

LEA Comprehensive Support and Improvement Competitive Grants Application

| | |
|--|--|
| LEA Name: | Albuquerque Public Schools |
| Submitting on Behalf of (name of school): | Maryann Binford Elementary School |
| Number of Students Served: | 758 |
| Number of Certified Licensed Staff: | 71 |

I. LEA Organizational Culture


A. LEA Overview

Describe the comprehensive needs assessment process that was used to identify needs and performance challenges in the district, to determine root causes, and set priorities for future action.

The APS Academic Master Plan

When Superintendent Reedy took the reins of the Albuquerque Public Schools (APS) in 2015, one of her first acts was to appoint a steering committee of district leaders to develop a comprehensive Academic Master Plan. With input from practitioners, families and the public, the Academic Master Plan Steering Committee crafted a list of shared principles and values upon which the Academic Master Plan is based:

- Safe schools
- Whole child development
- Quality teaching
- Healthy, supportive relationships
- Equitable access for all
- Student voice, feedback and involvement
- Innovative learning
- Developmentally appropriate curriculum
- Community and culturally responsive curriculum
- Social and emotional growth
- Authentic assessments
- Open communication with parents and community



As a part of the academic master plan process, the district also worked with stakeholders, including business owners and community leaders, to create a graduate profile outlining the skills, attitudes and characteristics APS graduates need in order to be successful members of our community. This process was facilitated by Mission: Graduate. The Albuquerque Public Schools Graduate Profile is included here.

Working backwards from the graduate profile, and keeping the shared principles and values in mind, the APS Academic Master Plan Committee defined three key goals for the district: Early Learning, College and Career Readiness and Developing the Whole Child. These goals are further defined as described below:

- **Goal 1. Early Learning:** Early learning begins at home, is nurtured in supportive classrooms as children develop language and number skills, and grows as students become adept at using these skills in a variety of ways.
- **Goal 2: College and Career Readiness:** All students will graduate – without the need for remediation – having the skills, attitudes and characteristics to prepare them for post-secondary education, careers and life in an ever-evolving global community.
- **Goal 3: Developing the Whole Child:** Students develop physically, mentally, emotionally, socially and intellectually in safe and welcoming environments that remove barriers to learning, embrace individuality and connect to their community.

The process of developing the APS Academic Master Plan also led the district to think deeply about how it could best support schools in achieving the ambitious vision defined in the plan. Rather than organizing schools into grade levels, the district recognized that schools only exist embedded into communities and that each school represents a network of relationships between students, families, teachers, and community members. So that district leadership and support could be more responsive to community needs and more embedded within community relationships, the district created four zones and named an Associate Superintendent of Leadership and Learning for each zone at the beginning of the 2017-2018 school year.

With this vision of success in mind, Albuquerque Public Schools has defined two processes to identify needs and performance challenges, to determine root causes of educational struggles, and to set priorities for future action, both for the district and for individual schools. These two continuous improvement processes are the APS Academic Master Plan Performance Framework and the NM DASH 90-Day Plan process.

The APS Academic Master Plan Performance Framework

Using the APS Academic Master Plan Performance Framework, schools are measured by an APS defined and developed Performance Framework for articulating holistic school performance in four categories, which are measured quantitatively from several data sources:

1. School Culture and Climate:

- Parent Survey
- Teacher Survey
- Student Survey
- Teacher Retention

2. Growth and Achievement

- Percentage of students improving on PARCC ELA
- Percentage of students improving on PARCC Math
- Percentage of 2nd graders at Reading benchmark

- Percentage of non-benchmark 2nd graders at Reading benchmark by 4th grade
- Percentage of students improving on iReady
- Percentage of students taking and passing Advanced Placement or Dual Credit classes
- Four-year cohort graduation rate
- Percentage of students in a cohort meeting College & Career Readiness standards

3. Student Engagement

- Attendance
- Truancy
- NM TEACH Domain 3 Scores
- Student Survey

4. Parents and Community Engagement

- Quality of Education Survey Results
- Quality of Education Survey Return Rate

The APS Academic Master Plan Steering Committee developed these categories after consulting with practitioners and community members and identifying key themes from these stakeholder dialogues. Each piece of feedback was read, categorized and labeled. Then, the Office of Accountability and Reporting (OAR) determined which data sources to use in Performance Framework calculations. Principals provided input into the desired weight of each indicator within each category: School Culture & Climate, Growth & Achievement, Student Engagement and Parent & Community Engagement. For each indicator in each category, schools are identified as green, yellow or red as a visual cue. After reviewing the results of the Performance Framework and the needs of each school, district leadership created a tiered system of support for schools with multiple entry points, depending on school needs and areas of concern indicated by the Performance Framework.


NM DASH 90-Day Plan

The APS Academic Master Plan Performance Framework complements the New Mexico Public Education Department's NM DASH 90-Day Plan process. Based on the information from the APS Performance Framework, APS required underperforming schools to start the NM DASH 90-Day plan in the spring of 2017. The remaining APS schools will complete their 90-Day Plans in the spring of 2018. Thus, all APS schools are using the 90-Day Plan process, which identifies needs and performance challenges, determines root causes, and sets priorities for future action.

Albuquerque Public Schools believes schools are the unit of change and has invested significantly in the district's capacity to assist schools in using the NM DASH 90-Day Plan to drive the school improvement process. To specifically address school growth and achievement within the NM DASH 90-Day Plan process, APS established a School Accountability Support (SAS) Department. SAS is the premier data-coaching team in the district. SAS applies research-based practices in their work with APS schools. Specifically, SAS introduces processes and protocols from *Data Wise* (Parker Boudette, City, & Murnane, 2008) to enhance the 90-Day Plan process. APS annotated the Data Wise model with the NM

DASH 90-Day Plan process to facilitate robust school improvement. Figure 1 displays the alignment of these two programs.

Figure 1. *Relationship Between Data Wise and the NM DASH 90-Day Plan*



In concurrence with these resources, SAS furnishes customized data reports for schools. For example, SAS generates an evidence statement analysis report that elucidates source data for school-wide analysis and planning. SAS also generates reports based on PARCC school student content roster data. By intertwining this data with class rostering, SAS

empowers teachers to think about their approach to differentiated instruction. SAS also uses the school report card, the performance level summary for each assessment, and individual student reports as school data analysis opportunities. With these in-hand resources, SAS conducts whole-staff professional development, trains school-based core teams, and coaches instructional coaches and lead teachers.

Finally, SAS provides comprehensive support for schools completing their NM DASH 90-Day plans. SAS Accountability Support Coordinators and NM DASH Coordinators not only serve on school core teams as district representatives, but they also provide regular feedback as schools construct and implement their plans. Furthermore, SAS conducts comprehensive training for APS schools on how to complete and submit their 90-Day Plans. This includes managing all APS accounts in the NM DASH portal.

Describe the results of a systematic review of existing LEA capacity, strengths, and needs related to curriculum, instruction, and assessment.

In the fall of 2017, APS utilized a Strengths-Weaknesses-Opportunities-Threats (SWOT) strategic analysis process to review the district's current reality. These results, along with community input, were used to determine the focus areas for the district's Academic Master Plan. The district has continued to use this process annually to examine its capacity, strengths and needs related to curriculum, instruction, and assessment. SWOT analysis is a formal process by which organizations position themselves to have a competitive advantage. This tool allows organizations to maximize opportunities and minimize threats in the environment while maximizing the advantages of the organization's strengths and minimizing its weaknesses (Heizer & Render, 2014).

District leadership completed the SWOT process utilizing tools and processes consistent with prior reviews. This review provided important details as district leadership identified needs

and performance challenges and began to establish priorities for future action. The review challenged district leadership to consider any preconceived notions about the district and measure this against the analysis.

A number of themes emerged in the most recent analysis. In terms of **Strengths (S)**, district leadership noted:

- As a large urban district, APS is able to offer a diverse range of academic programs. This has allowed the district to provide a large number of Advanced Placement classes. Dual Language programs are growing. The Executive Director of Innovation recently received grant funds to support the creation of a comprehensive K-12 STEM magnet program in a cluster of three schools.
- APS offers the most comprehensive special education programs in the state, encouraging families from across the state to move to APS and enroll their special needs children.
- APS offers an extensive range of CTE coursework and opportunities for multiple programs of study and meta-majors through access to dual credit from four post-secondary institution partners.
- APS instituted Instructional Rounds and more focused PD for principals this year.
- Community Schools are a growing stronger and more prevalent in APS.
- APS is fostering a collaborative culture across the district.
- The Learning Zone structure has tightened the district's organizational structure.

As far as **Weaknesses (W)**, the team noted:

- APS lacks professional development centered on turnaround strategies.
- APS needs a common interim assessment that is consistent with state standards.
- It is difficult to find time for impactful teacher training.
- There is a teacher shortage, which schools with special programs such as Dual Language or Special Education, feel most deeply.
- High turnover rates for both teachers and administration.
- The district needs to develop consistent K-12 pathways for students so they can follow a curriculum throughout their school career.
- The district needs to determine a K-12 ELA curriculum that supports teachers in Common Core State Standards based instruction.
- Teachers need ongoing professional development opportunities that support not only the implementation of adopted curriculum, but also deep pedagogical shifts and strategies that engage students.

In examining **Opportunities (O)**, APS identified:

- An improving budget forecast.
- Increased partnerships with external entities to include universities, community colleges and local non-profit organizations.

- A wide range of rural, suburban and urban schools, coupled with magnet and charter schools, offers parents a portfolio of school options to choose from.
- Innovative schools and school programs serve as demonstration labs for the district.
- The state has placed a greater focus on the importance of early childhood education.
- The Council of Great City Schools is looking for ways to support the current administration and developing initiatives.
- An improving relationship with the Public Education Department, including increased grant opportunities.

