorps member and Educational Assistant, Renee works with students in all teachers' classrooms and across content. She often works with small groups, and gets to know students closely. As a parent, Renee brings the perspective of hearing and being an active supporter of her grandson at home and school.
Stephanie Vicenti	Head Administrator	Ms. Vicenti has been in education for 17 years. Thirteen of those years were as a classroom teacher and the last five years were spent in various administrative roles such as an Instructional Coach, Dean of Students and Principal. She holds a Level IIIA K-8 Elementary License with a TESOL endorsement and Level IIIB PreK-12 Administrative License. Her experience in Data Driven Instruction, the SAT process, PBL and DI are an asset to any teacher/school she works with. She is also well versed in the importance of being an Instructional Leader, who is involved in classroom learning and teacher/student growth. Ms. Vicenti has been trained in the University of Virginia Turnaround School Protocol as an Instructional Coach and a Principal.
Ben Soce	Governing Council Chair	Mr. Soce is an enrolled citizen of the Navajo Nation and bilingual in Dine' and English. Ben is an Experiential and Outdoor Educator for the National Indian Youth Leadership Project. He received his Bachelor's in Liberal Arts from the University of New Mexico in 2013 and has been with NIYLP since 2000. Throughout his NIYLP career, Mr. Soce has been Lead Facilitator and Coordinator for various positive youth development programs. He has worked with



		Elementary, Middle, & High School students. More recently, he expanded his proficiency with working with high risk youth in residential treatment centers and juvenile justice systems. His main area of expertise is incorporating and infusing culture and holistic health into his work with area young people
Tamarah Pfeiffer	Governing Council Member	

## **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.

### **PARCC**

Initial Data Analysis shows that our students are not meeting necessary expectations on PARCC. Scores indicate that 39/50 (78%) of all students scored a 1,2 or 3 on the PARCC Math, while 43/50 (86%) scored below expectation (scoring a 1, 2 or 3) on the PARCC ELA test. Because this was the first year of our school being open, we did not have access to PARCC data from the 2016-2017 school year.

### **NWEA MAP Math Growth Assessment**

In the 2016-2017 school year, 75% of full academic year (FAY) students met their individual growth goal established by NWEA. Students grew an average of 1.88 grade level equivalents and the mean RIT growth was 9.61 points.

### **NWEA MAP Reading Growth Assessment**

In the 2016-2017 school year, 77% of FAY students met their individual growth goal established by NWEA. Students grew an average of 1.73 grade level equivalents and the mean RIT growth was 9.83 points.

**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?



Grade/Subject Area	2016/2017 PARCC Results	2017/2018 PARCC Goals	<u>Benchmarks</u> : How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals?
<b>6th Grade ELA</b> <b>1617 Avg:</b> 723.95 (Level 2)	<b>1617 Levels</b> Level 1: 2 students, Level 2: 11 students Level 3: 5 students, Level 4: 4 students, Level 5: 0 students	Average Goal: 743.95 (Level 3)	Increase average goal by 15%, showing student academic growth in Level 3 and 4 in the PARCC assessment. Student growth will be monitored by the schools Interim Assessment NWEA.
<b>7th Grade ELA</b> <b>1617 Avg:</b> 726.32 (Level 3)	<b>1617 Levels</b> Level 1: 4, students, Level 2: 10 students, Level 3: 5 students, Level 4: 5 students Level 5: 1 students	Average Goal: 746.32 (Level 3)	Increase average goal by 15%, showing student academic growth in Level 3 and 4 in the PARCC assessment. Student growth will be monitored by the schools Interim Assessment NWEA.
<b>6th Grade Math</b> <b>1617 Avg:</b> 717.91 (Level 2)	<b>1617 Levels</b> Level 1: 8 students, Level 2: 4 students, Level 3: 6 students, Level 4: 4 students, Level 5: 0 students	Average Goal: 737.91 (Level 3)	Increase average goal by 15%, showing student academic growth in Level 3 and 4 in the PARCC assessment. Student growth will be monitored by the schools Interim Assessment NWEA.
<b>7th Grade Math</b> <b>1617 Avg:</b> 721.76 (Level 2)	<b>1617 Levels</b> Level 1: 2, students, Level 2: 12 students, Level 3: 7 students,	Average Goal: 741.76 (Level 3)	Increase average goal by 15%, showing student academic growth in Level 3 and 4 in the PARCC assessment. Student growth will be monitored by the schools Interim Assessment NWEA.





