



**Request for Application (RFA) for  
Comprehensive Support & Improvement  
Schools (CSI)**

**Title I Sec.1003 [a]  
Every Student Succeeds Act  
CFDA Number: 84.010A**

**Espanola Public Schools**

**Deadline to Submit RFA:  
February 12, 2018 – extended to February 26**

*This is only a Request for Application (RFA) and does **NOT** constitute an award. Should this RFA result in an award, the LEA Superintendent/Charter Director will be notified by an official award letter. Only upon receipt of an award letter, signed by Secretary Designate Ruszkowski, may the LEA/charter school submit a Budget Adjustment Request (BAR).*

**New Mexico Public Education Department  
300 Don Gaspar Ave,  
Santa Fe, NM  
87501**

## **New Mexico Public Education Department: School Improvement 1003[a]**

### **I. Background**

Under the New Mexico Public Education Department's (NMPED) approved Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the state's lowest-achieving schools are identified as Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) schools. As a result, CSI schools, with the support of the larger Local Education Agency (LEA) and school community, have an opportunity to develop and implement targeted interventions with the goal of achieving dramatic school-level achievement gains such that the school is in good academic standing within three years.

### **II. Purpose**

LEAs with identified CSI schools are able to identify pathways for intensive improvement under New Mexico's ESSA plan:

1. NM DASH-Plus,
2. Applying and participating in State-Sponsored School-Based Interventions (such as Principals Pursuing Excellence),
3. High school transformation in partnership with PED (only 10 high schools will be selected for this opportunity each cycle) and
4. Application for Competitive Grants for School Improvement

The primary purpose of the CSI Request for Application process is to provide LEAs with schools identified as CSI the opportunity to apply for additional funding through a competitive grant process to support participation in an evidence-based school improvement program or innovative school interventions. This may be in addition to or in support of state-sponsored programs funded via targeted investments.

### **III. Eligibility**

This competitive grant is open to LEAs with CSI Schools. There are three ways a school can be identified as being in need of Comprehensive Support and Improvement:

1. Being among the lowest-performing 5% of **Title I** schools in the state, based on the total number of points earned on the School Grade Report Card;
2. Having a 4-year graduation rate below 67% for two out of the past three years (**Title I and non-Title I** high schools).

LEAs may submit multiple applications in response to this RFA, however; **only separate and complete applications for each CSI school will be accepted.**

A full list of CSI schools is available on the NM PED ESSA in New Mexico page:

<http://www.ped.state.nm.us/ped/ESSA.html>

#### IV. Evidence-based Interventions<sup>1</sup>

LEAs are charged with implementing ESSA, and ensure that LEAs are utilizing evidence-based strategies, activities, and interventions in schools in need of significant improvement.

While some ESSA programs allow the use of all four levels of evidence, Section 1003a of New Mexico’s ESSA Plan requires that CSI schools use these funds only for interventions reflecting one of the highest three levels of evidence (Strong, Moderate, and/or Promising).

- Strong: at least one well-designed and well-implemented experimental study (i.e., a randomized controlled trial).
- Moderate: at least one well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study.
- Promising: at least one well-designed and well-implemented correlation study with statistical controls for selection bias.

The PED will not provide a list of potential evidence-based interventions for school turnaround programs for use by LEAs in schools identified as CSI that choose to apply for the Competitive Grants for School Improvement. It is incumbent upon the LEA to demonstrate that the selected intervention falls into one of the three ESSA tiers of evidence in Category 1 (see table1).

**Table 1: Tiers of Evidence in ESSA**

Category 1:	Tier 1	Tier 2	Tier 3
“demonstrates a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes based on.”	“strong evidence from at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented experimental study”	“moderate evidence from at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented quasi-experimental study”	“promising evidence from at least 1 well-designed and well-implemented correlational study with statistical controls for selection bias”

#### V. LEA Organizational Conditions

LEAs must demonstrate that they have the organizational conditions necessary for turnaround success (as identified below) when applying to participate in the following evidence-based school turnaround programs:

- University of Virginia School Turnaround Program
- National Institute for School Leadership Executive Development Program
- New Mexico Leadership Innovation Program<sup>2</sup>

**Leadership Conditions:** LEAs must commit to lead for success by identifying priorities, aligning resources, investing in change that is sustainable, and clearly and consistently communicating that change is not optional.

**Differentiated Support and Accountability Conditions:** To achieve ambitious results, LEAs committed to turnaround must prioritize low performing schools and provide both additional,

<sup>1</sup> Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/guidanceusesinvestment.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> The NM Leadership Innovation Program is akin to the Principals Pursuing Excellence Program.

core support beyond what non-turnaround schools receive and individualized supports aligned with unique school needs, including the identification of resource inequities.

**Talent Management Conditions:** Public education is human capital intensive and efforts to turnaround low-Performing schools must prioritize how talent policies and approaches will be bolstered to support turnaround. LEAs must establish and continuously improve human capital management systems, including educator evaluation and support systems. Title II, Part A funds may be used by SEAs and LEAs to develop, implement, and improve rigorous, transparent, and fair evaluation and support systems if these systems are based in part on evidence of student achievement, which may include student growth, and must: (1) include multiple measures of educator performance, such as high-quality classroom observations and (2) provide clear, timely and useful feedback to educators. (ESEA sections 2101(c)(4)(B)(ii) and 2103(b)(3)(A)).

**Instructional Infrastructure Conditions:** LEAs often have invested heavy resources in producing curriculum and data that teachers either do not have the capacity, understanding, or willingness to use. LEAs must own this challenge and create an instructional infrastructure where data is well organized and the pathway on how to use data to adapt instruction are clear.

## **VI. Funding**

For the 2017-2018 SY, ESSA requires states to set aside seven percent of Title I, Part A funds for school improvement activities. Ninety-five percent of these funds must pass through to LEAs to support CSI schools, consistent with the state's new accountability system<sup>3</sup>.

PED is making multi-year awards (2017-2021), through the period of availability of funds<sup>4</sup>, to successful applicants.

Estimated funds available: **\$6,121,460.00** (for the 2017-2018 SY<sup>5</sup>)

## **VII. Maximum Funding Amounts**

- The planning period total funding requested may be no greater than \$30,000.00.
- The year-one implementation period total funding request may be no greater than \$150,000<sup>6</sup>.
- The year-two implementation period total funding request may be no greater than \$150,000.
- The year-three implementation period total funding request may be no greater than \$150,000.
- Ninety-percent (90%) of the maximum funding requests for each period must be directed toward school-level activities supporting the implementation of the evidence-based intervention.
- Applicants must describe and justify in the budget narrative any specific LEA-level expenses (indirect cost) to be supported by funds at no more than 10% of total request for each period.

---

<sup>3</sup> ESSA § 1003(b)

<sup>4</sup> Continuing awards are dependent upon continued appropriation from congress.