External **Threats (T)** include:

- A state budget that is too reliant on oil prices.
- A loss of instructional time tied to an increased number of lockdowns due to crime in the city.
- High population mobility.
- A lack of full-day pre-K programs to build early skills.
- A lack of public confidence in APS, coupled with actual misinformation about the district.
- Finally, a common expectation that school is a place to fix community problems, such as homelessness, hunger, poverty, and drug abuse.

APS is able to apply this analysis to its capacity and needs, identifying specific evidence-based interventions to assist schools in need of significant improvement. Clearly, issues around curriculum and talent management are at the forefront of this analysis and will guide the district's decision-making process moving forward.

B. Instructional Infrastructure

Instructional Materials: Describe the process used to ensure that grade level scopes and sequences align with the Common Core State Standards for ELA/Reading and math.

The Albuquerque Public Schools Department of Curriculum and Instruction (C&I) is responsible for ensuring that grade level scopes and sequences used by schools and teachers align with New Mexico Common Core State Standards (NMCCSS) for ELA/Reading and Math. The instructional materials adoption process establishes clear alignment to NMCCSS as a requirement for consideration. Delivery of scope and sequence is, however, not determined by adopted curriculum. Scope and sequence maps were created at the district level with the initial implementation of NMCCSS.

As a part of the process by which the district purchases instructional materials, APS C&I requires that all materials be written to align with the New Mexico Common Core State Standards. Materials only reorganized to align with the NMCCSS are not considered for use or purchase by the district. This is true for both for ELA/Reading and Math.

K-5 Mathematics

Albuquerque Public Schools uses Origo Stepping Stones as its K-5 core math program. Stepping Stones is aligned with the New Mexico Common Core State Standards and was

adopted by the district in 2014. The NMCCSS call for three shifts in the approach to teaching mathematics: a greater **focus** on fewer topics; more **coherence** of topics across grades; and increased **rigor** in math instruction. The Origo Stepping Stones curriculum for students in grades K-5 builds conceptual understanding through rigorous problem-solving activities, and supports computational fluency with strategies and practice.

In addition, the APS Department of Curriculum & Instruction is currently drafting new frameworks for K-5 Math, to be finished in April 2018 for use in the coming 2018-2019 school year. The purpose of the frameworks is to increase student achievement by ensuring that educators understand specifically what the NMCCSS mean and what students must know, understand and be able to do. In addition, frameworks are intentionally program agnostic to ensure longevity and fidelity of the implementation. Frameworks may also be used to facilitate discussion among teachers and curriculum staff and to encourage coherence in the sequence, pacing, and backwards planning for grade-level curricula. The APS Elementary Math Curriculum Frameworks, along with on-going professional development, are one of many resources used to understand and teach New Mexico Common Core State Standards in Mathematics with fidelity in APS classrooms.

K-5 Literacy

Albuquerque Public Schools adopted the Macmillan/McGraw-Hill program Treasures/Tesoros as its core K-5 English/Spanish Language Arts program in 2008, before the New Mexico Common Core State Standards were adopted in 2010. A small number of schools adopted StoryTown/Villa Cuentos, published by Harcourt, at the same time. Since 2010, both publishers have aligned these programs to the NMCCSS. Both of these programs are now outside of the official adoption period.

In addition to the officially adopted ELA/SLA K-5 program, all K-5 schools in APS have access to Foundations, which is a supplemental core program in grades K-2. Foundations is a multisensory early literacy program that focuses on phonemic awareness, phonics, high frequency word study, reading fluency, vocabulary, comprehension strategies, handwriting, and spelling. Foundations is aligned to the NMCCSS and is part of a Response to Intervention (RTI) framework. Ideally, Foundations is used to provide research-based instruction to all students as a Tier 1 approach. It is also appropriate for as a Tier 2 intervention for students at risk for reading difficulties, according to the publisher. Although Foundations includes comprehension strategies, it must be combined with a core/literature-based language arts program for an integrated and comprehensive approach to reading and spelling.

In response to the need for standards-aligned ELA/Reading instruction, the APS Department of Curriculum & Instruction is providing professional development for teachers through the Consortium on Reaching Excellence in Education (CORE). CORE Literacy was introduced to APS by the New Mexico Public Education Department (NMPED) through the Reads To Lead Grant. CORE Literacy is program agnostic and emphasizes the foundational reading skills each student must master to become a successful reader. Its professional development offerings help teachers make the shifts required by the NMCCSS in ELA. CORE Literacy trainers in APS offer CORE Literacy professional development, with upcoming training beginning in spring 2018, and summer institutes that can be earmarked for new staff of our

Comprehensive Support & Improvement (CSI) schools. CORE Literacy research shows a direct correlation to the skills, knowledge and abilities required by the NMCCSS.

6-12 Mathematics & Literacy

After the New Mexico Common Core State Standards were adopted in 2010, the district created scope and sequence maps for each grade level and subject area, which were completed in 2013. The APS Department of Curriculum and Instruction has also created units of study linked to the NMCCSS and the grade level scopes and sequences. These guiding documents are available online through APS C&I.

As complex understandings of the NMCCSS grew, individual teachers and schools began to reorganize the way the scope and sequence was delivered to reflect that understanding. The district is now at a point where schools have moved out of alignment with each other and is in the midst of a realignment process. All secondary schools are being surveyed in all ELA and Math courses to determine the month in which each standard is the primary focus of instruction. These surveys will be compiled at a district level to determine sequencing patterns for each course. New course scope and sequence documents will be created which are more reflective of the current implementation of NMCCSS.

Beginning in 2018-2019, standards will be clustered by grading term rather than month, so that student grades on report cards are an indicator of mastery of a specific set of standards. This aligns with the district Academic Master Plan and its focus on standards-aligned instruction and grades as an indicator of a student's ability to meet standards. A common scope and sequence will also allow teachers within a school to design common formative assessments by grade or course. The data from formative assessments can be disaggregated immediately at a classroom level to see if students are proficient in the specific standards addressed for that term.

The survey of individual course alignment of standards by school are due by May 2018. These will be analyzed and translated into new scope and sequence documents available for implementation in the fall of 2018. With all secondary schools following the same scope and sequence, professional development can be targeted to the specific standards that are being taught at that time and embedded in classroom practice.

A common scope and sequence across schools will be complemented by common vertically aligned curriculum. Instructional materials scheduled for purchase this summer will allow all secondary schools to utilize the Springboard curriculum for ELA. This rigorous curriculum, designed by the College Board, has already shown strong achievement gains in pilot middle schools and has been fully implemented in high schools for two years. The district also has national Springboard trainers in our schools who facilitate ongoing professional development.

Schools will be encouraged to use Eureka Math at both the middle and high school level to allow for similar vertical alignment. Instructional materials for Eureka Math are printed on demand at a district level and can be sequenced to match the district scope and sequence for math courses to allow for more convenient implementation.

Instruction: Describe the system of support and accountability for teachers and leaders in implementing rigorous standards-aligned instruction.

Multi-Tiered System of Support for Schools

As described previously in this application, Albuquerque Public School has developed a Performance Framework for schools in order to better understand individual schools' strengths and needs. Using a multi-tiered system of support with multiple entry points, district leadership customizes both the intensity and the type of support received by school leaders in their school improvement efforts. Because APS believes that schools are the unit of change, the district has carefully aligned its resources, supports and level of supervision to the needs of the schools to better catalyze the school transformation process. The support structure is as follows:

Tier 1 Criteria:

- NMPED School Grade: A or B.
- APS Performance Framework: 0-1 Red Areas.

Tier 1 Support Plan:

- Participation in instructional rounds.
- District-led monthly professional learning.

Tier 2 Criteria:

- NMPED School Grade: A, B or C.
- APS Performance Framework: 2-3 Red Areas.

Tier 2 Support Plan:

- Participation in instructional rounds.
- District-led monthly professional learning.
- Monthly site visits by Principal Support Specialists/Associate Superintendents.

Tier 3 Criteria:

- NMPED School Grade: D or F.
- APS Performance Framework: 2-4 Red Areas.
- NMPED Designation of Targeted Support & Improvement (TSI).

Tier 3 Support Plan:

- Participation in instructional rounds.
- District-led monthly professional learning.
- Monthly monitor/data review visits by Principal Support Specialist/Associate Superintendent.
- Implementation of Early Warning Systems protocols.
- Data Wise Analysis of iReady & Istation Student Formative Assessments.
- Principals Pursuing Excellence

Tier 4 Criteria:

- NMPED Designation of Comprehensive Support & Improvement (CSI).

Tier 4 Support Plan:

- Participation in instructional rounds.
- District-led monthly professional learning.
- Monthly monitor/data review visit for plan by Associate Superintendent.
- Implementation of Early Warning Systems protocols.
- Data Wise Analysis of iReady & Istation Student Formative Assessments.
- Priority staffing.
- Full-time assistant principal and instructional coach.
- Participation in School Turnaround Leadership Training through Harvard Graduate School of Education beginning in 2019-2020.

Tier 5 Criteria:

- NMPED Designation of More Rigorous Intervention (MRI)

Tier 5 Support Plan:

- Participation in instructional rounds.
- District-led monthly professional learning.
- Monthly monitor/data review visit for plan by Associate Superintendent.
- Implementation of Early Warning Systems protocols.
- Data Wise Analysis of iReady & Istation Student Formative Assessments.
- Priority staffing and budgetary oversight.
- Full-time assistant principal and instructional coach.
- School Turnaround Leadership Training through Harvard Graduate School of Education

APS plans to work with the Harvard Graduate School of Education to develop the capacity of principals at MRI schools and district leadership through its School Turnaround Leaders program. School turnaround efforts require highly effective leaders who are able to create the conditions for rapid and sustained change. Leaders must drive fundamental shifts in school culture and instructional practice that result in rapid gains and ongoing performance. The demands are great and the need for such leaders is even greater. The School Turnaround Leaders program from the Harvard Graduate School of Education brings together individuals and teams who are charged with turning around chronically underperforming schools. Participants learn how to establish high expectations for instructional quality, develop effective teams, translate data into action, and generate deep engagement among school and community stakeholders. They leave with a school improvement plan they can put into action right away.

