

Appendix F, Academic Improvement Plans for Charter Schools that Earned a D or F  
and Applied for Renewal with a Local Authorizer



ACE Leadership High School  
**PROPOSED: PEC Charter School Improvement Plan (SIP)**

2/4

Name of Charter School		ACE Leadership High School		School State ID Number	522	
Head Administrator		Tori Stephens-Shauger		School Year	SY17	
Governing Board Approval Date		4-8-2015 –included in negotiated contract and approved by PEC and governing board prior to finalization of contract		Submission Date	8-31-17	
Performance Framework Area for Improvement (Academic, Financial, Organizational) Specific Performance Indicator in Need of Improvement		Academic	Financial	Organizational	Deadline for Charter School to Demonstrate Improvement	Renewal in SY18
		Reading and math scores				
Remediation Strategy(ies)	Action Step(s)	Timeline	Person/Program Responsible for Implementation	How will you demonstrate success of the Remediation Strategy(ies)	Outcome Evidence (Data)	Met/ Did Not Meet
For math and reading: Provide regular training (whole group, project group and individual) to all teachers to ensure that they are implementing the agreed upon literacy skills into each project for all students	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wednesday professional development time used for some of this training in addition to some time during the 6 weeks of professional development</li> <li>Review short cycle data from Discovery Education and performance assessment short cycle to ensure the skills being focused on and reinforced are driven by the data we have</li> <li>Require that all project proposals and project overviews show how/where these skills will be included in the project</li> </ol>	SY16 – SY18	Project teachers, advisors, principal	Reading and math performance short cycle assessments show growth by 1 point overall each school year.	Refer to data dashboard uploaded with data to WebEPSS	
Support the transfer of	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Require that all project proposals and project overviews show</li> </ol>	SY16 – SY18	Project teachers, advisors, principal	Reading and math performance short cycle	Student portfolios – evidence of math and literacy skill	

PROPOSED: PEC Charter School Improvement Plan (SIP)

skills students gain from the reading and math program to their reading and math projects	<p>how/where these skills will be included in the project</p> <p>2. Use evidence of these skills from projects as evidence for performance assessment evaluation</p>			assessments show growth by 1 point overall each school year.	improvement	
Support student documentation of skill growth into portfolios	<p>1. Advisors will schedule time for students to complete their transition document which includes their portfolios</p> <p>2. Project Teachers will schedule time for students to archive their work to include in their portfolios</p> <p>3. Encourage the use of short cycle performance assessment evidence as portfolio items that show growth</p>	SY16 – SY18	Project teachers, advisors, principal	<p>Reading and math performance short cycle assessments show growth by 1 point overall each school year.</p> <p>Evidence of growth found in portfolios.</p>	Advisors providing students with time to archive and reflect on their evidence of growth on a regular basis.	

- School Improvement Plan (SIP) process pursuant to *Charter School Contract*-Section 4.03 (a)
- Timelines: 1) CSD Report on PF for schools-June 2) SIP to CSD/PEC-August 3) PEC Approves/Disapproves SIP-September
- **One (1)** Improvement Plan Template for **each** Performance Indicator identified as “Does Not Meet,” “Working to Meet Standard” or “Falls Far Below Standard”
- Outcomes of the charter school’s improvement must be evidenced with data
- Completion and evaluation of SIP results by CSD/PEC-May

ACE Leadership High School  
PROPOSED: PEC Charter School Improvement Plan (SIP)



**From:** [PSB, PED, PED](#)  
**To:** [amber@healthleadershiphighschool.org](mailto:amber@healthleadershiphighschool.org)  
**Cc:** [Martinez, Severo, PED](#); [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#); [DelRosario, Baylor, PED](#); [Poulos, Katie, PED](#); [Southworth, Margaret, PED](#)  
**Subject:** Health Leadership High School - NM DASH Feedback Tool  
**Date:** Thursday, November 02, 2017 1:28:03 PM  
**Attachments:** [HLHS Feedback Tool.docx](#)

---

Good Afternoon,

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

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

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

Best,

Patricia "Kitty" Montoya  
NMPED  
505-827-3671



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

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

District: HLHS (LEA)  
 School: HLHS  
 Date: 10/10/17  
 Completed By: Amber Reno

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

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

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

**Overall comment:**

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

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

**NM PED Reviewer comments in RED**

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



				is identified.
Representation <sup>1</sup> 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. HLHS, 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.

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

**Step 2 Reflections and Feedback:**

Achievement goals have been identified in ELA and Math and reflect SMART goal format. HLHS might consider including specific PARCC data by grade level, interim assessment data, student work and EOC data if available.