<sup>5</sup> Continuing awards are dependent upon continued appropriation from congress.

<sup>6</sup> Funding will be determined based on school size on a sliding scale.

- Normal indirect cost may also be claimed at the PED approved rate for the district.
- Supplies and materials are allowable for CSI schools, if necessary to meet the project goals and objectives, but must not exceed 10% of the total budget for each project period.

**VIII. Project Period**

For applications, the full project period for this grant is three years. Continuation funding after each period of the project is contingent upon progress toward meeting achievement goals, leading indicators, fidelity of implementation of required model actions, and maintenance of all grant requirements.

<b>Project Period Timeline</b>	
Applications Released by PED	December 5, 2017
Letter of Intent to Apply due to PED (Appendix A)	January 9, 2018
Applications Due to PED	February 12, 2018
Announcement of Awards	March 1, 2018
Planning Period for LEA/Schools	March 1, 2018 to June 30, 2018
Year-One Implementation Period	July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2019
Year-Two Implementation Period	July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020
Year-Three Implementation Period	July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021

**IX. Application Deadline and Submission Requirements**

**Letter of Intent**

LEAs should submit a Letter of Intent (LOI) designating the specific identified schools for which applications will be submitted.

The LOI should be submitted electronically through the Priority Schools Bureau email portal available at the following link: [ped.psb@state.nm.us](mailto:ped.psb@state.nm.us). The LOI should be received by 3:00 p.m. on January 9, 2018.

**X. Full Application Submission**

Complete applications **must** be submitted electronically through the Priority Schools Bureau portal available at the following link: [ped.psb@state.nm.us](mailto:ped.psb@state.nm.us).

In addition, one original application plus one hardcopy **must** be mailed by postal service to:

New Mexico Public Education Department  
 Attn: Debbie Montoya  
 Deputy Cabinet Secretary, School Transformation  
 Room 123  
 300 Don Gaspar Avenue  
 Santa Fe, New Mexico 85701

Complete hardcopy applications **must** be postmarked by February 12, 2018, and complete electronic copies must be submitted through the Priority Schools email portal ([ped.psb@state.nm.us](mailto:ped.psb@state.nm.us).) no later than 4:00 p.m. on February 12, 2018.

## **XI. Budget Requirements**

The budget documents requested in response to this RFA must identify and explain funded costs for activities that are necessary to carry out all aspects of the whole-school change. In addition, through the budget narrative, the LEA will be asked to identify other sources and amounts of funding that will support and sustain the activities that are crucial to rigorous implementation of the chosen evidence-based intervention.

- **Budget Narrative**

The budget narrative, described in the Proposal Narrative sections of this RFA, should identify and explain all funded costs for the entire project period (planning period, two years of implementation).

- **Budget Summary Chart (Appendix C)**

This chart summarizes the budget for the entire project period, three years of implementation.

## **XII. Additional Budget Guidance**

### **Appropriate Costs**

Funds are intended to *supplement* and *support* comprehensive school reform by funding *specific* initiatives designed to promote targeted and sustainable school improvement. The actions and practices identified through each category of the project narrative drive the appropriate costs.

Appropriate costs are those costs that are directly connected to the actions and to sustaining the practices prompted in the categories of the project narrative (e.g., the implementation of a curriculum aligned the Common Core State Standards (CCSS), continuous use of data to drive decision making, extended/expanded learning time, etc.).

Generally, there is a very high burden of proof to show that paying for food and beverages with Federal funds is necessary to meet the goals and objectives of a Federal grant. When a grantee is hosting a meeting, the grantee should structure the agenda for the meeting so that there is time for participants to purchase their own food, beverages, and snacks. In addition, when planning a meeting, grantees may want to consider a location in which participants have easy access to food and beverages.

While these determinations will be made on a case-by-case basis, and there may be some circumstances where the cost would be permissible, it is likely that those circumstances will be rare. Grantees, therefore, will have to make a compelling case that the unique circumstances they have identified would justify these costs as reasonable and necessary. This does not preclude an LEA from paying the travel expense of those attending a conference or meeting that is necessary to carry out its federal grant program, which could include per diem for food.

It is incumbent upon the applicant to demonstrate the close connections between the costs proposed and the organizational or pedagogical purposes those costs will support from the project narrative.

### **XIII. Budgeting and Planning for Sustainability**

In budgeting and planning for sustainability, LEAs should be certain to support critical, ongoing activities through reliable and stable funding sources. In budgeting and planning for sustainability, funds should support but not serve as the sole source of funding for this work.

### **XIV. Reporting Requirements**

The lead points of contact at the LEA responsible for oversight, monitoring, and support of the CSI School are required to participate in progress site visits and monitoring telephone calls with PED<sup>7</sup>.

In addition, LEAs will be responsible for submitting monthly, quarterly and/or annual reports on school progress<sup>8</sup> that may include, but are not limited to:

#### **NM DASH**

- NM DASH Feedback Tool for each school (2x a year)

#### **Leading Indicators**

- Student attendance and school average daily attendance
- Attendance by instructional staff and staff average daily attendance
- Interim assessment data
- Student course completion data
- Instructional staff turnover rate
- NM TEACH information
- In-school and out-of-school suspension rates and average in-school and out-of-school suspension rates by total school and broken down by sub-group
- Chronic absenteeism rates
- Dropout rates
- Number of students completing advanced coursework by subgroup (e.g., advanced Placement/ International Baccalaureate, college pathways or dual enrollment classes [high schools only])
- Other program evaluation and indicator data as needed

#### **Lagging indicators**

- Student achievement rates
- State assessment data disaggregated by sub-group
- Student achievement rates compared to the State
- Student achievement rates compared to the LEA
- Student growth data
- College readiness data
- Graduation and transition data

---

<sup>7</sup> Please note - if awarded, the subgrantee will be required to revise Step 2 - Analyze Data and Set Student Achievement Goals of the school NM DASH, identifying new goals that will be targeted with the RFA funds.

<sup>8</sup> Templates will be provided by PED.

### Behavioral and Academic Data

- Evidence that the LEA has a multi-tiered framework with proven evidence-based practices that improve behavioral and academic outcomes for students.
- Evidence that the school implements the practices that support student in a Multi-Tier System of Supports (MTSS) model to ensure that struggling students receive the targeted and intensive supports they need.
- PED-approved K-3 reading assessment used to measure student growth, inform instructional practice, and identify professional development needs.
- School-developed and/or LEA-directed formative/interim assessments used by the school to determine the likelihood of meeting academic achievement targets.
- School-developed and/or LEA-directed formative/interim assessments used to determine the impact of instructional practice.