During this five-day institute, principals and district leaders will work with a cohort of fellow turnaround leaders to analyze and refine school's turnaround plans and develop the skills needed for successful implementation. Leaders will:

- Develop a theory of action to achieve rapid, meaningful improvement
- Use data to set strategy, assess progress, and drive decision-making at the classroom and school levels
- Learn how to transform school culture and foster high-quality instruction
- Acquire strategies for communicating your vision to the press and community

For a culminating project, leaders will develop a theory of action for their schools and gain valuable feedback from peers and faculty. Principals of CSI schools will begin working with the Harvard program starting in the summer of 2019.

The Role of Instructional Rounds in Implementing Standards-Aligned Instruction

A key part of APS's system of support and accountability for schools is the practice of instructional rounds. APS adopted instructional rounds in the spring of 2016. Instructional rounds—a practice adapted to education from the field of medicine—offer a structure for educators to work together to solve common problems and improve their practice. The model was developed at the Harvard Graduate School of Education and was outlined in *Instructional Rounds in Education* (City, Elmore, Fiarman & Teitel). Instructional rounds have been used in schools and across districts to raise the quality of instruction for all students.

APS adopted instructional rounds as a part of an initiative to strengthen the learning culture in the district. After observing the instructional rounds process used by Santa Fe Public Schools, district leadership did a book study on *Instructional Rounds in Education* and attended a week-long instructional rounds institute at Harvard. As district leadership trained principals in the model of instructional rounds, leadership emphasized the opportunity to look at a specific problem of practice and benefit from one another's expertise, allowing school leaders to see what other schools are doing and be reflective about their own work.

Instructional rounds in APS support and build upon other improvement processes underway in the district. To begin, the district aligned its model of instructional rounds to the Data Wise process, using school achievement data to help schools identify a learner-centered problem of practice. Instructional rounds also support the continuous improvement assessment process in the NM DASH 90-Day Plan. In particular, instructional rounds help schools understand and define root causes and consider appropriate evidence-based interventions. Currently, school principals are participating in "Deep Dives." In this process, district leaders and principals visit a total of twelve schools in the district, three times, looking at a specific, data-driven problem of practice that ultimately seeks to improve the instructional core, inform the 90-Day Plan and identify professional development needs.

The Deep Dive model has allowed for intentional vertical articulation across the district's four Learning Zones. There have been both formal and informal conversations around feeder schools developing common problems of practice. To build capacity in the district, leadership expanded instructional rounds to include assistant principals at all levels. This supports the connections across the Learning Zones in terms of alignment to the district's priorities. It also fosters learning that supports best practices and, ultimately, student achievement.

APS has implemented instructional rounds as a district-wide commitment to provide both more support and more accountability for principals and assistant principals as they work with teachers to implement rigorous, standards-aligned instruction. For example, Eugene Field Elementary School was chosen as one of the two schools in Zone 1 to be the site of “Deep Dive Instructional Rounds” in the 2017-2018 school year. Before and after each visit, the host school’s principal met with the principal support specialist for Zone 1 to examine the problem of practice and the related feedback from the rounds. At the beginning of the school year, Eugene Field articulated the following learner-centered problem and problem of practice.

Eugene Field Elementary School Learner-Centered Problem: Students lack the necessary skills to demonstrate their knowledge in New Mexico Common Core State Standards (NMCCSS). Eugene Field Elementary School Problem of Practice: If teachers use questioning and engagement strategies to encourage students to demonstrate what they know or think they know, then students will practice the skills necessary to demonstrate knowledge in New Mexico Common Core State Standards and increase their learning.

At the first instructional round visit in September 2017, the participants in instructional rounds specifically looked for student engagement and questioning. The feedback showed low student engagement due to teachers’ frequent use of Depth of Knowledge (DOK) 1 and 2 questions. The recommended next steps focused on elevating questioning and using purposeful small groups to increase engagement. In the second instructional round visit in November 2017, the feedback indicated more use of small groups and a conscious effort to increase student engagement. From there, the problem of practice narrowed into questioning. The recommended next steps focused on planning for higher DOK and a deeper understanding of NMCCSS. The final visit to Eugene Field is scheduled for February 27, 2018. At this visit, the network will continue to look at questioning strategies in instruction and will use a school-developed student engagement rubric to capture a clearer picture of engagement in the areas of teacher questioning, student ownership of learning, the level of cognitive demand required of students, engagement strategies and structures, and the substance of student talk. At the conclusion of the February instructional round, the network will work with the host site to develop next steps and activities to continue to move the work forward.

Support & Accountability for School Leaders

Albuquerque Public Schools uses the New Mexico Highly Objective Uniform Statewide Standard of Evaluation for Principals and Assistant Principals (HOUSSE-P) process for evaluating the performance of principals and assistant principals towards meeting the goal of implementing rigorous, standards-aligned instruction. This process is based on the New Mexico Principal Leadership Competencies and Indicators (NMPLCI). While the responsibilities and duties of principals are many, the first leadership competency is that a principal work with all members of the school community to make quality instruction a prime focus. Principals are ultimately responsible for demonstrating progress towards the accomplishment of school goals as stated in the school’s NM DASH 90-Day Plan.

Within APS, each principal is responsible for working with his or her supervisor, typically the respective Associate Superintendent for the Learning Zone in which the school is located. The Associate Superintendent works with the principal to complete the required Professional Development Plan and to ensure that it is aligned with the district's Academic Master Plan and the school's specific NM DASH 90-Day Plan. The principal's supervisor also holds school visits throughout the year and gathers evidence that demonstrates whether or not the goals of the Professional Development Plan and the NM DASH 90-Day Plan are being met. These visits also inform the monthly district-level professional development for school leaders. Finally, at the end of the school year, the Associate Superintendent completes a summative evaluation of each principal and makes decisions about changes in school leadership.

Support & Accountability for Teachers

Albuquerque Public Schools uses the NMTEACH educator effectiveness system required by the New Mexico Public Education Department. The NMTEACH framework uses multiple indicators, including student test scores, principal observations, student surveys and attendance, to generate a score and corresponding label for each teacher. Teachers can be characterized as Ineffective, Minimally Effective, Effective, Highly Effective and Exemplary by the NMTEACH system.

Albuquerque Public Schools uses the observation portion of the NM TEACH evaluation system to focus on improving teachers' implementation of the instructional core. The teacher evaluation process requires two walkthroughs and two formal scored observations using the NMTEACH rubric. Observations allow for immediate identification of problems and provides the ability to address them in a timely manner, without waiting for summative evaluations to be finalized. If the evaluator identifies any element of Domains 2 or 3 that is below effective (3), the evaluator provides strategic feedback with specific supports and expectations of outcomes based on that support. Outcomes are assessed through walkthroughs and observations.

The scores for each teacher's observation are reviewed annually in the fall and spring. If the teacher's average scores on the observation are ineffective or minimally effective (below 2.5 on a 5 point scale), an improvement plan is written and support is provided by a Consulting Teacher through the Peer Assistance and Review (PAR) process. APS employs four consulting teachers, who are master teachers selected for their skill with content and pedagogy. The consulting teacher works with the classroom teacher and uses the improvement plan as the guide for approximately 90 days. At the 45-and-90-day targets, a PAR panel convenes to listen to reports from the consulting teacher and school administrator for evidence of progress. The PAR panel makes recommendations based on that evidence to either discontinue the plan, continue the plan, move to more intensive support or discharge the classroom teacher. All improvement plans and PAR processes are systematic, transparent and well documented.

Albuquerque Public Schools invests heavily in the NMTEACH evaluation system and the Peer Assistance and Review process because the district shares the Public Education Department's belief that every student deserves access to a quality teacher. APS believes that

supporting educators through professional development, high-quality and frequent feedback based on observations and intensive intervention when needed is the best way to meet that goal.

Assessment: Describe the LEA's cycle of data-driven instruction. Identify the interim assessments being used.

As described previously in this application, Albuquerque Public Schools has been using Harvard's Data Wise Project to inform its cycle of data-driven instruction since 2015. The Data Wise Project supports educators in using collaborative data inquiry to drive the continuous improvement of teaching and learning for all students. Since the Public Education Department has introduced the NM DASH 90-Day Plan process, the district has aligned its Data Wise protocols with the NM DASH, as they both support schools in the process of building capacity, examining data, developing action plans, making interventions and evaluating the effectiveness of the results.

Engaging in a useful cycle of data-driven instruction is challenging both for teachers and for school leaders. Too often, the process is hampered by a lack of assessment literacy, assessments which provide incomplete data, assessments which deliver data too late or a lack of common planning time for teachers to engage in collaborative examination of student work. Finally, sometimes teachers lack strategies to provide flexible interventions in their core instructional programs to address the weaknesses identified through the data-driven instructional cycle. Students pass, or fail, a unit test, but the teacher feels pressure to move on through the curriculum regardless. APS recognizes the need to build capacity for schools and teachers around data-driven instruction, and schools' NM DASH 90-Day Plans, as well as their grant applications, reflect this understanding.

In addition to the state-mandated assessments – PARCC and iStation -- APS has implemented the iReady Diagnostic Assessment for Math and Reading as a widespread interim assessment. In the fall of 2015, 4,661 students took the iReady ELA Diagnostic Assessment; by the fall of 2017, that number had grown to 33,639 students. In the winter of 2015, 2,058 took the iReady Math Diagnostic Assessment; by the winter of 2017, that number had grown to 46,860 students. In 2017-2018, all middle schools opted into the iReady Diagnostic Assessment and most elementary schools have already done so, especially in math. Eight high schools asked to use the diagnostic this year, the first year it has been offered for high schools.

As shown in the attached schedule, schools administered the fall iReady assessment between July 31 and September 27, 2017. The winter administration window was between December 4, 2017 and January 26, 2018. Finally, the spring administration window will open March 19 and will close May 22, 2018.