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

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

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

**Step 3 Reflections and Feedback:**

Focus areas are aligned to data analysis. HLHS might consider adding more specificity in data collection regarding walkthroughs and lesson planning. This statement reflects recommended specific data: 33% of teachers at HLHS in 2016-2017 received less than effective scores for Domain 1F: Designing Student Assessment. Many of the other statements do not contain quantitative evidence and are vague.

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

**Step 4 Reflections and Feedback:**

Clear hypothesis: Root Cause Statement for Tier I instruction is well written. For Data-driven Instruction Focus Area, please consider language that describes what is lacking/not evident...i.e., “Lack of consistent and effective implementation of the mastery based assessment and feedback model.” Professional learning supports can then be included in your Critical Action to address the Root Cause.

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Evidence to support: HLHS should consider using quantitative and qualitative data in their evidence statements. Example: 50% of lesson plans do not support effective and consistent implementation of the mastery-based assessment and feedback model. In general, for both Focus Areas, more quantifiable data linked to student achievement would provide clarity..

<b><u>Step 5 – Desired Outcomes &amp; Critical Actions</u></b>	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Solid Progress</b>	<b>Limited Progress</b>	<b>Not Evident</b>
<i>Desired Outcomes</i> – observable changes in adult behavior <b>NM PED Review Determination: 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</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

Determination: Solid Progress.				
--------------------------------	--	--	--	--

**Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:**

To meet Solid Progress, the Workbook for indicator Desired Outcomes- observable change in adult behavior: specific observable changes in adult behavior need to be articulated. Example: During non-evaluative leadership team walkthroughs, 100% of teachers will be observed implementing high impact literacy and/or math strategies.

To meet Solid Progress on the Workbook for indicator Desired Outcomes-specific focus on student achievement, please link to student achievement and consider how all Desired Outcomes are observable change in adult behavior.

A Desired Outcome for specific focus on student achievement – Data Driven might look like... “In 90 days, all staff will effectively plan for and implement mastery-based assessment and feedback model of instruction.” Then, the other items described in the Workbook would be captured in the Critical Actions below.

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

**Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:**

Monitoring plan has all components expected.

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

**From:** [Amber Reno](#)  
**To:** [PSB, PED, PED](#)  
**Cc:** [Pelayo, Icela, PED](#)  
**Subject:** Fwd: Health Leadership High School 90 Day plan  
**Date:** Monday, October 16, 2017 11:52:17 AM  
**Attachments:** [T Hogan 90-day Plan Feedback Rubric - Version B \(1\).docx](#)  
[HLHS Offline Planning Process Workbook - Template - 9.6.17 \(1\).docx](#)

---

Icela,

I found the address to send our plan and feedback tool to Priority School Bureau.

So, please disregard my previous request for support.

Thank you,

Amber Reno

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Amber Reno <[amber@healthleadershiphighschool.org](mailto:amber@healthleadershiphighschool.org)>  
Date: Mon, Oct 16, 2017 at 10:26 AM  
Subject: Health Leadership High School 90 Day plan  
To: <[Icela.Pelayo@state.nm.us](mailto:Icela.Pelayo@state.nm.us)>  
CC: Blanca Lopez <[blanca@healthleadershiphighschool.org](mailto:blanca@healthleadershiphighschool.org)>, <[margaret.southworth@state.nm.us](mailto:margaret.southworth@state.nm.us)>

Good morning,

I just received back the feedback tool completed by our governing council, and I am ready to submit that and our plan. I am attaching these documents to this email, but please let me know if there is somewhere else that I need to submit these documents. I am off-site at DTC training today, and as such, I don't have with me the papers that outlined the submission process.

Thank you for your help in this matter,

Amber Reno  
Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment  
[Amber@healthleadershiphighschool.org](mailto:Amber@healthleadershiphighschool.org)  
(505) 750-4547 Ext-105

--

Amber Reno  
Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment  
[Amber@healthleadershiphighschool.org](mailto:Amber@healthleadershiphighschool.org)  
(505) 750-4547 Ext-105



**District: HLHS (LEA)**  
**School: HLHS**  
**Date: 10/10/17**  
**Completed By: Amber Reno**

**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?
Blanca Lopez	Executive Director	Blanca has been the Executive Director at HLHS since 2013. She has extensive experience in education, working sixteen years as a school leader and twenty years in the classroom before that. It is important to note that in addition to several other areas of endorsement, she holds a teaching endorsement in Bilingual Education and Special Education, bringing a critical perspective to the core team’s work. She is familiar with the improvement efforts at HLHS and is very familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching staff.