	Level 4: 4 students Level 5: 0 students		
--	--	--	--

SMART Checklist		
<b><u>Specific</u></b>	Is the goal clearly defined?	
<b><u>Measurable</u></b>	Are multiple concrete criteria identified for measuring progress toward attainment of the goal?	
<b><u>Ambitious</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 (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?

<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?
Data-Driven Instruction	Data-Driven Instruction (DDI) is a precise systematic approach to improve student learning, thru assessment analysis, standards alignment and differentiated instruction. Thru DDI, SDIS will engage in backwards planning and assessment to ensure academic growth with all students. PARCC, NWEA and Formative Assessment analysis will ensure Project Based Learning and the integration of Cultural Studies provides a strong foundation to meeting the learning needs of our students.
Tier II Intervention	Upon PARCC analysis from the 1617 school year, roughly 80% of our current 7th and 8th graders tested below proficient on ELA and Math assessments. In order to address the urgent and poignant need to improve these students' skills in english and mathematics, SDIS will incorporate Tier II interventions based on PARCC and NWEA data into its Study Hall classes which will allow students at low, middle, and high performing levels to have tailored instruction.



Peer Embedded Professional Development	Based on NWEA data last year, SDIS saw the lowest growth with its high achieving and low achieving students in grades 6 and 7. Given our school does not have periods for grade level and content level collaboration, it is important for us to focus on peer coaching and observation based on NMTEACH rubric, integration of data-driven instruction and differentiation, and classroom culture/management geared toward student growth and interventions for low and high-performing cohorts of students.
--	---

#### **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?

<i>Focus Area (selected in Step 3)</i>	<i>Root Cause Statement</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
Data Driven Instruction	SDIS struggled with staff all of its core classes. Although there were teachers who taught multiple subject areas, DDI was used minimally to drive instruction. Backwards planning was also missing from the curriculum to assist in the alignment of standards and materials taught.	The correlation to NWEA results for the 2016/2017 school year does not correlate, for the growth shown by NWEA, was significant higher than what the school was graded on and received a “F” for the 2016/2017 school year.
Tier II Interventions	Interim assessment is not used to assist in identifying students who are performing significant lower than their grade level peers.	Lack of leadership and the four staff members that started the school year was overwhelmed with other activities.



Professional Development (through Peer Collaboration)	Incomplete staff, did not allow for peer collaboration and support cross-curricula.	Two core teachers were in place to start the 2016/2017 school year. A third core teacher was hired in late January.
---	---	---



## **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?

<i>Focus Area</i>	<i>Draft Desired Outcome (change in adult behavior): 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?</i>
Data-Driven Instruction	SDIS commitment to build a continuum of learning that makes students the priority. The understanding that comprehensive data analysis is directly tied to school wide improvement for the purpose of being effective instructional leaders whose actions benefit students' academic performance and improve students achievement, which incorporating the unique identities of our students indigenous heritage.
Tier II Intervention	Purposeful, small group instruction in core reading and math ensure student growth is evident with more focused instruction thru remediation of skills deficits, pre-teaching and review of skills, provide multiple opportunities to practice with immediate corrective feedback.



Peer Embedded Professional Development	Building leadership capacity through a coaching method that allows teachers to develop professionally. Teacher's strengths will be utilized to enhance collaboration and improve overall school culture. SDIS would like to increase their capacity to provide effective differentiated instruction to engage all learners thru Project Based Learning opportunities.
--	---

### *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?

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

**Desired Outcome:** Use data to drive backwards planning and the implementation of Project Based Learning, while increasing the academic rigor.