Schools currently using iReady Diagnostic Assessments for Math and Reading use the information to identify the root cause of student learning challenges, measure growth across a students' career and support data-driven differentiated instruction. The iReady Diagnostic is a computer adaptive assessment, meaning that it provides easier or harder questions

depending on students’ answers to previous questions. By adapting across grade levels, the diagnostic helps teachers to identify gaps in students’ understandings spanning multiple years. Online reports help teachers provide individualized instruction targeted to students’ unique needs.

However, an interim assessment used only three times a year still may not provide teachers with sufficient information to engage in a data-driven instructional cycle based on standards mastery. When schools purchase iReady, teachers also get access to the iReady Standards Mastery Assessment, which allows teachers to select from prebuilt assessment forms to easily build and administer assessments in synchronization with the district’s scope and sequence. This ensures schools are assessing student proficiency as the standards are covered. The iReady Standards Mastery Assessments are available for standards in Reading and Math in grades 2 through 8. Schools identified as needing extra support as a part of the state’s ESSA plan (MRI, CSI and TSI) will be encouraged to develop site-based common formative assessments, using iReady Standards Mastery, to more closely monitor students’ academic growth and progress towards proficiency on grade-level standards. Grant applications from CSI schools reflect the need for additional resources to provide access to iReady Instruction and the iReady Standards Mastery Assessment. Applications also include resources for additional planning time to examine instruction and re-teach standards using different instructional techniques.

Describe the process used to ensure that interim assessments align with the Common Core State Standards and each grade level’s scope and sequence.


As described above, Albuquerque Public Schools uses the iReady Diagnostic Assessment as its primary interim assessment. The APS Office of Accountability and Reporting has verified that the iReady Diagnostic Assessment aligns to New Mexico Common Core State Standards and the Department of Curriculum and Instruction has confirmed that the diagnostic matches the district’s scope and sequence at each grade level.

The iReady Diagnostic Assessment was built for the Common Core. It provides data-driven insights that classroom teachers and school and district administrators need to determine exactly where to focus their instructional time to ensure all students are on track to meet more rigorous expectations.

The Educational Research Institute of America conducted a research study evaluating the relationship between iReady Diagnostic and the 2016 PARCC end-of-year assessments. The research found a high correlation between the iReady Diagnostic and PARCC. iReady was also shown to accurately predict end-of-year proficiency rates.

2016 Correlations between Spring iReady Diagnostic and PARCC Assessments

The strong correlations between the spring iReady Diagnostic and the 2016 PARCC Assessments—with overall correlations of




.79 for ELA/Literacy and .83 for Mathematics for all students across grades 3–8—exceed the Center on Response to Intervention's recommended .70 minimum threshold for correlations.

Curriculum Associates partnered with leading academics to develop a regression-based model for predicting PARCC proficiency rates. iReady proficiency prediction from fall, winter, and spring Diagnostic results proved to be highly accurate.

Comparison of predicted and observed proficiency rates for 2016 PARCC Assessments

The analysis above support school's choices to use iReady as a common interim assessment used to drive the school-level process of data-driven instruction. In order for an interim assessment to drive improvement on summative assessments linked to New Mexico Common Core State Standards, such as the PARCC, the link between performance on the interim assessment and performance on the summative assessment must be clear, consistent and predictable. Research on the iReady Diagnostic Assessment shows this to be the case.



Provide the schedule for administering common interim assessments in ELA and Math (as an attachment).

Describe the process for test-in-hand analysis and adaptation of instructional plans based on interim assessment data (e.g. common planning time, teacher-administrator one-on-one meetings, and group professional development).

Each APS school has an Instructional Council that includes the teacher leadership for the school. Extensive research has shown the benefit of investing in a collaborative environment and that enlisting buy-in to a shared mission and vision is critical to the school turnaround process. The Instructional Council acts as the leadership team, along with the principal, that manages the process for the implementation of the New Mexico Common Core State Standards at each school. The Instructional Council also develops the structure for the collaboration time at the school level. The Instructional Council is responsible for the following:

- Creating structures at the school that explicitly connect the work of the Instructional Council and the Instructional Coach so that collaboration is connected to implementation.
- Moving the staff from awareness of New Mexico Common Core State Standards to implementation.
- Ensuring that teachers are able to share their perspectives and pedagogical strategies with each other as they learn about and implement the NMCCSS.

- Collaborating with the Instructional Coach and teacher leaders on professional development about the NMCCSS.
- Gathering both qualitative data and quantitative data about the progress of implementation, questions that arise, and the supports needed by teachers.
- Basing the implementation of the NMCCSS on the unique needs of the staff and student population of the school.
- Ensuring that the implementation of the NMCCSS is informed by, and connected to, district plans.

Each school in APS, including CSI schools, uses a customized process for test-in-hand analysis and adaptation of instructional plans based on interim assessment data, taking into account its specific schedule and needs. At Maryann Binford Elementary, teachers use formative assessment data to plan instruction. All teachers have collaboration time for 40 minutes a week. If funded by the grant, additional collaborative time will support implementation of engaging tasks to fill in student gaps. Four hours a month of collaborative time within grade levels will provide teachers time to plan and implement tasks based on student data. Teachers will break apart standards that students are struggling with, based on formative assessments, and create objectives and engaging tasks to support students. After tasks have been implemented, the school will test students on the same standard and measure growth using the PDSA model. Administration will monitor lesson plans to ensure that plans are purposeful, support the CCSS and address filling in student gaps.

C. LEA Support and Accountability

Identify specific senior leadership that will direct and coordinate LEA participation in supporting the CSI school.

Support for schools identified as needing Comprehensive Support & Improvement (CSI) will come from the highest levels of district leadership. Each CSI school will be supported by one of the district's Associate Superintendents for Leadership and Learning: Dr. Gabriella Duran Blakey (Zone 1), Dr. Gabriel Antonio Gonzales (Zone 2), Yvonne Garcia (Zone 3) and Troy Hughes (Zone 4). Please see the included organizational charts which show which CSI school is assigned to which Associate Superintendent. The Associate Superintendents are responsible for hiring and supervising the principal of each CSI school, approving the school's NM DASH 90-Day Plan, and approving each school's allocation of resources through its approved budget. The Associate Superintendent for each CSI school also provides monitoring and oversight as outlined in the multi-tiered system of support described previously in this proposal. Finally, each Associate Superintendent is supervised by the district's Superintendent.

The district's Chief Information and Strategy Officer, Dr. Richard Bowman, will work directly with each CSI school to provide assessments, data and information pertinent to the creation, implementation and evaluation of the school's NM DASH 90-Day Plan. This office also provides support, both technical and strategic, to the schools and their 90-Day Plans through the School Accountability Support Department.

The district's Assistant Superintendent of Equity, Instruction and Support (EIS), Dr. Madelyn Serna Mármol, will work directly with each CSI school to create, implement, and provide support on evidence-based interventions and curricular supports. EIS's Curriculum and Instruction Department and Office of Innovation and School Choice will provide instructional and strategic support on 90-Day Plans. In addition, both departments will provide professional development and support to teachers and school leaders. The EIS Department of Family and Community Supports will provide guidance to schools in development and implementation of Next-Step Plans and wrap-around supports for students.

Each school designated as CSI will receive support from one of two, newly-hired, ESSA Principal Support Specialists. Gene Saavedra and Katherine House have a history of successful school turnaround initiatives in Albuquerque Public Schools and Rio Rancho, respectively. The ESSA Principal Support Specialists will coach CSI school leaders in how to create the school culture and climate to successfully implement evidence-based interventions and to use data-driven instructional cycles to improve the school-wide implementation of a standards-based instructional core. Please see the illustration below to understand the role of senior leadership in supporting each CSI school and providing accountability for school improvement efforts.

Submit an organizational chart (or charts) identifying the structures at the LEA level that are responsible for providing support and accountability to CSI schools (as attachment(s)).

Describe and discuss the specific cycle of planning, action, evaluation, feedback, and adaptation between the LEA and the school leadership. This response should be very specific about the type, nature, and frequency of interaction between the LEA personnel with school leadership.

The specific cycle of planning, action, evaluation, feedback and adaptation between APS district leadership and school leadership will use the NM DASH 90-Day Plan format. The NM DASH 90-Day Plan format is based on a continuous improvement model of planning, implementation and monitoring. Each CSI school has gone through the process of building a core team, analyzing student data, setting student achievement goals, identifying focus areas and conducting a root cause analysis. From this process, school leaders created desired outcomes and defined critical actions. For each school, the Associate Superintendent of Learning and Learning reviewed the 90-Day Plan and scored it according to the PED's rubric. Once the plan was refined and strengthened, the school leader began the process of implementation, which includes proceeding with critical actions and communicating with stakeholders.

Associate Superintendents will meet with the leadership of each CSI school at least every 30 days, as outlined previously in this application. At this meeting, the school leader and the core team will review critical actions with the Associate Superintendent and will also review progress indicators such as interim assessment data. At this formal meeting, the Associate Superintendent and the school team will diagnose the extent to which critical actions are having a positive impact of the quality of teaching and learning at the school and will celebrate any positive progress. If positive changes are the quality of teaching and learning at

the school are not evident, the Associate Superintendent will work with the school team to make needed adjustments to the plan based on available data. At this point, the school team may identify additional supports required from the district necessary to support the plan. The school team will enter the results of the review into the NM DASH portal for great accountability. Every 30 days, the Associate Superintendent and the school team will repeat the cycle, leading to greater progress and consistency in school transformation efforts.

Communication and Stakeholder Involvement/Engagement

The LEA/school must fully and transparently consult and collaborate with key education stakeholders about the CSI school and on the implementation status of the evidence-based intervention. The plan for consultation and collaboration provided by the LEA/school must:

- Describe in detail, the methods, times, and places that will be used for regularly and systematically updating parents, families, the community and other stakeholders on the implementation status of the evidence-based intervention.
- This should include, but is not limited to, analyses of evidence and leading indicator data to determine the impact of key strategies, as well as planned/approved course-corrections as applicable.