Amber Reno	Dir. Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment (CIA)	Amber is new to HLHS this year, but she was employed in the same position at a network school the year prior to coming here. She has a firm understanding of the instruction and assessment models in practice at the school. Before working in school leadership, Amber was a high school ELA and drama teacher. She also spent two years working as an instructional coach and spearheading the overhaul of SAT/504 systems at her school, and as such, she has a firm understanding of the RTI framework.
Louis Gonzalez	Instructional Coach/Project Teacher (9-12)	Louis is an experienced ELA and Social Studies teacher who has worked in the role of Instructional Coach at HLHS for the last three years. Before coming to HLHS, he worked as a project teacher at another network school. Louis possesses a deep understanding of the instructional and assessment models in practice at HLHS and the challenges and successes teachers are experiencing within these models. He regularly pushes back against programmatic proposals that are not clearly aligned to the vision and mission of the school.
Steve Siciliano	Dir. Special Education/Project Teacher (9-12)	Steve is a special education teacher of over five years. One half year, he worked as a Special Education teacher for the re-engagement program at a school that employs a similar instructional model. As the Director of Special Education at HLHS, Steve has in-depth knowledge of the needs of students on IEPs, and he provides ongoing professional development to staff regarding appropriately differentiating instructional and assessment strategies. Steve's experiences within the network and at this school specifically have cemented a firm appreciation for our Student Support pillar and the critical role that project teachers/advisors play in supporting the emotional and social needs and development of our students.
Jonathan Koelling	Core Math Teacher (9-12)	Jonathan is a highly qualified math teacher in his eighteenth year of teaching. For six of those years, Jonathan worked in schools with more traditional instructional models, but the majority of his experience has been teaching in a charter school with a more innovative approach. Though the majority of courses at HLHS are delivered through Entrepreneurial Project Based Learning, Jonathan was brought on at HLHS this year to provide core math instruction using the Integrated Mathematics Program curriculum; he has been able to approach this student learning through an Academic Project Based



		Learning approach.
Yolanda Shoemate	Project Teacher (9-12)	Yolanda has been teaching at HLHS for five of her thirty four teaching years. She is well-respected by her colleagues and by students. She is endorsed in Business Education, Bilingual Education, and Modern, Classical, and Native Languages. Before coming to HLHS, Yolanda spent two years working as a project teacher at a network school with a similar instructional model, but the majority of her teaching experience has occurred in schools with more traditional teaching and learning models.
Jennifer Prye	Project Teacher (9-12)	Jennifer Prye has worked in educations for fifteen years and holds a Secondary Vocational-Technical license. She is new to HLHS this year, coming from a CA school that employed a similar instructional model. She also spent five years with Military Education and Research, where she did clinical education for army, physical therapy students and airforce, psychology students, and she has some adjunct college teaching experience. She has expressed interest in beginning a literacy council at HLHS.
Terri Hogan	Governing Board Member	Teri worked in Secondary education for 27 years. She served as PE, Health and Special Education Teacher as well as an Athletic Trainer. She now works at the VA hospital as a Registered Nurse. She serves on the governing board and is staffed by the Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment.
Moneka Stevens	Community Engagement Director	Moneka, who holds an MCRP in Community Regional Planning, works as the CEC director for the school, serving as the liaison between the community, our community partners, and HLHS students and staff. Before joining HLHS in 2014, she worked as a youth director at NM forum for Youth and Community. She advocates for and supports the design of health projects in which academic learning outcomes are clearly aligned with the authentic work of healthcare professionals.

### **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.





Proficiency Data Over Time (on school report card):

2015: 2% proficient in math; 2% proficient in reading

2016: 2% proficient in math; 9% proficient in reading

2017: 2% proficient in math; 5% proficient in reading

NOTE: On the school report card, proficient is defined as receiving a proficient or advanced score on PARCC and SBA-Spanish

Short Cycle Comparative Growth Data (Discovery)

2015-2016: 87% of students made average to above average growth in math; 81% of students made average to above average growth in reading.

2016-2017: 85% of students made average to above average growth in math; 87% of students made average to above average growth in reading.

NOTE: We have transitioned to a state approved short cycle assessment, STAR 360. As a result, we only have access to reports previously downloaded and save from Discovery Ed. What we know for certain is that Discovery Ed was not well aligned to the PARCC. We certainly hope the new, short-cycle assessment is better aligned, but this will be a learning year and will make goal setting more difficult.