### **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>
9/4-9/15	NWEA Testing	NWEA Testing Schedule, Chromebooks	Director of Operations	Teachers
9/10/17	Identification of lower	NWEA testing data	Teachers	Administration





	performing students in Reading and Math based on NWEA results.			Teachers Educational Assistants
9/18/17	NWEA Goal Setting	NWEA Report NWEA Goal Setting Sheet	Students Teachers	Students Teachers Educational Assistants
9/20/17	Standards Based Grading	Schoology Classroom Report Card CCSS	Teachers Administra tion	Teachers
9/25/17	NWEA analysis-Deep Dive, with item analysis and identify standards that were not mastered	NWEA Test NWEA Individual Item Analysis	Teachers Administra tion	Teachers Administration Educational Assistants Students
9/25/17	NWEA Reflection to PARCC	Reflection Worksheet- Does NWEA prepare our students for PARCC?	Teachers Administra tion	Teachers Administration

**Focus Area: Tier II Intervention**
**Desired Outcome:** Grade Level proficiency will increase by 20 points in Math and ELA.

**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>
9/10/17	Identification of lower performing students in Reading and Math based on NWEA results.	NWEA testing data	Teachers	Administration Teachers Educational Assistants
9/11/17	Educational Assistants-assist on building on the skills of the lower 25% during Study Hall. Additional testing to find gaps in learning.	Fluency Passages Comprehension Check Math Skills Assessment	Administra tion	Educational Assistants
9/18/17- 12/22/17	Identified students are being pulled out of study hall to get extra support	Newsela Gizmo DreamBox	Administra tion	Teachers Educational Assistants
Wednesday	Check-in with student progress- half a day PD.	Teachers Data Folders	Teachers Educational	Administration Teachers



			Assistants Administrati on	Educational Assistants
9/20/17- 12/22/17	Teachers will use Standard - based grading to ensure students are mastering the CCSS.	Schoology CCSS	Teachers Administrat ors	Teachers

### Focus Area: Peer Embedded Professional Development

**Desired Outcome:** Build Leadership capacity through a coaching method that will assist teachers to develop professionally.

#### 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>
9/13/17	Teacher Summative Evaluations-review and next steps.	Teacher Summative Evaluations	Teachers	Teachers Administration
9/25/17	Alignment of Schoology and Standards Based Grading	Schoology Ms. Purdy Google Classroom	Ms. Purdy Administra tion	Teachers Administration
9/25/17	Building and facilitating an environment of learning and collaboration by utilizing teacher strengths to reach beyond the classroom.	Collaboration Protocol Cross- Curricula CWT	Administra tion	Teachers Administration
9/27/17	Creation of walk-thru form	NMTeach Domains	Administra tion Teachers	Administration Teachers
9/27/17- 12/22/17	Observation Schedule/Feedback	Class Schedules- Preps	Administra tion	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> Data-Driven Instruction		
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Use data to drive backwards planning and the implementation of Project Based Learning, while increasing the academic rigor.		
<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>
9/4/17	Creation of documents to support Data Driven Instruction.	Teacher feedback, possible changes.
9/25/17	Implementation of Data -Driven Instruction processes, using documents and streamlining Lesson Plans, Schoology Standards Based Grading and NWEA results.	Process may been to be done weekly, bi-weekly or monthly pending on the need.
9/25/17	Reading and Math Intervention Groups	Grouping will be fluid and based not only on NWEA test results but teacher observation.
11/10/17	Student Led conferences and using data to drive learning.	Individualized Data Folders in Google Drive.
11/10/17	Bi-weekly checks on students progress. Using advisory time to allow students to update Data Folders in Google. Checklist should be created in advisory for students to follow and work on during their study hall periods.	Advisory Plan need to reflect not only personal growth, but personal wellness and how that relates to academic success.