Albuquerque Public Schools believes in the importance of enlisting parents and other key educational stakeholders in the school improvement process. On December 5, 2017, Superintendent Raquel Reedy wrote to stakeholders in a public message about the schools identified by the state's ESSA plan as in need of More Rigorous Intervention (MRI), Comprehensive Support & Improvement (CSI) or Targeted Support & Improvement (TSI). The district has held multiple public meetings at each of the MRI schools in order to explain the designation and to enlist support for the district's school redesign plans.

Upon notification from the New Mexico Public Education Department of the status of each grant application, each CSI school will hold a public meeting at the school in April 2018 to outline the reason for the school's CSI designation, the evidence-based interventions selected by the school and the rationales for making those choices. The public meeting will be conducted by the school principal, with the assistance of the ESSA Principal Support Specialists for CSI schools and the Office of School Accountability Support, to help stakeholders, including parents, understand the data behind the designation.

Following the initial meeting in April 2018, each CSI school will hold biannual meetings in October and April of each of the three subsequent years of the ESSA designation to update the community, including parents and students, on the progress of school transformation efforts. Not only will schools communicate the status of evidence-based interventions, school leaders will also seek to involve stakeholders in supporting the school's efforts to meet challenging goals for improvement. At each meeting, the principal will outline the evidence-based interventions, provide leading indicator data and analyze evidence to show whether or not the evidence-based intervention is showing signs of effectiveness. At this time, school leaders will also solicit the community to provide input and suggest improvements and course corrections in the implementation process. In this way, CSI schools will implement evidence-based interventions in a manner and method responsive to the needs and priorities

of the community it serves. Importantly, public meetings with shared data will also promote accountability in the implementation process.

These bi-annual meetings will not be the only way in which the district and individual CSI schools share information about the status of school improvement efforts. In addition to these meetings, APS will update stakeholders regarding the progress of CSI schools, along with the district as a whole, at the following meetings:

1. School Instructional Council Meetings
 - Held monthly at each school
2. School Community School Council Meetings
 - Held monthly at each community school
3. District Board of Education Equity & Engagement Committee Meetings
 - Held monthly at the district administration building
4. APS Board of Education Meetings
 - Formal updates presented in October and April

Finally, APS will use its communications tools, including its website, a weekly email newsletter for all stakeholders, a weekly email newsletter for employees and social media accounts, to share information about when stakeholder meetings will be held at each school and what attendees should expect to learn when they attend. By sharing this information, the district will ensure that all stakeholders have an opportunity to contribute to school improvement efforts and a diversity of perspectives will be represented.

II. School-Level Context

A. School Overview

Describe the results of in-depth student achievement data analysis, including the percent of students scoring at each level on PARCC and Istation (if applicable).

Over the last three administrations of PARCC (i.e., Spring 2015, Spring 2016 and Spring 2017), Maryann Binford Elementary School has experienced a mixture of results in the percent of students who met or exceeded expectations. This appears to largely be the result of student cohort effects. As shown in Table 1, performance has increased as the students who were in Grade 3 during the Spring of 2015 moved to Grade 4 for 2016 and Grade 5 for 2017. If we follow this logic, students who were in Grade 4 during the Spring of 2016 have consistently performed worse than their year-older peers.

Table 1. Overall PARCC Performance

| Subject | Year | PARCC Performance Level | | | | |
|--|------|-------------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| English/ Language Arts 3rd Grade | 2015 | 31.8% | 26.5% | 25.8% | 15.9% | |
| | 2016 | 47.2% | 32.4% | 16.2% | 3.5% | 0.7% |
| | 2017 | 42.1% | 27.0% | 22.0% | 8.8% | |
| English/ Language Arts 4th Grade | 2015 | 28.8% | 28.8% | 35.3% | 7.2% | |
| | 2016 | 26.6% | 32.9% | 26.6% | 13.3% | 0.7% |
| | 2017 | 35.6% | 39.7% | 19.9% | 4.8% | |
| English/ Language Arts 5th Grade | 2015 | 32.1% | 41.2% | 16.0% | 10.7% | |
| | 2016 | 27.6% | 35.1% | 29.1% | 8.2% | |
| | 2017 | 28.3% | 33.1% | 23.4% | 15.2% | |
| Mathematics 3rd Grade | 2015 | 22.4% | 28.3% | 29.6% | 19.1% | 0.7% |
| | 2016 | 29.6% | 31.0% | 27.5% | 12.0% | |
| | 2017 | 37.9% | 31.1% | 21.1% | 7.5% | 2.5% |
| Mathematics 4th Grade | 2015 | 31.7% | 45.8% | 18.3% | 4.2% | |
| | 2016 | 26.6% | 34.3% | 30.1% | 9.1% | |
| | 2017 | 30.6% | 38.8% | 22.4% | 7.5% | 0.7% |
| Mathematics 5th Grade | 2015 | 39.8% | 42.9% | 14.3% | 3.0% | |
| | 2016 | 31.6% | 42.6% | 23.5% | 2.2% | |
| | 2017 | 28.5% | 38.9% | 28.5% | 4.2% | |

Across PARCC subject exams, female students at Maryann Binford generally outperformed their male peers in Spring 2015 and Spring 2016, but not in Spring 2017. Over 90 percent of students at Maryann Binford Elementary School self-identify as Hispanic. This makes it difficult to analyze any differences between race/ethnicity student groups. All of Maryann Binford Elementary School students now receive free meals as the school participates in the Community Eligibility Program of the Department of Food and Nutrition. This makes a comparison by free/reduced-price lunch status no longer possible.

While only serving a population that is no more than 15 percent special education, Maryann Binford Elementary has consistently seen gaps in PARCC performance with students with disabilities underperforming their peers. Students who are English Learners (EL) at Maryann Binford generally perform lower than their non-EL peers on PARCC.

Examining Maryann Binford Elementary School students' 2016-2017 i-Station results, shows a high level of variability in the percentage of students who performed at Tier I (i.e., meeting the standard) across the assessed grade levels. While less than one-fifth of students were at Tier I in kindergarten, just under three-fifth of students were at Tier I in Grade 2.

Table 7. Overall i-Station Performance

| Grade | Test Primary Result | | |
|-------|---------------------|-------|-------|
| | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| 01 | 42.3% | 34.6% | 23.1% |
| 02 | 55.5% | 21.0% | 23.5% |
| 03 | 43.1% | 26.1% | 30.7% |
| K | 19.6% | 32.0% | 48.5% |

Describe the results of in-depth NM TEACH data analysis, including the total number of instructional staff in the schools building and the number of staff identified as exemplary, highly effective, effective, minimally effective, and ineffective as identified by the most recently released NM TEACH data.

In 2016-2017, the last year for which NM TEACH data has been released, Maryann Binford Elementary School had 43 certified instructional staff members evaluated through NM TEACH. The number and percentage of instructional staff identified as exemplary, highly effective, effective, minimally effective and ineffective are given below.

| NM TEACH | Number | Percentage | 2016-2017 District Percentages |
|---------------------|--------|------------|--------------------------------|
| Exemplary | 0 | 0% | 3% |
| Highly Effective | 2 | 5% | 27% |
| Effective | 21 | 49% | 44% |
| Minimally Effective | 17 | 40% | 23% |
| Ineffective | 3 | 7% | 3% |
| TOTAL | 43 | | |

Based on this comparison, it is clear that teachers evaluated as Ineffective and Minimally Effective (47%) are over-represented at Maryann Binford Elementary School as compared with the district overall (26%). The largest gap between Maryann Binford Elementary School and district averages is of teachers evaluated as Highly Effective (5% versus 27%). Of the 21% of teachers who were evaluated as Minimally Effective or Ineffective, they earned a range of 4 points to 34 points (out of 70) on the student achievement portion of the NM TEACH evaluation. With professional development, increased use of formative assessments and school-wide change initiatives, Maryann Binford will shift student achievement in a positive direction, which will impact teacher summative evaluations.

B. NM DASH Plans

For the school the LEA is applying on behalf of, they must submit the following components:

- Completed NM DASH Offline Planning Process Workbook or 90-day Complete Detail Printout (as an attachment).
- Completed NM DASH Feedback Tool (as an attachment).

C. Collaboration Structures

For the school the LEA is applying on behalf of, describe the collaboration structures in place to include the:

- Schedule of grade-level, grade-band, or content area collaboration meetings, including frequency and length and a process and procedures utilized during collaboration meetings (e.g. agendas, protocols)
- Systems in place for principal and/or other instructional leaders to support and hold teachers accountable for meeting effectiveness.

At Maryann Binford Elementary, grade level teams meet every Thursday for a 40 minute collaboration period. On the second and fourth Wednesday of the month, school leadership and the Instructional Council facilitate data dialogues and planning tasks to support students in their areas of need. The Data Wise Agenda is used in these meetings. School administration and the Instructional Council facilitate collaborations with protocols that include accountability and actionable steps for student growth. Reflective conversations using the “Reflection Protocol” take place with teachers and the administration/IC twice a semester.

III. Evidence-based Interventions

A. Root Cause

Describe the process used by the LEA in collaboration with the school to identify needs and performance challenges, complete root cause, and identify focus area(s).