In our charter renewal application, our short cycle assessment goals are that:

- In reading 15% of students will make above average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360, and 70% of students will make average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360.
- In math 10% of students will make above average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360, and 65% of students will make average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360.

HLHS recognizes the critical importance of supporting the social-emotional well-being and growth of our students. We utilize the Developmental Assets Profile to assess students' social-emotional assets and to guide our work in this regard.

2015-2016: 22% of students had composite asset scores in the thriving range; 31% of students had composite asset scores in the adequate range.

2016-2017: 18% of students had composite asset scores in the thriving range; 33% of students had composite asset scores in the adequate range.



**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	2017 PARCC Results	2018 PARCC Goals	<u>Benchmarks:</u> How will you know you are on track to meet your summative student achievement goals?  *All benchmark goals for reading and math are the same regardless of level. As noted, we have no historical data from this short-cycle assessment, making it difficult to estimate the correlation between this assessment and the PARCC. As such, we are using the short-cycle goals from our charter.
9th grade ELA	2%	12%	15% of students will make above average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360, and 70% of students will make average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360.
10th grade ELA	8.7%	18.7%	15% of students will make above average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360, and 70% of students will make average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360.
11th grade ELA	3.8%	13.8%	15% of students will make above average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360, and 70% of students will make average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360.
Math 1	2.2%	12.2%	In math 10% of students will make above average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360, and 65% of students will make average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360.
Math 2	0%	10%	In math 10% of students will make above average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360, and 65% of students will make average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360.
Math 3	0%	10%	In math 10% of students will make above average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360, and 65% of students will make average growth between tests 1 and 3 on STAR 360.



### 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?

<p><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?</p>	<p><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?</p>
<p>Tier I (core) instruction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● 95% of students did not demonstrate proficiency on the ELA PARCC Assessments in 2017. This is 4% less students demonstrating proficiency on this assessment than in the previous year.</li> <li>● For the last three years, 98% of students did not demonstrate proficiency on the Math PARCC Assessments.</li> <li>● Teachers have noted the difficulty of providing rigorous math instruction within our primary instructional model, which is Project Based Learning. Despite the various applications of math content in the health field and within projects, the amount of time needed to adequately build background knowledge and computational skills is difficult to incorporate in a robust and authentic health project.</li> <li>● Our instructional model requires regular disciplined inquiry by students. As such, students interact with texts in all projects. This provides us with ample opportunity to teach and reinforce reading and writing strategies within projects. Teachers are interested in identifying high-leverage strategies that can be implemented across all projects.</li> <li>● Although classroom walkthroughs and project plans reflect regular disciplined inquiry, there is question about the complexity of texts students interact with and the level of rigor associated with reading and writing tasks in projects that are not explicitly linked to English credits.</li> </ul>



<p>Data-driven instruction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● HLHS employs a mastery-based/evidence-based assessment model. This model is counter to the way teachers were assessed when they were students, and most teachers did not deeply explore this model through their teacher preparation programs. Discussion of our assessment model and practices during weekly PD meetings indicate a need to further our shared understanding.</li> <li>● Walk-throughs and prep hour conversations with teaching teams reveal that assessment and feedback practices vary substantially across the school and are not always aligned with our assessment model.</li> <li>● The vast majority of professional development has focused on project design and tuning, rather than on the assessment model and practices.</li> <li>● 33% of teachers at HLHS in 2016-2017 received less than effective scores for Domain 1F: Designing Student Assessment.</li> <li>● We have purchased a new short-cycle assessment and teachers have not yet been trained on the reporting functions and how to interpret the data.</li> <li>● The process for determining which students will receive additional reading and math intervention through our newly purchased short-cycle assessment and intervention software (STARS 360 Renaissance) has not been articulated.</li> </ul>
--------------------------------	---

**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>
Tier I (core) instruction	<p>There are no explicit school wide expectations regarding high-impact literacy and math practices occurring in all projects.</p> <p>Providing rigorous math instruction within authentic health projects is difficult because of the need to build the foundational knowledge and skills that are prerequisite to the authentic needs for math within the projects.</p>	<p>-Evidenced in walk throughs, project design documents and prep hour conversations between the CIA Director, Instructional Coach, and project teachers.</p> <p>-Walkthrough tool does not support monitoring and tuning literacy and math instruction in all projects.</p> <p>Assessments (short-cycle, PARCC, and teacher created) occurring in previous years' support teacher reflection.</p>
Data-driven instruction	<p>Teachers have not received adequate professional learning support to effectively and consistently enact the mastery-based assessment and feedback model.</p>	<p>Historical PD agendas reflect that the focus on schoolwide and network PD has been on project design work rather than on the assessment model and how to use assessment results to inform feedback, teaching, and learning.</p>