### XV. Scoring Guide

<b>CSI RFA Title I Sec. 1003[a] Scoring Guide</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>I. LEA Organizational Culture</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>25%</b>
A. LEA Overview	5	
B: Instructional Infrastructure	10	
C. LEA Support and Accountability	10	
<b>II School Level Context</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15%</b>
A. School Overview	5	
B. NM DASH Plans	5	
D. Collaboration Structures	5	
<b>III Evidence-Based Interventions</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>50%</b>
A. Root Cause and Focus Areas	10	
B. Choice of Evidence-Based Interventions	20	
C. Sources of Evidence	10	
D. Theory of Action	10	
<b>IV. Budget</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10%</b>
A. Budget Narrative	5	
B. Budget (Excel Files)	5	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

### XVI. Review and Ranking of Applications

Only complete applications from eligible LEAs received at PED by the due date will be accepted. LEAs must clearly identify in the application cover page the specific CSI schools for which they are applying or the application will be rejected as incomplete.

All complete applications will be reviewed and rated by at least two external reviewers.

1. The scores of the first two reviewers will be totaled and then averaged to arrive at the final score for each application using the percentage.
2. If there is a difference of 7 points or more between the two reviewers' scores, a third reviewer will review the application.

3. The two scores mathematically closest to each other will be averaged for the final score unless the difference between the third review score and the first two are equidistant; in which case the third reviewer's score will solely be used.
4. Total scores will be rank ordered using the final score on the application.
5. LEAs will be selected in order of rank; however, not all applying schools in a LEA may be selected dependent on funding availability.

## **XVII. Continuation or Redistribution of Funding**

Continuation funding after each period of the project is contingent upon progress toward meeting achievement goals, leading indicators, fidelity of implementation of required model actions, and maintenance of all grant requirements.

If a subgrantee fails to comply with Federal statutes, regulations or the terms and conditions of this award, the State Education Agency (SEA) may impose additional conditions, as described in §200.207 Special Conditions (below).

If the SEA determines that noncompliance cannot be remedied by imposing additional conditions, the SEA may take one or more of the following actions, as appropriate in the circumstances:

- a) Temporarily withhold cash payments pending correction of the deficiency by the subgrantee or more severe enforcement action by the SEA.
- b) Disallow all or part of the cost of the activity or action not in compliance.
- c) Wholly or partly suspend or terminate the award.
- d) Recommend the USED initiate suspension or department proceedings as authorized under 2 CFR part 180.
- e) Withhold further Federal awards to the project or program<sup>9</sup>.

The SEA may impose additional award conditions<sup>10</sup> as needed, which may include the following:

- 1) Requiring payments as reimbursements rather than advance payments;
- 2) Withholding authority to proceed to the next phase until receipt of evidence of acceptable performance within a given period of performance;
- 3) Requiring additional, more detailed financial reports;
- 4) Requiring additional project monitoring;
- 5) Requiring the subgrantee to obtain technical or management assistance; or
- 6) Establishing additional prior approvals.

If any funded LEAs withdraw or become ineligible within the first year of funding due to not progressing toward meeting achievement goals, leading indicators, fidelity of implementation of required model actions, and maintenance of all grant requirements, the leftover funds may be used to fund the next highest ranking applications.

---

<sup>9</sup> 2 CFR Part 200 §200.338 Remedies for Noncompliance

<sup>10</sup> §200.207 Special Conditions

## LEA Comprehensive Support and Improvement Competitive Grants Application Cover Sheet

LEA Information		
<b>LEA/State Charter Name:</b> Española Public Schools		<b>LEA NCES ID #:</b> 3500900
<b>Mailing Address:</b> 1260 Industrial Park Road, Española, NM, 87532		
<b>Phone:</b> 505-753-2254		<b>Fax:</b> 505.367.3363
<b>Superintendent/Charter Director:</b> Bobbie J. Gutierrez		<b>Email:</b> bobbie.gutierrez@k12espanola.org
<b>Title I Director:</b> Myra Martinez		<b>Email:</b> myra.martinez@k12espanola.org
<b>Federal Programs Director:</b> Myra Martinez		<b>Email:</b> myra.martinez@k12espanola.org
<b>Business Manager:</b> Maria Fidalgo		<b>Email:</b> maria.fidalgo@k12espanola.org
<b>Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools LEA Lead:</b> Leslie Kilmer		<b>Email:</b> leslie.kilmer@k12espanola.org
LEA will Apply for the Following Eligible School(s)		
Name of School	School NCES ID #	Proposed Intervention Model
Carlos F. Vigil Middle School	350090000814	Evidence Based Whole-school Improvement

## **CSI RFA Application**

### **Proposal Requirements**

1. The proposal narrative should **not exceed 50 pages** (not including required charts, forms, and requested artifacts submitted as appendices).
2. It should be typed, single-spaced, with LEAs addressing each of the subsections by entering text where indicated.
3. Font may NOT be less than 12 pt. Times New Roman.
4. Charts and forms do not require 12 pt. Times New Roman font.
5. The complete LEA application including budgets, charts, and forms will be posted on the PED ESSA webpage.

**LEA Comprehensive Support and Improvement Competitive Grants Application**

<b>LEA Name:</b>	<b>Espanola Public Schools</b>
<b>Submitting on Behalf of (name of school):</b>	<b>Carlos F. Vigil Middle School</b>
<b>Number of Students Served:</b>	<b>538</b>
<b>Number of Certified Licensed Staff:</b>	<b>35</b>

**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.**

Espanola Public Schools is working with ObserverTab LLC to identify and prioritize needs in the district to include:

- **Assessment of School Leadership:** Each teacher completed a survey in which they were asked to respond to a series of questions that targeted the effectiveness of the principal’s instructional leadership abilities. **Please see Appendix D: Observer Tab Sample Survey**
- **Assessment of Instructional Leaders at the District Level:** Each principal completed a survey in which they were asked to respond to questions targeted at identifying the instructional support that the district administration provides each school site.
- **Two Focus Groups (Teacher and Parent)** responded to questions and provided information that included:
  - What are the qualities of a "BEST" District?
  - Rank 1-4 (1-lowest priority to 4-highest priority)
  - Which three characteristics are the most important for your district?
  - Knowing parents, teachers, coaches, and administration are all committed and focused on students, why do think Española’s test scores aren’t as high as they need to be?
  - Why do you think there is a high degree of turnover (teachers and administrators) in Española?
  - If you were talking to parents, would you tell them to enroll their child in Espanola? Why or why not?
- A comprehensive report has been provided to the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent to assist in determining next steps, to include budget, personnel and professional development. This report is available upon request.

Espanola Public Schools is in discussion and planning with Cooperative Educational Services (CES) to administer an instructional needs assessment, K-12, during the spring semester. A meeting was held with district administration and CES on February 6, 2018, to finalize the assessment tool and processes. Evidence will be collected in the following areas:

## Classroom Management, Active Student Engagement, Depth of Knowledge, Explicit Instruction, and Differentiation

The outcome of the instructional needs assessment will provide valuable information regarding instructional priorities for the district and how money will be budgeted to address these needs.