Albuquerque Public Schools requires all schools to use the NM PED’s NM DASH 90-Day Plan process to identify needs and performance challenges, identify focus areas and complete root cause analysis. The district has devoted significant resources to collaborating with schools in understanding and completing the process successfully, primarily through the School Accountability Support Department. For example, to develop its current 90-Day Plan, Maryann Binford Elementary School convened a core team of stakeholders. Through their work, they examined current student performance data and set goals for improvement using PARCC and Istation data. The next step was to use current data to determine the root cause of barriers to achieving these goals and a corresponding theory of action to lead to the desired result. The table below outlines each root cause analysis and a corresponding theory of action, which will be linked to an evidence-based intervention identified in the grant application.

| Root Cause Analysis | Theory of Action |
|---|--|
| Evidence-Based Intervention: Formative Assessment | |
| In the 2016-2017 school year, focus walks and walkthroughs indicated that teachers need to challenge students at Maryann Binford with <i>rigorous engaging instruction</i> . Instructional rounds feedback indicated that 67% of teachers used worksheets to engage students. The majority of instruction is teacher talk rather than student talk as indicated from focus walks, instructional rounds, and walkthroughs. | If teachers use iReady, then this action will provide valid and reliable growth measure and individualized instruction for students in reading and mathematics. This program pinpoints student needs down to the sub-skill level, and ongoing progress monitoring / short cycle assessments shows whether students are on track to achieve end-of-year targets. The reporting and ongoing progress monitoring provide teachers with real time insights for each student at the class and school level and this will increase reading proficiency by 200% and math proficiency by 100%. |
| Evidence-Based Intervention: Data Wise Continuous Improvement | |
| As evidenced by a review of lesson plans by the administrative team, teacher lesson plans | If teachers have time for collaboration outside the duty day to discuss student data |

| | |
|--|--|
| revealed a lack of uniformity related to CCSS rigor, lesson differentiation, and strategies for student engagement. | using the Data Wise Model, then teacher action plans to address student learning weakness will improve. Improved teacher plans will led to increased student achievement. |
| Evidence-Based Intervention: Kagan Cooperative Learning Strategies | |
| During instructional rounds, district administrators found that more than half of the classrooms at Maryann Binford had students working independently on worksheets. In addition, small group instruction was seen in only one classroom. The regularity of these practices was further supported by non-evaluative walkthroughs by the school's administrative team. | If teachers receive professional development in Kagan Cooperative Learning strategies, teachers will increase the use of cooperative learning engagement strategies. When students spend more time in class engaged in CCSS-aligned Tier 1 instruction, student academic proficiency will increase 200% in reading and 100% in Math. |

B. Choice of Evidence-Based Interventions

Identify the interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that schools in need of comprehensive support and improvement may choose to address the root cause.

Albuquerque Public School examined and vetted multiple interventions which meet either Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3 levels of evidence as defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act. APS examined each intervention for its tier, which is based on the type of study that was done: experimental, quasi-experimental or correlational. Experimental studies provide the most rigorous level of evidence, but are rare in the educational literature. APS also examined interventions for their effect sizes and characterized these as Low, Moderate or High. Interventions with high effect sizes are more likely to lead to measurable student growth.

| Intervention | Impact Based on Effect Sizes | ESSA Tier | Sources of Evidence |
|--|------------------------------|-----------|---|
| Use of Formative Evaluation (iReady) | High | Tier 2 | Hattie, J. (2009). <i>Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement</i> . New York. Routledge. |
| AVID Strategies | Moderate | Tier 2 | Watt, K.M., Powell, C.A., Mendiola, I.D., & Cossio, G. (2006). Schoolwide impact and AVID: How have selected Texas high schools addressed the new accountability measures? <i>Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk</i> . 11:1, 57-73. |
| Data Wise Continuous Improvement Process | Moderate | Tier 3 | Bocala, C. & Boudett, K.P. (2015). Teaching educators habits of mind for using data wisely. <i>Teachers College Record</i> , v117 n4. |

| | | | |
|---|------------------|--------|--|
| Cooperative Learning Strategies (Kagan) | Moderate | Tier 2 | Hattie, J. (2009). <i>Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement</i> . New York. Routledge. |
| Summer Learning | Low | Tier 2 | Hattie, J. (2009). <i>Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement</i> . New York. Routledge. |
| Blended Learning | Moderate | Tier 2 | Brodersen, R.M. & Melluzzo, D. (2017). Summary of research on online and blended learning programs that offer differentiated learning options. Institute of Educational Sciences (IES) Regional Educational Laboratory (REL), U.S. Department of Education, Washington, D.C. |
| Project/Problem Based Learning | Low to Moderate | Tier 3 | Hattie, J. (2009). <i>Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement</i> . New York. Routledge. |
| Project GLAD | Low to Moderate | Tier 2 | Hahn, S.L.A. (2009). Developing the English language vocabulary of native Korean-speaking students through Guided Language Acquisition Design. Retrieved 2-15-2018 from uoregon.edu. |
| Small Group Tutoring | Moderate to High | Tier 2 | Hattie, J. (2009). <i>Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement</i> . New York. Routledge. |
| Tripod Student Surveys | Moderate | Tier 2 | Ferguson, R.F., (2012). Can student surveys measure teacher quality? <i>Phi Delta Kappan</i> , Vol. 94, No. 3 |
| Check and Connect | Moderate | Tier 2 | <u>Sinclair, M. F., Christenson, S. L., Evelo, D. L., & Hurley, C. M. (1998)</u> from the <i>What Works Clearinghouse</i> |
| Student Engagement | Moderate | Tier 2 | Hattie, J. (2009). <i>Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement</i> . New York. Routledge. |
| Dual Credit | Moderate to High | Tier 2 | Early college, early success: Early college high school initiative impact study. Berger, A., Garet, M., Hoshen, G., Knudson, J., & Turk-Bicakci, L. (2014). Washington, DC: American Institutes for Research. |
| Decreasing Chronic Absenteeism | Moderate | Tier 3 | Balfanz, R., & Byrnes, V. (2012). <i>Chronic Absenteeism: Summarizing What</i> |

| | | | |
|---------------------|------------------|--------|--|
| | | | We Know From Nationally Available Data. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Center for Social Organization of Schools. |
| Reducing Anxiety | Low | Tier 2 | Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. New York. Routledge. |
| School Counseling | Moderate to High | Tier 2 | Whiston & Quinby (2009). Review of school counseling outcome research. Psychology in the Schools, 46(3), 267-272. Schatzberg & Nemeroff (2009). Textbook of Psychopharmacology. Arlington, VA: The American Psychiatric Publisher. |
| Phonics Instruction | Moderate | Tier 2 | Hattie, J. (2009). Visible Learning: A Synthesis of over 800 Meta-Analyses Relating to Achievement. New York. Routledge. |

Determine the interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that are relevant and appropriate to the needs of the school.

Based on a root cause analysis, Maryann Binford Elementary School's interventions are relevant and appropriate to meeting the needs discovered through the root cause analysis as described below. Only interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence were considered for adoption.

Identify the school's chosen intervention(s).

Maryann Binford Elementary School selected the following evidence-based interventions:

- Implementation of Formative Assessments
- Implementation of Data Wise Continuous Improvement Process
- Implementation of Kagan Cooperative Learning Professional Development

Please see the theory of action included below for more details regarding each evidence-based intervention in the context of the theory of change.

C. Sources of Evidence

Identify the sources of evidence used to determine the interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that are relevant and appropriate to the needs of the school.

Albuquerque Public Schools used the What Works Clearinghouse, published and peer-reviewed research and meta-analyses in order to determine which relevant and appropriate interventions met the top three tiers of evidence as defined by the Every Student Succeeds Act. For the source of evidence for each intervention, please refer to the table included previously in this application.

D. Theory of Action

Detail a Theory of Action that will support implementation of the evidence-based intervention.

| Theory of Action | Implementation of Evidence Based Intervention |
|--|--|
| <p>Formative Assessment: If teachers use iReady, then this action will provide valid and reliable growth measure and individualized instruction for students in reading and mathematics. This program pinpoints student needs down to the sub-skill level, and ongoing progress monitoring / short cycle assessments shows whether students are on track to achieve end-of-year targets. The reporting and ongoing progress monitoring provide teachers with real time insights for each student at the class and school level and this will increase reading proficiency by 200% and math proficiency by 100%.</p> | <p>Maryann Binford will purchase the iReady Diagnostic Assessment, Standards Mastery Assessment and the personalized, online instructional module. This diagnostic will be used to analyze students’ strengths and weaknesses, while the online instruction will be used to provide individualized instruction.</p> |
| <p>Data Wise Continuous Improvement: If teachers have time for collaboration outside the duty day to discuss student data using the Data Wise Model, then teacher action plans to address student learning weakness will improve. Improved teacher plans will led to increased student achievement.</p> | <p>Maryann Binford will provide additional planning time for teachers to analyze benchmark assessment data monthly to make adjustments to the instructional core. Teachers will also work to identify learner-centered problems by analyzing student work on rigorous CCSS-aligned tasks. This test-in-hand strategy will trigger immediate changes in the instructional plan for the week en route to ensuring standards mastery by students.</p> |
| <p>Kagan Cooperative Learning: If teachers receive professional development in Kagan Cooperative Learning strategies, teachers will increase the use of cooperative learning engagement strategies. When students spend more time in class engaged in CCSS-aligned Tier 1 instruction, student academic proficiency will increase 200% in reading and 100% in Math.</p> | <p>Maryann Binford will provide training for all teachers on Kagan Cooperative Learning strategies in order to improve teachers’ ability to implement high-value, Tier 1 instruction on a daily basis and thus to increase student engagement.</p> |

IV. Budget

A. Budget Narrative

The LEA/school must provide an appropriate and complete budget narrative that identifies and explains all proposed costs for LEA and school-level activities for the entire project period (planning period, three years of implementation).

| Proposed Costs | Planning | Year 1 | Year 2 | Year 3 |
|---|----------|------------|------------|------------|
| Formative Assessment: Maryann Binford will purchase and use the iReady Formative Diagnostic Assessment. | \$0 | \$37,007 | \$33,087 | \$33,087 |
| Data Wise Continuous Improvement: Maryann Binford has budgeted for additional time for teachers to collaborate using formative assessment and the Data Wise process. | \$15,000 | \$58,560 | \$59,550 | \$59,550 |
| Kagan Cooperative Learning: Maryann Binford will purchase professional development for teachers in Kagan Cooperative Learning Strategies. | \$0 | \$49,750 | \$49,750 | \$49,750 |
| LEA Indirect Cost: This has been budgeted at the PED Approved Indirect Cost Rate | \$433.50 | \$4,199.66 | \$4,114.98 | \$4,114.98 |

In addition, applicants should identify all other sources of income that will support and sustain the whole-school change described in this application.