**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):</i> What is the Desired Outcome? What will be different if you are successful in focusing on this area of practice? After 90 days, what changes in practice will be observed?
Tier I (core) instruction	Core math instruction will occur outside of health projects; Literacy and math teams will meet biweekly to identify high-impact literacy and math strategies; teachers will lead monthly PD focusing on specific strategies; biweekly non-evaluative leadership team walkthroughs will include feedback specific to these schoolwide practices
Data-driven instruction	All teachers’ professional development plans will include a goal related to designing and using assessment data; bi-weekly prep-hour meetings between project teachers and the curriculum, instruction, and assessment team will always include discussion of assessment and feedback practices; each trimester (for trimesters 2 and 3) there will be at least two critical friend protocols enacted in order to examine teacher assessment and feedback practices.



*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:** Tier 1 (core) instruction

**Desired Outcome:** Core math instruction will occur outside of health projects; Literacy and math teams will meet biweekly to identify high-impact literacy and math strategies; teachers will lead monthly PD focusing on specific strategies; biweekly non-evaluative leadership team walkthroughs will include feedback specific to these schoolwide practices.

**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>
8/14/17	The published master schedule will include core math blocks	Master schedule template	A. Reno	V. Mota (registrar)
11/3/17	Literacy and Math team membership will be determined by the end of the Oct/Nov PD week and a schedule for trimester 2 meetings and PD will be developed	Calendar template	A. Reno	All teachers; Instructional Coach



11/6/17 through 5/25/18	Literacy and Math teams will meet four times each trimester (for trimesters 2 and 3) in order to identify high-impact strategies based on the needs reflected by the interim assessment data, plan PD to share these best practices, and reflect on the effect of the implementation	Collaboration time for team members  Resources to support determination of high-impact strategies (Marzano, Brinkman, and Knight texts)  Interim assessment results	Team Leads	Director of CIA, All teachers; Instructional Coach
11/6/17	Revise feedback tool to ensure feedback will be provided regarding the inclusion of the identified high-impact literacy and math practices.	Feedback tool	A. Reno	Leadership team
11/1/17 through 5/25/18	Literacy and math teams will facilitate PD twice per trimester (for trimesters 2 and 3) to share the identified high-impact strategies to be implemented in all projects	PD time (to occur during Friday PD time)	A. Reno	All teachers; Instructional Coach
12/1/17 through 5/25/18	Biweekly, non-evaluative walkthroughs by the leadership team followed by 1:1 feedback specific to the incorporation of identified high-impact strategies	Shared calendar for walkthroughs  Revised Feedback tool  Bambrick text	B. Lopez	Leadership team

<b>Focus Area:</b> Data-driven instruction				
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> All teachers' professional development plans will include a goal related to designing and using assessment data; biweekly prep-hour meetings between project teachers and the curriculum, instruction, and assessment team will always include discussion of assessment and feedback practices; each trimester (for trimesters 2 and 3) there will be at least two critical friend protocols enacted in order to examine teacher assessment and feedback practices.				
<b>CRITICAL ACTIONS</b>				
<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>	
7/27/17	All HLHS teachers will attend the Network Summer PD Session: Mastery Assessment , in an effort to begin building a more consistent, shared understanding of our assessment model	Excerpts from <i>Pathways to Proficiency</i> Network Collaboration	A. Reno	CIA Directors from other network schools All teachers
9/8/17	Friday morning PD focuses on the data included in our school report card.  Teachers begin brainstorming strategies for addressing students' literacy and math needs.	PD Time  Copies of school report card	A. Reno	All teachers  Leadership  Testing Coordinator
10/11/17	All teachers PDPs will include a goal related to assessment and feedback. This school wide initiative will drive PD planning and become a critical focus of the professional conversations between teachers, the IC, and the CIA Director.	<i>Pathways to Proficiency</i>	A. Reno	All teachers  Instructional Coach
10/16/17 through 5/25/18	Teachers will participate in bi-weekly prep-hour conversations with the CIA Director. Every conversation will include discussion of assessment practices, helping to build shared understanding of the assessment model, ensuring that teachers are planning for students to have multiple opportunities to demonstrate proficiency, receive feedback and additional instruction before attempting to demonstrate proficiency again.	<i>Pathways to Proficiency</i>  Bi-weekly meetings during prep times between teachers and the CIA Director.	A. Reno	All Teachers  Instructional Coach
11/6/17	All teaching staff will	<i>Pathways to</i>	A. Reno	All teachers



through 5/25/18	participate in a professional book study (3 PD sessions during Tri2, and 2 PD sessions during Tri3 will focus on the concepts shared in the book). This book focuses on evidence-based grading practices and how to provide meaningful, actionable feedback.	<i>Proficiency</i>  5 morning PD sessions		Instructional Coach
11/6/17 through 5/25/18	For trimesters 2 and 3, there will be at least two critical friend protocols enacted in order to examine teacher assessment and feedback practices.	Protocols  Teacher Assessments  Student work w/ examples of feedback given	A. Reno	All teachers  Instructional Coach