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

Upon completion of the K-12 instructional needs assessment during the spring semester, data collected will be compiled into a report from CES, which will be used to identify strengths and needs related to curriculum, instruction and assessment. The data will be shared with district leadership and site principals.

PARCC data is readily available to both educators and patrons. The district leadership has thoroughly examined this data. In our work with ObserverTab to identify district priorities, an examination of all data has provided the district with insight and direction that informs possible strategies for district and school improvement.

The percentage of students meeting or exceeding expectations in Española Public Schools in 2017 indicates a need for improvement in both ELA and Math (**Please see Appendix E: Española Public Schools 2017 PARCC ELA and Math Data.**) The critical area of focus is clearly Math, where only 11% of Española students met or exceeded state benchmarks. ELA standards must also be addressed; nearly half of the district's students did not meet expectations based on this assessment. If the state and/or comparable districts have significantly higher results using the PARCC measures, this indicates that the issues are local to Española Public Schools. Performance should be addressed through focused effort. We should expect that Española's student performance is comparable to students in similar districts and to students within the state. State and district comparisons can identify areas of focus important to Española students to be competitive with their peers throughout New Mexico. New Mexico PED provides an analysis of all assessments including PARCC ELA and Math, NMAPA reading and Math, and Istation Reading. An examination of state results and comparable districts indicates that Española underperforms in both ELA and Math. (**Please see Appendix F: Española Public Schools 2017 PARCC Performance Results Compared to Comparable Districts.**) It is reasonable to expect that student percent proficient in Española meet state and comparable district averages. Both ELA and Math are areas of need requiring focus and attention in professional development and coaching. The district leadership recommends a twofold approach for learning, specific to the core:

First, work with educators on core curriculum standards in ELA and Math: prioritize, unpack skills and concepts, determine benchmarks, differentiate, and develop pre/mid/post assessments. Second, establish learning targets, success criteria and formative assessments to monitor progress based on those priorities.

Upon review of data provided by the report from ObserverTab, the district leadership also recommends specific subject professional development:

ELA:

- Close Reading (whole group instruction) for increasing comprehension
- Factual Text Comprehension
- Writing: Informational, Opinion/Argument

Math:

- Solving Math word problems using Close Reading strategies and teaching practices for lesson design and delivery

Big 8 Strategies: Expectations, Cueing, Proximity, Attention Prompts, Time Limits, Signals, Voice, and Tasking

- Active Student Engagement
- Depth of Knowledge
- Explicit Instruction
- Flexible Grouping to determine specific teacher and school needs,

Upon review of the data by the report from ObserverTab, an additional recommendation is to administer teacher observations in each school, determining for each teacher:

- Focused Rate (percentage of students who are compliant – following teacher direction)
- Engaged Rate (percentage of students responding)
- Depth of Knowledge
- Effective Instruction

## **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.**

In June of 2016, the Española Public Schools facilitated the development of K-12 Common Core State Standards aligned curriculum frameworks for Math (**please see Appendix G for these documents**) and 7-12 Common Core State Standards aligned curriculum frameworks for ELA (**please see Appendix H for these documents**). K-6 frameworks for ELA were not developed at that time, as there were not enough elementary teachers to work in grade level bands for both Math and ELA. We currently have a contract in process to hire a consultant to facilitate the development of K-6 curriculum frameworks for ELA, June 2018.

This past September, during a District In-service day, the developers/authors of the K-6 curriculum frameworks for Math hosted grade level professional development sessions on the frameworks for their peers. This past October, during a District In-service day, grade 7-12 mathematics teachers and grade 7-12 ELA teachers met to review the frameworks, adjust them as appropriate and ensure vertical alignment and pacing. This vertical articulation process will continue during District In-service days throughout the 2018-2019 school year.

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

**Accountability for Teachers:**

At this time, standard practices are utilized for teacher accountability that yield usable classroom and instructional data in order to provide the necessary support both at the school site and district level. Specifically, NMTEACH standards through MyLearningPlan are closely followed and monitored by every school leader, with at least two formal observations complemented by a host of other evaluative and non-evaluative practices that include but are not limited to, informal conferences, walk-throughs, assessment and reflective one-on-one meetings, in-school professional development, and outside training opportunities.

Additionally, district-wide, our summative reports have provided richly informed decisions regarding professional development opportunities tailored to the specific needs of teachers. These professional development opportunities happen more than once throughout the school year, are decided on the merit of need and are implemented by choice; teachers choose from a “menu” of topics and areas and decide what professional development sessions to attend, depending upon their perceived weakness.

Systems are in place both at the school and district level to monitor the implementation and effectiveness of the knowledge acquired through these venues. Schools carry out short-cycle assessments and analyze the resulting data in terms of structures and practices put in place as a result of the professional learning opportunities, as well the established goals of the school.

**Accountability for Leaders:**

The Deputy Superintendent supervises all principals. An Onsite Tool is used to capture important information about the principal’s leadership goals, growth and development as a school leader, as well as key information about their school site. **(Please see Appendix I: Española Public Schools Principals’ Onsite Tool.)**

The intent of the Onsite Tool is to inform site leadership coaching. The Deputy Superintendent meets with principals at mid-year to review the provided information and again in the spring to follow up with the principals’ progress. During these meetings, coaching questions include, but are not limited to:

- What can I do to support you?
- What would you like my role to be with this situation?
- What information can I find out for you?
- What information do you need to get back to me?
- What will happen if you don’t do that? What will happen if you do?
- What do you see as your next steps?
- How can you go about making that happen?
- What challenges have you encountered? What can you do to minimize the effect?
- How are teachers reacting?
- What are your goals for this situation?

The information captured within the Onsite Tool is used to complete HOUSSE Form D for principal evaluations.

The Deputy Superintendent is facilitating work with principals during their monthly leadership meetings, to create district wide “Academic Non-negotiables.” The Academic Non-negotiables will be a guiding document for the district to ensure that every school and every classroom across the district has a set of evidence-based instructional practices that are agreed upon and implemented district wide. Site principals will be held accountable by the Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent for ensuring these non-negotiables are being implemented, and teachers will be held accountable for the same by site principals.

### **Other Tools Española Public Schools is using to Support Accountability**

MyLearningPlan - Professional Learning Suite:

The MyLearningPlan Professional Learning Suite is a comprehensive set of tools which include content and evaluation tools and observation calibration, allowing our district to support employees through effective evaluations and individualized professional development. The Professional Learning Suite manages every aspect of classroom observations, professional development, registration, mentoring, and video-based peer review - ultimately allowing our district and school administrators to support continual teacher professional learning. Content can be mixed and matched over time to create a rich collection of personalized professional learning resources for teachers and administrators, connected to Domains 1, 2, 3, and 4. Additionally, administrators can create custom templates for documenting anything associated with a professional development process, such as requesting credit, registering for an activity or creating goals. They can also monitor important data such as attendance rates and budget codes. Española Public Schools utilizes Professional Learning Suite to support teachers in improving their instruction and the learning of their students.