<b>Focus Area:</b> Tier II Intervention		
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Grade Level proficiency will increase by 20 points in Math and ELA.		
<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>
9/11/17	Educational Assistants will do in depth testing on reading fluency, sight word knowledge and comprehension to gauge where students need to start with Tier II interventions	Teacher support materials Teacher modeling modifying of work.
Friday	Friday assessment day's will be for individualized testing to show progress with student learning.	Friday assessments could turn into Bi-weekly assessments.
Wednesday	Wednesday PD days to re-evaluate RTI groups and update one another how students are coming along with their learning.	Running record needs to be create in google drive so that all teachers can document student progress. Documents could be used and transferred for the SAT process.

<b>Focus Area:</b> Peer Embedded Professional Development		
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> Build Leadership capacity through a coaching method that will assist teachers to develop professionally.		
<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>
9/11/17	Classroom Walk-Thru and feedback is evident and on going for the month of September	Specific concerns and goals are put in place by the second walk thru to ensure instructional expectations are followed thru with.
10/4/17	Collaborative PD with Language Teachers and Core instructional staff to build upon content taught.	Inclusion of Language Teachers in core curriculum to implement team teaching opportunities
11/10/17	Student-Led Conferences: use feedback from parents to assist in helping drive the school's mission and vision, and meeting the emotional needs of our students.	Parent and student workshops after school. How can families become a team and value their students. Parent, Teacher and



		Student support groups.
--	--	-------------------------

--



District:  
 School: Six Directions  
 Indigenous School  
 Date: 11-08-17  
 Completed By: Tamarah  
 Pfeiffer, Ph.D Board Member

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

**For PED use only**  
 NM PED Calibration Review  
 Date:  
 Reviewer Code:

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
15	1	0

For PED use only		
Solid Progress	Limited Progress	Not Evident

<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</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>	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: Limited Progress

This is the second year of operation. In the growing of the school it is evident that we have limited progress in building core team due to the number of board members (limited currently to 5) and faculty. The diversity is more at the parent level and the board committees that are potentially to be developed will have that diversity included within them.

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



<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	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>	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</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><u>Step 2 Reflections and Feedback: Solid Progress</u></b> The school leadership along with Faculty have disaggregated student data to reflect the current work ahead for instructional practices. This is a solid progress and includes smart goals as part of the DASH formally known as EPPS.				
<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>	The 2-3 focus areas selected are <b>aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative</b>	2-3 focus areas <b>are selected.</b>	Shows lack of attempt or action

<sup>2</sup> For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://www.ped.state.nm.us/ped/AssessmentEvalDocs/2017-2018%20Assessment%20Calendar.pdf>



	quantitative evidence.	evidence.		
--	------------------------	-----------	--	--

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

Solid Progress – The DASH has identified three key areas of support to include: Professional Development, Data Driven Decision Making, and Tier II intervention.

<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 Root Cause Statement	Each focus area has a clear statement 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> statement 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</b> statement of the cause or causes of school performance challenges.	Shows lack of attempt or action
Evidence to support	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: Exemplary/Solid Progress**

The work of the root cause analysis is exemplary with a solid progress to evidence of support. The team determined not only focus areas that can be developed further to include the mission of the school in the professional development but also the language component necessary to the success of the students at SDIS.

<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	Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying the specific observable change(s) in adult	<b>Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying specific observable change(s) in adult</b>	Desired outcomes <b>do not</b> identify specific observable changes in adult behavior.	Shows lack of attempt or action





	behaviors, <b>which creates focus and urgency toward action.</b>	behavior.		
<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</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	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	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	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: Solid Progress**

The urgency to move from a “F” school to a school that is aligned to the work of the DASH not only has solid timelines but also identifies the resources, work plan, and specific actions to build in school accountability.

<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
-------------------	--	--	--	---------------------------------

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

The school leader has determined a variety of monitoring practices including calendaring in specific days for professional development but also procedural guidance that will assist in the tracking of the student achievement moving forward.