**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?

**Focus Area:** Tier 1 (core) instruction

**Desired Outcome:**

Core math instruction will occur outside of health projects; Literacy and math teams will meet biweekly to identify high-impact literacy and math strategies; teachers will lead monthly PD focusing on specific strategies; biweekly non-evaluative leadership team walkthroughs will include feedback specific to these schoolwide practices.

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

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
-----------------------	--	------------------------------



Week of 8/14/17	Ensure that master schedule includes core math courses and students have been scheduled accordingly. Review with leadership team and registrar.	N/A
Week of 11/6/17	Review Literacy and Math team membership during the Leadership Meeting and approve meeting and PD schedules.	N/A
Monthly; 11/16/17 through 5/25/18	Review Literacy and Math team meeting agendas; Review feedback forms from Literacy and Math team PDs.; Evidence of strategies shared during PDs will be observable within 1 week	Additional modeling or coaching from IC to support teachers struggling with implementation of strategies; film exemplary application of the strategies in practice to share with teachers who need additional examples
Monthly; 12/1/17 through 5/25/18	Leadership team will debrief the biweekly observation cycle once per month  Leadership team will observe strategies in practice in 100% of projects	Additional modeling or coaching from IC to support teachers struggling with implementation of strategies; film exemplary application of the strategies in practice to share with teachers who need additional examples

<b>Focus Area:</b> Data-driven instruction		
<b>Desired Outcome:</b> All teachers' professional development plans will include a goal related to designing and using assessment data; bi-weekly prep-hour meetings between project teachers and the curriculum, instruction, and assessment team will always include discussion of assessment and feedback practices; each trimester (for trimesters 2 and 3) there will be at least two critical friend protocols enacted in order to examine teacher assessment and feedback practices.		
<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>
10/11/17	100% of PDPs will include a goal related to assessment and feedback	CIA Director will work with teachers who need support with the PDP goal-setting form
Ongoing; after each formal	100% of teachers will improve assessment practices between their first and second formal observation.	Teachers who are excelling after the first observation cycle will provide mentorship, modeling, or



<p>observation</p>		<p>other support to the teaching staff</p> <p>Struggling teachers will be afforded additional instructional coaching support.</p>
--------------------	--	---

**System to Monitor Implementation**

**Weekly Leadership Meetings:**

During weekly leadership meetings, there will be a brief update by the CIA Dir. regarding the implementation of the 90-Day plan.

**Monthly Core Team Meetings:**

The Core Team will meet monthly (beginning in November) to co-author a brief report on the implementation of the 90 Day plan, to include evidence of the plan’s effects on practice and student achievement. This report will be shared with the Leadership Team, all staff, and the governing council.

**Interim Assessment Data-Analysis Meetings:**

Within two weeks of the administration of the Winter Interim Assessment, one morning PD will focus on analysis of the results in order to determine whether we are on track to meet our Benchmark Goals.

Within two weeks of the administration of the Spring Interim Assessment, one morning PD will focus on analysis of the results in order to determine whether we have met our Benchmark Goals.





Technology Leadership High School  
**PROPOSED: PEC Charter School Improvement Plan (SIP)**

Name of Charter School		Technology Leadership High School		School State ID Number	561	
Head Administrator		Kara Cortazzo		School Year	2017-2018	
Governing Board Approval Date		October 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2017		Submission Date	October 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2017	
Performance Framework Area for Improvement (Academic, Financial, Organizational) Specific Performance Indicator in Need of Improvement		Academic	Financial	Organizational	Deadline for Charter School to Demonstrate Improvement	NA
		Performance Goals for Reading 17-18 SY				
Remediation Strategy(ies)	Action Step(s)	Timeline	Person/Program Responsible for Implementation	How will you demonstrate success of the Remediation Strategy(ies)	Outcome Evidence (Data)	Met/ Did Not Meet
Students will read and comprehend a variety of informational texts and communicate ideas through writing.	<p>Students will read with fluency</p> <p>Students will comprehend written text.</p> <p>Students will communicate ideas through writing</p> <p>Students will use technology research tools to locate, evaluate, and collect information to analyze data and communicate results</p> <p>Students will use a variety of media and formats to collaborate and communicate idea to public audiences</p>	17-18 SY	Teachers	The school will meet or exceeds the target of this indicator of 75-84% or more of identified students: made more than one full year’s growth in reading short-cycle assessment scores when comparing beginning year results to later results OR test at “at or above grade level” on the winter or spring short-cycle assessment.	Star Reading Data for 17-18 SY	