Instructional Rounds:

Española Public Schools has experienced extreme turnover in terms of their Superintendent. During SY 2016-2017, the Special Projects Coordinator was asked to develop a protocol for instructional rounds. Instructional rounds are a practice of observing patterns of teaching and learning across classrooms, with the goal of improving instruction. The practice was adapted from medical rounds that doctors conduct and assists educators in working together, using a basic protocol, to improve classroom instruction. The instructional rounds practice is meant to be a collegial problem solving experience, rather than a punitive/”gotcha” experience. There are many protocols for instructional rounds – the protocol Española Public Schools will be using is a hybrid from the Harvard Graduate School of Education. **(Please see Appendix J: EPS Instructional Rounds Protocol.)**

Key Elements of Española Public Schools Instructional Rounds:

- The host school identifies a “problem of practice” (POP) which will be the visiting team’s focus during classroom visits. Problems of practice might relate to student engagement, implementation of the CCSS, effective instructional practices, rigor, differentiation, questioning, etc.

- The host school first provides an overview of the POP. The visiting team (including the host) then divides into groups and observes in three to four classrooms for no more than 20 minutes. During this time, the team members record what teachers and students are saying and doing related to the POP - in a nonjudgmental fashion. What is observed is what is recorded.
- Additionally, the District will also identify other focus areas for the classroom visits, which may differ from POPs.
- Once the observations are completed, the school host and visiting team debrief on what they observed, citing evidence. Plus/Delta data is recorded and analyzed and patterns are identified. The visiting team then makes suggestions for improvements and “next steps” are identified.
- The host school incorporates the data and suggestions into their school improvement work.

The District plans to begin implementation of instructional rounds during SY 2018-2019.

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

At least twice a month, elementary schools engage in analysis on data primarily from Istation BOY, MOY and EOY assessments, and progress monitoring data, in order to inform grade-level decisions on instruction as well as dedicated Response to Intervention (RTI) periods. Preliminary rosters and dedicated support groups are created by the entire staff, while smaller focused groups are dedicated to analyzing data further for particular students whose needs may require additional attention. A typical cycle of assessment lasts one month, with a variety of complementary assessments and evaluative practices carried out by teachers within this same period, including in-classroom formative assessment, Lexia Learning and Math IXL.

Lexia and Math IXL (complementary assessment):

Upon district advice, most schools have purchased access to Lexia (reading preparation software) and Math IXL, which directly complement instruction and assessment based on Istation. Teachers are able to evaluate student growth without waiting an entire month for data.

Grade 7-12 Assessments:

A short cycle assessment for secondary schools is not in place, but options are being considered for the 2018-2019 school year. In its place, grade level and interdepartmental teams have been created, albeit pending standardization, which approach student assessment and planning in a collaborative manner. For example, the ELA department at Española Valley High School meets every Friday to review student work and plan/monitor instruction respective of the established curriculum alignment. As a result, teachers are aware of student achievement beyond their classroom and are able to prioritize needs in a broader perspective while learning from one another.

Teacher Rounds are being piloted at Española Valley High School within the ELA Department.

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

Our elementary schools are using Istation for ELA. Istation measures progress in meeting specific skills delineated in the Common Core State Standards. Istation offers “standards-correlation” information for those interested in understanding how instruction and assessment through this service ties to their adopted standards (the CCSS in our case). K-6 ELA curriculum frameworks will be developed June 2018. The basis for the development of these frameworks will be the Common Core State Standards.

For elementary math, “standard” short cycle assessments are currently not in place; however, most schools have purchased access Math IXL. Math IXL also measures progress in meeting specific skills delineated in the Common Core State Standards. Math IXL also offers “standards-correlation” information for those interested in understanding how instruction and assessment through this service ties to their adopted standards (the CCSS in our case). K-6 teachers utilize the Española Public Schools CCSS aligned curriculum frameworks for Math.

“Standard” short cycle assessments for secondary ELA and Math are currently not in place; however, Española Public Schools’ goals for the 2018-2019 school year include having these assessments will be in place. Currently, grade level and interdepartmental teams, through looking at student work (through the lens of the Española Public Schools CCSS aligned district curriculum frameworks) have collaboratively created their own assessments. The ELA and Math frameworks that were created a few years ago are aligned to the Common Core State Standards and guide ELA and Math departments in designing and implementing interim assessments.

Ensuring that each of these types of formative and summative tools align directly with the Common Core State Standards is a district expectation. Istation, being a tool utilized state-wide, is very clear about its adherence to the requirements and goals of the Common Core State Standards. This translates into not only exercises that are relevant to standards, but into data that informs teachers and schools of the varying and changing needs of students that are in direct connection to Common Core objectives.

Similarly, other services such as Math IXL and Lexia take the task of meeting standards very seriously. Prior to the district recommending these services and to schools accepting adoption, a careful review was made to ensure that the investment in these tools would result in student growth that was focused on areas relevant to the Common Core State Standards. Both Lexia and Math IXL pride themselves in a strong alignment to the standards under which their client falls. In our case, these services provided satisfactory evidence that their correlation was in fact valid, usable and superior in comparison to other services.

**Provide the schedule for administering common interim assessments in ELA and Math.**

**Please see Appendix K: Española Public Schools 2017-2018 schedule of Common Interim Assessments for ELA and Math.** Please note, the 2018-2019 schedules have not yet been developed.

**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).**

Locally, cycles of assessment have been designed to be purposeful, relevant and strictly data-informed. At the primary level, bi-monthly team meetings are dedicated to the review of interim assessment data (Istation, IXL, Lexia, Bilingual tests, in-classroom summative assessment, etc.) to inform decisions for the following month. Newly created structures resulting from this work influence both the school planning and in-classroom instruction that targets specific student needs that became apparent during the previous assessment cycle, and grade-level needs that proved to be common among most students. The majority of schools have institutionalized an RtI period within their schedules with groups of students categorized by area of need and strength. For example, a typical school will dedicate certain teachers to give assistance to students who struggle with phonemic awareness, while other teachers will be solely dedicated to fractions and ratios for an entire month. These decisions are designed very carefully by all teachers during a common dedicated time mandated and provided by the district (every other Thursday, half day).

In addition to RtI periods, teachers are expected to evaluate their monthly assessment data carefully in order to modify instruction as appropriate. While curriculum guides have been provided, the district has made it a priority to give special attention to needs that have become evident in the assessment results, and whether that instructional need was foreseen or not, teachers are encouraged to reflect and adapt periodically.