While the grant funding requested in this proposal is important and significant, it is not enough on its own to sustain the whole-school change described in this application and envisioned for Comprehensive Support & Improvement schools. The school will use its operational budget and other sources of income to align to its 90-Day Plan and support schoolwide changes in practices. For example, the district has invested in ESSA Support Principals and the School Accountability Support Department to strengthen school change practices at the district level. At the school level, principals must demonstrate how their Title I budgets align to their 90-Day Plan and how those budgets support evidence-based interventions. Finally, schools’ operational budget must align to the root causes described in the 90-Day plan once non-negotiable operational commitments are met.

For each major activity, describe the LEA’s strategies for why and how the LEA/school will sustain these actions past the whole project period of the grant.

Albuquerque Public Schools plans to sustain those actions that prove to be successful interventions past the whole project period of the grant. For Maryann Binford Elementary School, those interventions may include formative assessment using iReady, the Data Wise Continuous Improvement process and professional development in Kagan Cooperative Learning Strategies. For each activity, the school will capture data to make determinations as to the effectiveness of the intervention in achieving the goal of increasing student learning and improving the school’s on-time graduation rate. Only those interventions demonstrating effectiveness in meeting these goals will be sustained after the grant period.

Clearly describe and justify any specific LEA-level administration and support expenses to be funded by CSI grant at no more than 10% of the total funding request for each period. Normal indirect cost may also be claimed at the PED-approved rate for the district.

Albuquerque Public Schools has requested to claim the normal indirect cost at the PED-approved rate for the district. For the 2017-2018 school year, that indirect cost rate is 2.89% and this figure has been used to calculate the school's budget on the attached Budget Summary Chart.

The LEA and schools must demonstrate how they will align other available federal, state, and local resources to support the chosen evidence-based intervention.


Albuquerque Public Schools and Maryann Binford Elementary School will align other available federal, state and local resources to support the evidence-based interventions. For example, funding for professional development comes from the school's Title I and operational budgets. The district also provides support, such as technology, for the implementation of iReady diagnostic assessments and software.

B. Budget Forms

A complete Budget Summary Chart for the entire project period (planning period and two-years of implementation) (as an attachment).

The budget items must be clear and obvious as to how the proposed activities are directly impacting the school-level implementation of the evidence-based intervention(s) proposed in this application. The proposed expenditures must be reasonable and necessary to support the proposal's initiatives and goals/objectives. Grant funding must supplement, not supplant, existing funding sources.

Albuquerque Public Schools Organizational Chart: Zone 2





| Assessment | Testing Window |
|--|---|
| Math | |
| BOY GR K-3 | September 1 - 29, 2017 |
| MOY GR K-3 | January 3 - 31, 2018 |
| EOY GR K-3 | May 1 - May 23, 2018 |
| ACCESS | |
| | January 22 – March 16, 2018 |
| Science | |
| GR 4 | March 5 - 30, 2018 |
| New Mexico Alternate Performance Assessment (NMAPA) | |
| GR 3-5 | March 12 - April 6, 2018 |
| PARCC | |
| GR 3-5 | April 16 - May 11, 2018 (<i>online</i>) |
| GR 3-5 | April 16 - May 4, 2018 (<i>paper</i>) |
| Spanish Reading | |
| GR 3-5 | April 16 - May 4, 2018 (<i>paper</i>) |
| End of Course Exams (EoCs) | |
| GR 4-5 | April 30 - May 18, 2018 |
| Interim Assessments (iReady) | |
| BOY | July 31 - September 29, 2017 |
| MOY | December 4, 2017 - January 26, 2018 |
| EOY | March 19, 2018 - May 22, 2018 |



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

Fall 2017-2018 School Year
 Maryann Binford Elementary
 Albuquerque Public Schools
 January 26, 2018

Core Team

Katrina Sisneros - Principal
 Brenda Worsham - Teacher
 Natalie Martinez - Principal
 Marianita Gonzales - Teacher
 Dorene Baca - Teacher
 Monica Dimas - Teacher

| Content Area | Grade(s) | Last Year's Results | This Year's Goals | Benchmark Goals |
|-----------------------|---------------|---|--|---|
| English Language Arts | 3rd, 4th, 5th | In the 2016-2017 school year, Mary Ann Binford had %8.8 proficient in 3rd grade, %4.8 proficient in 4th grade, and %15.2% in 5th grade. | We plan to raise 3rd grade from %8.8 to %26.4 proficient. We plan to raise 4th grade from %4.8 to %14.4 proficient. We plan to raise 5th grade from %15.2 to %45.6 proficient. | Our monthly formative assessments with i-Station will provide data to drive instruction. If we increase proficiency by 4.4% every 12 weeks we will meet our summative goal. Our monthly formative assessments with i-Ready will provide data to drive instruction. If we increase proficiency by 2.4% every 12 weeks we will meet our summative goal. Our monthly formative assessments with i-Ready will provide data to drive instruction. If we increase proficiency by 4.4% every 12 weeks we will meet our summative goal. |

| Content Area | Grade(s) | Last Year's Results | This Year's Goals | Benchmark Goals |
|--------------|----------|---|--|--|
| Mathematics | | <p>Our 3rd grade PARCC proficiency is %9.9.</p> <p>Our 4th grade PARCC proficiency is %8.2.</p> <p>Our 5th grade PARCC proficiency is %4.2.</p> | <p>We plan to raise 3rd grade proficiency from %9.9 to %19.8.</p> <p>We plan to raise 4th grade proficiency from %8.2% to %16.4.</p> <p>We plan to raise 5th grade proficiency from %4.2% to %8.4.</p> | <p>Our monthly formative assessments with i-Ready will provide data to drive instruction. If we increase proficiency by 2.5% every 12 weeks we will meet our summative goal.</p> <p>Our monthly formative assessments with i-Ready will provide data to drive instruction. If we increase proficiency by 2.05% every 12 weeks we will meet our summative goal.</p> <p>Our monthly formative assessments with i-Ready will provide data to drive instruction. If we increase proficiency by 1.05% every 12 weeks we will meet our summative goal.</p> |

FOCUS AREA: School culture

Desired Outcome: We will increase student attendance. We will decrease from 14% of students with 10 or more absences to 7% with 10 or more absences by December 2017.

Root Cause(s): There has been a lack of clear expectations around building relationships with students.

There was not enough professional development to support teachers in establishing relationships with students.

Although a truancy plan was in place, there was a lack of accountability for teachers to follow through with expectations.

Truancy incentives and expectations were put in place in the Spring rather than at the beginning of the school year.

CRITICAL ACTIONS

| Timeline (start/end dates) | Critical Action to Address Root Cause & Achieve Desired Outcome | Resources Needed / Source | Person(s) Responsible | Person(s) Involved |
|-------------------------------|---|--|--|------------------------|
| 07/18/2017 - 07/21/2017 | Teachers will receive professional development on the Morning Meeting. Teachers will receive a copy of the book. | Morning Meeting Book and Professional Development. | Katrina Sisneros Natalie Martinez | All Staff |
| 07/24/2017 - 08/01/2017 | Student Expectation assembly will explain the PBIS system and our truancy incentives. | Assembly time | Katrina Sisneros Natalie Martinez Brenda Worsham | All students and staff |
| 07/31/2017 - 09/01/2017 | All teachers will receive additional support to implement the Morning Meeting through PD. | Morning Meeting Book | Katrina Sisneros | All teachers |
| 08/07/2017 - 10/11/2017 | Administration and Instructional Coach will conduct 1 non-evaluative walkthrough to support the morning meeting work. | Time to do walkthroughs | Katrina Sisneros Natalie Martinez Dorene Baca | Teachers |
| 08/07/2017 - 09/15/2017 | Administration will send out clear expectations to support teachers if they have truancy concerns in their class. | Truancy Plan, Staff Meeting, Weekly Staff Memo | Katrina Sisneros Natalie Martinez | All teachers |

CRITICAL ACTIONS

| Timeline (start/end dates) | Critical Action to Address Root Cause & Achieve Desired Outcome | Resources Needed / Source | Person(s) Responsible | Person(s) Involved |
|----------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 07/17/2017 - 09/15/2017 | Principal will set up a plan to get teachers their truancy data bi-monthly | Synergy | Katrina Sisneros Natalie Martinez | Front office staff and teachers |
| 08/01/2017 - 09/01/2017 | Principal will calendarize school messengers to go out to parents informing them of the importance of good attendance. Attendance data will be sent out every month. | School Messenger and Outlook Calendar | Katrina Sisneros | Teachers, students and families |
| 07/24/2017 - 12/22/2017 | Administration will provide incentives for students with perfect attendance for the month. | Prizes for students Certificates | Katrina Sisneros Natalie Martinez | Family Liason, Principal, Assistant Principal and Students |

PROGRESS INDICATORS

| Indicator Date | Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome | Potential Adjustments |
|----------------|---|-----------------------|
| 07/21/2017 | All Teachers received training and the Morning Meeting book for a reference. Teachers practices different components and had time to plan implementation. | none |

FOCUS AREA: Tier I (Core) instruction

Desired Outcome: Teachers will plan engaging rigorous instructions for all learners in their classroom. We will increase our Reading Proficiency by 200% and our Math by 100%.

Root Cause(s): Lesson plans lack CCSS rigor. Teachers lack an understanding of what rigor is.

Although lesson plans were submitted, they lacked accountability to change them.

There's no common expectations for quality Tier 1 instruction and planning.

Students are given worksheets and asked to work independently often. There is a lack of differentiated instruction and student engagement.