Technology Leadership High School  
**PROPOSED: PEC Charter School Improvement Plan (SIP)**

Expand Vocabulary Knowledge and Use	Word walls will be utilized in project rooms to expand student vocabulary	17-18 SY	Director of Curriculum	The school will meet or exceeds the target of this indicator of 75-84% or more of identified students: made more than one full year's growth in math short-cycle assessment scores when comparing beginning year results to later results OR test at "at or above grade level" on the winter or spring short-cycle assessment.	Star Math Data for 17-18 SY	
-------------------------------------	---	----------	------------------------	--	-----------------------------	--

- School Improvement Plan (SIP) process pursuant to *Charter School Contract*-Section 4.03 (a)

Technology Leadership High School  
**PROPOSED: PEC Charter School Improvement Plan (SIP)**

Name of Charter School		Technology Leadership High School		School State ID Number		561	
Head Administrator		Kara Cortazzo		School Year		2017-2018	
Governing Board Approval Date		October 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2017		Submission Date		October 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2017	
Performance Framework Area for Improvement (Academic, Financial, Organizational) Specific Performance Indicator in Need of Improvement		Academic	Financial	Organizational	Deadline for Charter School to Demonstrate Improvement		
		Performance Goals for Math 17-18 SY					
Remediation Strategy(ies)	Action Step(s)	Timeline	Person/Program Responsible for Implementation	How will you demonstrate success of the Remediation Strategy(ies)	Outcome Evidence (Data)	Met/ Did Not Meet	
Students will use problem solving skills to think critically and apply knowledge and reason to solving real world problems.	<p>Teachers will give strategies for students to think and reason effectively when students are not able to problem solve successfully</p> <p>Teachers will reinforce how to solve problems accurately using problem solving skills through rituals and routines that support conceptual understanding of math</p> <p>Teachers will have students communicate using mathematical language by having the students demonstrate skills and knowledge of math concepts by problem solving using technology tools to collect information and data to make informed decisions for solving real world problems</p>	17-18 SY	Teachers	The school will meet or exceeds the target of this indicator of 75-84% or more of identified Teachers will teach students: made more than one full year's growth in math short-cycle assessment scores when comparing beginning year results to later results OR test at "at or above grade level" on the winter or spring short-cycle assessment.	Star Math Data for 17-18 SY		

- School Improvement Plan (SIP) process pursuant to *Charter School Contract*-Section 4.03 (a)

**PROPOSED: PEC Charter School Improvement Plan (SIP)**

- **One (1)** Improvement Plan Template for **each** Performance Indicator identified as “Does Not Meet,” “Working to Meet Standard” or “Falls Far Below Standard”
- Outcomes of the charter school’s improvement must be evidenced with data
- Completion and evaluation of SIP results by CSD/PEC-May

**Technology Leadership High School Minutes**October 18<sup>th</sup>, 2017

4:30 PM

6100 Uptown Blvd NE #350, Albuquerque, NM 87110

## 1. Opening Business

## a. Call to Order

## b. Take Roll:

- Board President, Al Hernandez – Present via phone
- Board Vice President, John Mierzwa- Present
- Board Member, John Duran-Absent
- Board Member, Kersti Verna Tyson-Present
- Board Member – Pauline Lucero-Present

## Other:

- Executive Director, Kara Cortazzo- Present
- Director of Finance, Yolanda Tafoya-Present
- Secretary, Thalia Silva-Present
- Guest, Abby Lewis-Present

## c. Vote to Approve Agenda-

VOTES: Al Hernandez motions to approve agenda, seconded by Pauline Lucero.4-0

d. Vote to Approve Minutes from September 12<sup>th</sup>, 2017 Board Meeting-

VOTES: John Mierzwa motions to approve agenda, seconded by Pauline Lucero. 4-0

## 2. Public Comment- No Public Comments

## 3. Action Items

## A) Improvement Plan

An improvement plan must be written for reading and math due to the grade of the school "F".