A similar approach is implemented at the secondary level, even in the absence of formal short-cycle assessments. Interim assessments in the form of departmental projects, diagnostic assessments, pilot instructional rounds, and localized surveys, serve to inform weekly PLC meetings in every department with a focus on systematizing and strengthening instructional practices. For example, on a given meeting teachers may bring samples of student work and discuss scoring on a shared rubric. Once teachers are familiar with the consensus around the rigor of tasks and content pacing, they acquire a level of confidence in their own instruction and become part of a larger environment of inquiry and constant collective reflection. Instructional rounds are being piloted in the ELA Department, but similar practices take place in other areas under the supervision and guidance of the high school and middle school leadership.

**C. LEA Support and Accountability**

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

The following individuals will direct and coordinate LEA participation in supporting the CSI School: Deputy Superintendent and identified Cabinet Members, to include: Executive Director and Assistant Director of Student Services and Wellness, Executive Director of Federal Programs, Director of 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers and Assessment and Accountability (Carlos F. Vigil Middle School has a vibrant 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC program), and Director of Technology. These individuals will be tasked to ensure Carlos F. Vigil Middle School has the necessary resources to be successful throughout the grant's planning and implementation years. The above senior leadership will receive a copy of the approved CSI grant and will schedule an initial meeting with the principal to identify areas of need and support. Regular meetings will be scheduled with the senior leadership and the Carlos F. Vigil Middle School principal and his/her team to assess progress and ongoing support throughout the grant cycle.

**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)).**

**Please see Appendix L: Espanola Public Schools Organizational Chart**

**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 CSI School Administrator Cycle of Feedback and Evaluation Tool will be used by the district leadership and school leadership to provide regular and timely feedback regarding school administrator's professional growth and development, school climate and culture and progress toward meeting the CSI Grant goals. This will include completion of the NM HOUSSE Self-assessment and goal setting by the CSI school administrator at the start of SY 2018-2019; four formative on-site visits, using the Principal On-site tool previously described in this application; semester 1 and semester 2 review of progress toward the NM HOUSSE Competencies; and survey, interviews and observations, at the start and continuing through semester 2. **(Please see Attachment M: Española Public Schools CSI School Administrator Cycle of Feedback and Evaluation Tool for specific dates, activities and artifacts/data collection.)**

### **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.**

Carlos F. Vigil Middle School will utilize several methods to transparently consult and collaborate with key education stakeholders about the CSI school's activities and on the implementation status of the evidence-based interventions.

The school currently sends home monthly newsletters. Should the grant be secured, these newsletters will report highlights of the implementation activities of the CSI grant and after key assessment benchmark dates with assessment results. For SY 2018-2019, newsletters will be sent home to parents on the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month. The school will also report on these highlights in the same way at their monthly Parent Advisory Committee meetings. These meetings take place on the fourth Tuesday of each month.

The Superintendent of Schools hosts a weekly radio show on KDCE, here in Espanola. The district commits to dedicating a radio show each quarter, on progress toward meeting the goals and benchmarks of the CSI grant. These radio shows will take place on the second Thursday of each quarter.

The Superintendent of Schools also creates and disseminates to district and site school community members, City of Española, Rio Arriba County, and Native American community members, a quarterly newsletter. The district commits to including highlights/updates on grant implementation, assessment results, etc. in these newsletters. The exact dissemination dates for this are t.b.a.

Our Española Public Schools Board of Education meetings take place on the first and fourth Wednesday of each month. If awarded, the district will include a standing, monthly information item focused on the grant. This will keep the Española Public Schools Board of Education members and community members who attend these meetings, apprised of the progress being made in implementing the CSI grant at Carlos F. Vigil Middle School.

Lastly, Española Public Schools has a good relationship with its local newspaper, The Rio Grande Sun RGS). The Superintendent will reach out to the RGS, requesting that it publish periodic updates regarding progress being made in implementing the grant, advancements in student achievement, etc.

## **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). Describe the results of in-depth NM TEACH data analysis, including the total number of instructional staff in their 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.**

The following chart depicts Carlos F. Vigil Middle School’s 2016 and 2017 PARCC results for ELA, Math and Algebra, Grades 7 and 8:

PARCC	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Spring 2017 Math 7	39	16	108	44.33	84	34.4	13	5.3	0	0
Spring 2016 Math 7	37	13.7	92	39.1	86	36.6	19	8.1	1	0.4
Spring 2017 ELA 7	69	28.4	71	29.2	79	32.3	23	9.3	1	0.4
Spring 2016 ELA 7	72	30.6	84	33.7	58	24.7	19	8.1	2	0.9
Spring 2017 Math 8	92	30.3	36	30.6	31	16.9	4	2.2	0	0
Spring 2016 Math 8	122	57	63	30.4	24	11.2	3	1.4	0	0
Spring 2017 ELA 8	69	29.6	83	36.3	34	23.2	23	10.7	0	0
Spring 2016 ELA 8	92	34.8	81	30.7	70	26.3	21	8	0	0
Spring 2017 Alg I	3	10.2	16	32.7	21	42.9	7	14.3	0	0
Spring 2016 Alg I	8	13.7	17	33.3	20	39.2	6	11.8	0	0

Our data indicates that for the past two years, our PARCC results have been very similar for ELA and Math, for both grade levels. The following chart depicts the average of 2016 and 2017 student performance data at each PARCC level, by percent. The majority of our students perform at Levels 2 and 3, with the exception of 8<sup>th</sup> grade of Math, which has the majority of students in Levels 1 and 2.

Grade/Subject	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Grade 7 ELA	29.5 %	32.45 %	28.6 %	8.8 %	.65 %
Grade 8 ELA	32.2 %	33.6 %	24.85 %	9.35 %	0 %
Grade 7 Math	15.85 %	41.7 %	35.5 %	6.7 %	.4 %
Grade 8 Math	53.65 %	30.5 %	14.05 %	1.8 %	0 %
Algebra	12.95 %	33.0 %	41.05 %	13.05 %	0 %

Additionally, grade level teams looked at the School Evidence Statement Analysis Reports for ELA and Math. This report tells us the order of difficulty for each question asked on the PARCC exam, tells us the Common Core State Standard that was used for the question and gives us the domain and school count of how many students responded to the questions correctly or incorrectly. It also allows us to see how our students performed in comparison to students throughout the state and in other states. The data indicates that overall, Carlos F. Vigil Middle School students performed below other districts in New Mexico, as well as below schools in other states.

Based on this analysis, we are currently calibrating our curriculum framework guides and working to address the following achievement deficiencies indicated on the School Evidence Statement Analysis Reports:

Grade 7 ELA – Written Expression, Writing Knowledge, Literacy Analysis, Research Simulation, and Narrative Writing, as well as Informational Text

Grade 8 ELA - Written Expression, Writing Knowledge, Literacy Analysis, Research Simulation, and Narrative Writing, as well as Informational Text and Literature

Grade 7 Math - The Number System, Modeling and Reasoning, and Statistics and Probability

Grade 8 Math - Functions, Geometry, Expressions and Equations, and Modeling and Reasoning

Grade 8 Algebra – Functions and Modeling and Reasoning

Lastly, we analyzed data using the Student Roster Reports. These rosters report individual student achievement in various skill categories. For instance, for ELA, the report provides data for Literacy, Information and Vocabulary (Reading) and Expression and Conventions (Writing). For Math, the skill categories are Major Content, Supporting Content, Reasoning, and Modeling. There are sub-skills embedded within each skill category.