CRITICAL ACTIONS

| Timeline (start/end dates) | Critical Action to Address Root Cause & Achieve Desired Outcome | Resources Needed / Source | Person(s) Responsible | Person(s) Involved |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 07/24/2017 - 12/22/2017 | Principal and Assistant Principal will calendarize walkthroughs to provide feedback on the schools three "must haves" for effective Tier 1 instruction. The essentials consist of a refocus area, essential questions, and lesson plans available on the desk. 1 non-evaluative walkthrough a month. | Outlook Calendar | Katrina Sisneros Natalie Martinez | Teachers and Administration |
| 08/01/2017 - 10/05/2017 | Teachers will begin backward planning together as a grade level. Clear expectations of Domain 1 will be incorporated in the planning, CCSS Exemplars will be studied. | Collaboration Time | Katrina Sisneros Dorene Baca | Teachers, Instructional Coach and Admin |
| 08/01/2017 - 10/25/2017 | Admin will do 1:1 conference to support with Domain 1, 2 and 3. | Appointment Time/NMTeach Rubrics. Examples of Lesson Plans | Katrina Sisneros Natalie Martinez | Teachers and Admin |



District: APS
 School: Mary Ann Binford ES
 Date: December 4, 2017
 Completed By: Gonzales

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 |
| 16 | | |

| 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 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 ¹ | The core team has full representation from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community. | The core team has representation from two of the following: across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community. | The core team has limited representation from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and/or community. | Shows lack of attempt or action |

Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:
 1.)

| <u>Step 2 – Analyze Data & Set Student Achievement Goals</u> | Exemplary | Solid Progress | Limited Progress | Not Evident |
|--|--|--|--|---------------------------------|
| Summative goals | In addition to the indicators for solid progress, an optional third goal has been identified based on deep data analysis (e.g. subgroup achievement, attendance rates). | Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in both ELA and math using the most recent available baseline data. | Measurable summative student achievement goals have been identified in ELA and/or math. | Shows lack of attempt or action |
| Benchmark goals ² | Benchmark goals to monitor progress are | Benchmark goals to monitor progress are | Benchmark goals to monitor progress are | Shows lack of |

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

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



| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---------------------------------|
| | clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to the most current interim assessment data. | clearly articulated in both ELA and math, align with summative goals, and are connected to interim or formative assessment data. | articulated in both ELA and/or math. | attempt or action |
| SMART: Specific, Measurable, Ambitious & Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound | Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria and create a sense of focus and urgency towards action. | Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy all SMART criteria. | Summative and benchmark goals have been written to satisfy 4 or fewer SMART criteria. | Shows lack of attempt or action |
| Step 2 Reflections and Feedback: | | | | |
| Step 3 – Focus Areas | Exemplary | Solid Progress | Limited Progress | Not Evident |
| High leverage and aligned | The 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas selected are aligned to deep data analysis and include qualitative and quantitative evidence. | The 2-3 focus areas selected are aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative evidence. | 2-3 focus areas are selected. | Shows lack of attempt or action |
| Step 3 Reflections and Feedback: 1.) | | | | |
| Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis | Exemplary | Solid Progress | Limited Progress | Not Evident |
| Clear Root Cause Statement | Each focus area has a clear statement of the deepest underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges that will result in a substantial reduction of the performance challenge. | Each focus area has a clear statement of the underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges. | Some or all of the focus areas have a 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 and quantitative data and are supported by evidence. | Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data. | Root causes are identified, but are not connected to data analysis. | Shows lack of attempt or action |
| Step 4 Reflections and Feedback: 1.) | | | | |
| Step 5 – Desired Outcomes & Critical Actions | Exemplary | Solid Progress | Limited Progress | Not Evident |
| <i>Desired Outcomes</i> – observable changes in adult behavior | Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying the specific observable change(s) in adult behaviors, which creates focus and urgency toward action. | Each focus area has a 90-day desired outcome identifying specific observable change(s) in adult behavior. | Desired outcomes do not 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 should logically result in increased student achievement. | Each desired outcome is specific and there is a clear connection between desired outcomes and a focus on increasing student achievement. | The desired outcomes lack specificity about the observable changes in adult behavior. There is no clear connection 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 promote a sense of urgency toward addressing root cause(s) and achieving the desired outcome. | For each focus area, critical actions address clear underlying root cause(s) and are connected to achieving the desired outcome. | It is not clear 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 strategically owned by various school/district individuals. | Each critical action identifies a person responsible. | It is not clear 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, including funding sources. | All critical actions have a clear timeline and identify resources needed to support them. | Critical actions do not identify timelines and/or needed resources. | Shows lack of attempt or action |

Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:

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

Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:

Appendix A: Comprehensive Support and Intervention Assurances

The following assurances indicate support of the Board of Education (BOE), Local Education Agency (LEA), and School Leadership for the 2017-2018, 2018-2019, 2019-2020, and 2020-2021 school years in the areas specified. By signing these assurances, the parties agree to three years full participation in the **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Evidence-Based Intervention Implementation**.

If at any time a signed party does not adhere to the agreed assurances, the Request for Application will be deemed incomplete.

LEA:

The Board of Education commits to the following:

1. Provide the prioritized support, autonomy, and accountability for urgent and sustainable success, including:
 - a. The BOE assures that it was involved in the discussion and application process with the LEA applying on behalf of eligible schools and supports the application/s.
 - b. The BOE commits to supporting the superintendent in modifying practice and policy, if necessary, to enable schools and teachers to fully participate and implement evidence-based interventions.
 - c. The BOE commits to flexibility in scheduling as it relates to evidence-based intervention activities, to include but not limited to allocating time for professional development and collaboration.
 - d. The BOE supports the use of summative and formative assessments to assess student proficiency and reviews LEA and school growth regularly to inform superintendent's progress toward LEA proficiency targets.
 - e. The BOE commits to successful completion of the evidence-based intervention in the event of LEA or school leadership changes.

The LEA commits to the following:

1. Assuring that each school the LEA proposes to serve will receive all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of funds received under Title 1, Part A, Sec. 1003a
2. Provide the prioritized support, autonomy, and accountability for urgent and sustainable success, including:
 - a. Partner with principal to establish a comprehensive school 90-day plan that is aligned with the LEA's strategic plan
 - b. Partner with principal on critical decisions like staffing, scheduling, budgeting, targeted professional development, and other operational issues
 - c. Put into place rigorous and aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year along with efficient data collection and distribution for use at the school level
 - d. Proactively engage all stakeholders to acknowledge current reality and present a bold vision for the future of the school
 - e. Hold turnaround schools and principals accountable through a robust monitoring system as defined by the LEA

3. Ensure that conditions are in place at the school level to support turnaround, including:
 - a. Rigorous aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year
 - b. Deep item analysis of interim assessments 3-4 times per year with one-on-one teacher-leader (principal, assistant principal, instructional coach) analysis meetings
 - c. Teacher action plans addressing root cause analysis of interim assessment data will be developed by all teachers and leaders prior to one-on-one teacher-leader analysis meetings
 - d. Structured weekly collaboration time for ongoing data analysis by PLCs
 - e. Student and staff culture of learning
 - f. Short-cycle observation walkthroughs and one-on-one teacher-leader feedback meetings
4. Message the evidence-based intervention to all stakeholders to include school board members and collective bargaining units as necessary
5. Develop a sustainability plan prior to the end of Year 3

School Leadership Commits to the Following:

1. Partner with LEA leadership to create and/or align systems at the school level to support a 90-day plan aligned with the LEA's strategic plan, including:
 - a. Rigorous aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year
 - b. Timely dissemination of interim assessment data to teachers
 - c. Deep item analysis of interim assessments 3-4 times per year with one-on-one teacher-leader(principal, assistant principal, instructional coach) analysis meetings
 - d. Teacher action plans addressing root cause analysis of interim assessment data developed by all teachers prior to one-on-one teacher-leader analysis meetings
 - e. Structured weekly collaboration time for ongoing data analysis by PLCs/grade level meeting/collaboration time
 - f. Student and staff culture of learning
 - g. Short-cycle observation walkthroughs and one-on-one teacher-leader feedback meetings
2. Align school policies and structures to provide ongoing school-site support for all teachers to support implementation of the evidence-based intervention

David E. Peery
 President, Board of Education Signature

2/21/2018
 Date

Raguel Peedy
 Superintendent Signature

2/22/18
 Date

Johnnie Gale
 School Leadership Signature

2/22/18
 Date

Appendix B: Certification and Approval

I hereby certify that I am the applicant’s Superintendent/Charter Director, and that the information contained in this application is, to the best of my knowledge, complete and accurate. I further certify, to the best of my knowledge, that any ensuing program and activity will be conducted in accordance with all applicable application guidelines and instructions, and that the requested budget amounts are necessary for the implementation of this project.

I understand that this application constitutes an offer and, if accepted by the PED or renegotiated to acceptance, will form a binding agreement. I also agree that immediate written notice will be provided to PED if at any time I learn that this certification was erroneous when submitted, or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

| | |
|--|------|
| Raquel M. Reedy | |
| Superintendent/Charter Director Printed Name | Date |

| | |
|---|---------|
|  | 2/22/18 |
| Superintendent/Charter Director Signature (blue ink) | Date |

Certification and Approval

I hereby certify that I am the applicant’s School Board President, and that the information contained in this application is, to the best of my knowledge, complete and accurate. I further certify, to the best of my knowledge, that any ensuing program and activity will be conducted in accordance with all applicable application guidelines and instructions, and that the requested budget amounts are necessary for the implementation of this project.

I understand that this application constitutes an offer and, if accepted by the PED or renegotiated to acceptance, will form a binding agreement. I also agree that immediate written notice will be provided to PED if at any time I learn that this certification was erroneous when submitted, or has become erroneous by reason of changed circumstances.

| | |
|------------------------------|------|
| Dr. David Peercy | |
| Board President Printed Name | Date |

| | |
|---|-----------|
|  | 2/21/2018 |
| Board President Signature (blue ink) | Date |