Executive Director has attached a copy for Board Members to review. After discussing the improvement plan, Board Members recommended to make a couple changes to the wording.

VOTES: John Mierzwa motions to approve with recommended changes, seconded by Pauline Lucero. 4-0

## B) Volunteer Policy

New policy for TLHS. Board members reviewed new policy. Please see attached.

## C) Attendance Policy

Attendance policy was updated. Please see attached.

## D) Background Check Policy

Attendance policy was updated. Board Members reviewed. Please see attached.

## E) Volunteer Pledge

New policy for TLHS. Board members reviewed. Please see attached.

VOTES: Kersti Verna Tyson motions to approve Volunteer Policy, Attendance Policy, Background Check Policy and Volunteer Pledge as amended, seconded by Pauline Lucero. 4-0

## F) Number of Board Members per CSD directive

Charter School Division is asking charter schools to have a specific amount of board members to comply. Our contract with CSD states that we can have 5-7 Board Members. It does not specify a

number now. Abby Lewis explained to Board Members that we can keep our contract stating 5-7 Board

members and comply with the law. Executive Director will meet with Abby Lewis to write a response to CSD.

VOTES: Pauline Lucero motions to respond to CSD as advised from legal counsel, seconded by Kersti Verna Tyson. 4-0

G) Bar Approval

561-000-1718-0008-IB – Fund 31200 Capital Outlay Lease Assistance \$84,301

561-000-1718-0009-IB - Fund 27103 1000 Dual Credit \$304

561-000-1718-0010-IB - Fund 27107 2200 Capital Outlay GO Library SB66 \$2,450

561-000-1718-0011-I - Fund 14000 1000 Instructional Materials \$1,688

561-0000-1718-0012-I - Fund 31400 4000 Special Capital Outlay \$100,000

VOTES: John Mierwza motions to approve, seconded by Pauline Lucero. 4-0

4. Information Items

▪ Budget Overview

Director of Finance reviewed Cash Report of first quarter ending September 30 with Board Members. No Discrepancies.

▪ Expenditure Comparison by Month

Director of Finance reviewed with board members the comparison of school year 2016-2017 expenses to current school year.

▪ Bank Reconciliation Report

Bank Reconciliation of September 2017 had no discrepancies. Please see attached.

▪ Statement of Revenues and Expenditures

Reviewed with Board Members. Please see attached.

▪ Balance Sheet

Reviewed with Board Members. Please see attached.

▪ School Grade

Executive Director reviewed categories with Board Members. She emailed PED to have them explain how they compare the scores. PED has not responded. She reviewed the categories she understands. For the surveys that parents, teacher and students submit to PED received a score of a “B” which means we are doing a good job serving our students. TLHS also received 4 bonus points for reducing truancy engaging with families using technology. Executive Director will focus on the categories that we can have control.

▪ APS Charter Application

Application was submitted October 2, 2017.

▪ APS Site Visit – November 6<sup>th</sup> (1:00-2:00)

Executive Director would like for two board members to attend the meeting. Abby Lewis will attend this site visit and Board Members will check their availability.

▪ APS Charter Public Meeting at 5:30 on Tuesday, 10/24 at John Milne Board Meeting

Executive Director will present our charter to APS Board for ten minutes. A parent and student will also attend and talk about our school. If possible she would like a Board Member to attend.

▪ APS Board of Education’s Policy Committee meeting at 4 PM, Wednesday, 12/13

During this meeting, it will be determined if TLHS is accepted as an APS Charter.

▪ CSD Site Visit on 12/15

Charter School Division will be at TLHS for our yearly visit. They will be at TLHS for the day.

▪ Reengagement Program

We currently have 30 students enrolled. The program is going well.

▪ Student Enrollment

We have 179 students enrolled. The target of students is 180.

- New Mexico for School Leadership Data Collection  
They want to collect data of our students. Executive Director does not feel comfortable to release Student ID's for this data collection. She will look more into the IRB to understand it before signing it. Abby Lewis and Executive Director will meet with UNM and take a decision based on the meeting. She will let Board Members know.

5. Discussion Items

- a. La Resolana Leadership Academy Charter School  
APS asked Executive Director if she can help La Resolana Leadership Academy Charter School with recruitment since we target the same population. Now, Executive Director will not be able to help due to the process of changing from state to APS. If La Resolana Leadership Academy gets re charter she is willing to help.

6. Closing Business

- a. Announcements  
No announcements
- b. Next Scheduled Meeting- November 14, 2017 at 4:30 6100 Uptown Blvd NE #350, Albuquerque, NM 87110
- c. Adjournment