The following chart indicates where our students performed in relation to the state. In ELA and Math, with the exception of Algebra, our performance targets were only partially met. This chart reiterates what the general PARCC scores reflect – our students are in need of intense interventions in research based instruction.

Grade/Subject	Did Not Yet Meet	Partially Met	Approached	Met	Exceeded
Grade 7 ELA	650-699	700-724	725-746	750-784	785-850
School		716			
State			727		
Grade 8 ELA	650-699	700-724	724-749	750-793	794-850
School		715			
State			729		
Grade 7 Math	650-699	700-724	725-729	750-785	786-850
School		718			
State		724			
Grade 8 Math	650-699	700-724	725-749	750-800	801-850
School		701			
State		713			
Algebra	650-699	700-724	725-749	750-804	805-850
School			729		
State		724			

Student performance tasks show us what our students know and are able to do, and where the gaps are in their learning, but how do we make sure that we’re using the data from those performance tasks to close those gaps? Educators in the most rapidly achieving schools cite data-driven instruction and inquiry as one of the most important factors in helping all students achieve success. According to Bambrick-Santoyo “When correctly applied, data driven instruction has led to dramatic gains in student performance nationwide”.

In considering the best framework for instruction, our school must not only consider the data of our current students but the data of the incoming 6<sup>th</sup> grade students from the 10 elementary schools of the district (please see the chart below).

In reviewing the 2017 PARCC data in ELA and Math for grade 6 students, Carlos F. Vigil Middle School will be receiving 47 students at level 4 (proficient) or higher in math, and 53 students at level 4 (proficient) or higher in ELA, out of 251 students. The data shows that 18.7% of the incoming students will be proficient or higher in mathematics and 21.1% in ELA, assuming they all stay in our school district. With this information, we need to analyze and create a framework of action to effectively support what students need to learn most. It is also essential that we have vertical teaming and vertical alignment implemented across-content literacy and math programs to ensure an environment in which data driven instruction drives the educational setting.

PARCC Elem	NMPEID Grade	Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
		#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
ELA Alcalde	F	3	6	7	28	13	52	3	12	0	0
Math Alcalde		2	8	14	56	6	24	3	12	0	0
		Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
ELA Velarde	F	0	0	3	42.9	3	42.9	1	14.3	0	0
Math Velarde		2	28.6	3	42.9	2	28.6	0	0	0	0
		Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
ELA Hernandez	F	5	23.8	9	42.9	7	33.3	0	0	0	0
Math Hernandez		8	38.1	10	47.6	3	14.3	0	0	0	0
		Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
ELA Eutimio	D	11	19.3	17	29.8	23	43.9	4	7	0	0
Math Eutimio		20	33.9	21	35.6	11	18.6	7	11.9	0	0
		Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
ELA Tony Quintana	D	16	33.3	9	30	3	16.7	0	0	0	0
Math Tony Quintana		10	33.3	13	40	7	23.3	1	3.3	0	0
		Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
ELA James Rod	C	6	9.2	15	23.1	29	44.6	14	21.5	1	1.5
Math James Rod		16	24.6	15	23.1	23	35.4	9	13.8	2	3.1
		Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
ELA Abiquiu	C	2	9.5	2	9.5	10	47.6	7	33.3	0	0
Math Abiquiu		2	9.5	6	28.6	8	38.1	3	23.8	0	0
		Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
ELA Chimayo	B	1	3.3	2	10.5	11	57.9	4	21.1	1	5.3
Math Chimayo		2	10.5	7	36.8	6	31.6	4	21.1	0	0
		Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
ELA San Juan	B	1	2.1	9	19.1	14	29.8	19	40.4	4	8.5
Math San Juan		6	12.8	9	19.1	17	36.2	13	27.7	2	4.3
		Level 1		Level 2		Level 3		Level 4		Level 5	
ELA Dixon		0	0	2	50	1	25	1	25	0	0
Math Dixon		1	25	0	0	2	50	1	25	0	0

Currently, Carlos F. Vigil Middle School has 35 certified teachers, serving 554 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade students. For the 2016-2017 school year, 26 certified teachers were evaluated. Here are these teachers' NM TEACH summative ratings:

Rating	Number of Teachers
Exemplary	0
Highly Effective	9
Effective	9
Minimally Effective	7
Ineffective	1

In analyzing this data, we note that of the seven minimally effective teachers, four teachers' ratings were due to poor attendance and performance on PARCC and/or EOC Exams; the remaining five teachers' ratings were due to performance on PARCC and/or EOC Exams. Our ineffective rated teacher was transferred to a different content area at the start of this school year, as was one of our minimally effective rated teachers.

**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 – **Please see Appendix O: Carlos F. Vigil Middle School's Completed NM 90 Day Plan Offline Planning Process Workbook**
- Completed NM DASH Feedback Tool – **Please see Appendix P - Carlos F. Vigil Middle School's Completed NM DASH Feedback Tool**

**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.**

There are four types of Collaborative Teams that work to make Carlos F. Vigil Middle School a Professional Learning Community. These are the Grade-level Core Instructional Teams, The General Grade-level Teams, the Content-area Teams, and the Leadership Team. In general, these meetings follow a protocol where an agenda is developed prior to the meeting, team members sign in, minutes are kept, and a designated leader facilitates discussion and keeps the team on task. The following is a description of the purpose and frequency of collaboration.

**Grade-level Core Instructional Team**

There are two teams at the 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade levels that consist of one teacher of each of the four core subjects (ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies). These four teachers share the same student population. They meet two times per month during the first two months of school and monthly thereafter. They can also meet on an as needed basis because they have a common

planning period. The primary goal of this collaborative team is to unify and evaluate instructional and organizational strategies and to plan horizontal curriculum when appropriate. Another goal of this team is to identify and remediate student behavior or issues that have the potential to prevent learning.

### **General Grade-level Teams**

This team consists of all teachers at one grade-level and meets a minimum of two times per school year. The primary goal of this team is to unify and evaluate organizational and procedural strategies. Examples of some of these strategies are requiring student use of AVID binders and Cornell notes for note taking.

### **Content-area Teams**

These teams meet monthly and consist of all teachers of the same subject. Their goal is to create a common assessment that is aligned to specific learning targets which is administered prior to the following meeting. After calibrating the scoring of these assessments, the data is used to guide an analysis of instructional strategies. New targets are chosen and assessments created and the cycle repeated with improved instructional strategies in place.

### **Leadership Team**

This team meets monthly and consists of administration and representative staff. Their primary goal is to facilitate communication from all staff to administration and from administration to all staff. Other goals include collaborating on school-level organizational strategies and to reviewing the results of Core Instruction and Content-area teams.

### **Accountability**

Each team has a leader who is responsible for maintaining a binder of meeting artifacts such as agendas, minutes, assessments, data, and other products that result from collaboration. Individually, teachers provide these same artifacts digitally in support of Domain Four for their annual evaluation. Administrators look for uniform best practices in the classroom as a result of the collaboration described above.

## **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).**

Española Public Schools principals were trained by NMPED in the NM DASH 90-Day Plan. Several monthly principal meetings were devoted to the NM DASH 90-Day Plan, where principals reviewed and discussed the sections of the plan, what was being asked of them, etc. Additionally, each principal/school was assigned a mentor/support person, specifically tasked to provide guidance and support to school leadership teams in developing their Plans. Throughout the process, district administration provided support in the way of guidance, feedback, data, assistance with identifying underlying causes, etc. Once schools developed their initial NM DASH 90-Day Plans, district staff reviewed them using the NM Dash Feedback Tool and provided feedback to school leadership teams. District staff continually

monitors the progress schools are making in carrying out their stated critical actions and measuring their impact in addressing root causes within each focus area.

## **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.**

Through the process of developing the 90 Day Plan, it was determined that our students are performing below grade level in both ELA and mathematics, with the root cause being teachers may be under-resourced and in need of professional development to respond to this. Several online evidence-based intervention clearinghouses were used to research intervention plans that met the top three tiers of evidence as required by ESSA, as well as our root causes. They included Building Assets Reducing Risks (BARR), Read 180, Accelerated Reader, Reading Plus, Odyssey Math (Edgenuity), Core-Plus Mathematics, Lexia Learning, and Southern Regional Education Board (SERB).

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

All of the intervention plans and programs listed above would be considered relevant and appropriate to the needs of the school. Cost, required training and ease of implementation were some of the criteria used to choose a plan.

### **Identify the school's chosen interventions**

Our **Tier 1** Intervention objective (classroom-level for all students) is to improve our ability to provide targeted instruction that follows the district-developed CCSS aligned curriculum frameworks and related resources ("the core"). Carlos F. Vigil Middle School's adopted core Math program is CPM (College Preparatory Math), and its adopted core ELA program is Pearson Common Core Literature. To facilitate improvement in delivering the core, it is proposed that teachers receive professional development through the Southern Regional Education Board (SERB) – the Literacy Design Collaborative and Mathematics Design Collaborative programs. This training is intended to support teachers in the development of rigorous, engaging, standards-based units that utilize SREB's documented Math and Literacy Practices. It is also proposed that teachers receive training on "Capturing Kids' Hearts" through the Flippen Group to strengthen positive classroom management and relationship/rapport building.

For **Tier 2** Intervention, students will receive supplemental mathematics and reading instruction through Edgenuity's Pathblazer (Odyssey Math and ELA) 6-8 Math and ELA. This intervention will take place during our fifth period scheduled Response to Intervention (RtI) block. Instruction will be individually prescribed, based on observed student needs and Edgenuity short-cycle assessment data.

For **Tier 3** intervention, current support systems such as content area teachers, social workers, counselors, and case managers will continue to serve students identified as needing intensive

intervention. Edgenuity's Pathblazer 6-8 Math and ELA will continue to be used in Tier 3. Additionally, Lexia Learning will be utilized for ELA. Students will be identified for Tier 3 through the SAT referral process. **Please see Appendix N: Carlos F. Vigil Middle School's 2018-2019 Master Schedule**

### 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.

- **SREB/My Student Survey (2017):** Study on SREB impact on student experiences. Non-published.

#### Summary of Results:

Overall, analyses of student perceptions indicate that students in classrooms where LDC and MDC were used experienced the desired literacy and mathematics instruction to a greater degree than students in non-LDC/MDC classrooms. The study found LDC-trained teachers in English language arts (ELA), social studies, science and career and technical education (CTE) incorporated literacy-based assignments in their curriculum more often than non-LDC-trained teachers. Students in classrooms where LDC had been implemented were reading and discussing grade-level texts and writing about those texts more often than students in classrooms where LDC had not been used.

Based on student perceptions, results show that LDC- and MDC-trained teachers engaged students in more challenging assignments and used more questioning and feedback strategies to address students' deeper understanding of literacy-based assignments and mathematical concepts, and to motivate students to assume greater ownership of their learning. Both LDC and MDC students reported their teachers encouraged peer discussion, and students experienced classroom environments that promoted collaboration and active learning to a greater extent than students in comparison classrooms.

- 
- **Flippen Group:** Effectiveness of the Capturing Kids Hearts Process, 2008-2009 Randomized Controlled Trial, H. Griswold, C. Rosebrack, N. Berry.

#### Summary of Results:

Schools implementing CKH-CBD produced increases in student protective factors (student acquisition of pro-social skills) and decreases in student risk factors (negative behaviors such as discipline referrals). Students in intervention schools demonstrated a 40% increase in prosocial skills (respect, caring concern, communicative competencies, citizenship, and problem solving) compared with students in control schools. Discipline referrals decreased significantly in the intervention schools compared with those observed in control schools. Univariate ANOVA yielded a standardized effect size (Hedge's  $g$ ) of -2.1 (significant decrease in discipline referrals in intervention schools compared with control schools).

- **Odyssey Math & Odyssey ELA (Edgenuity):** The effects of response to intervention on the mathematics achievement of seventh and eighth grade students (Doctoral dissertation) Cornelius, A. S. (2013).

**Summary of Results:**

The purpose of this quantitative study was to investigate the effectiveness of a system-wide Response to Intervention (RtI) program on the mathematical achievement of seventh and eighth grade students. The study consisted of five district schools with a total of 502 participants. The students were identified as belonging to one of two tiers, which differed in regard to amount of intervention. The first tier (Tier 1) of students only received the regular classroom instruction while the second tier (Tier 2/3) received an additional thirty minutes of intervention strategies. The students receiving interventions, the Tier 2/3 students, were divided into two groups. One group received primarily teacher-directed instruction (TDI) as an intervention while the other group received computer-assisted instruction (CAI) as an intervention. For the purpose of this study, the CAI intervention involved the use of the commercial program, Odyssey Math. The students were benchmark tested at the beginning and end of the 2010-2011 school year using the STAR Math assessment program and also progress monitored on a regular basis. In an attempt to determine the effectiveness of the RTI program, a gain score ANOVA was conducted using the scaled scores of the two tiers from the beginning and the end of the school year. The analysis indicated that Tier 2/3 students did demonstrate greater growth than the students in Tier 1. The gain scores of the two groups of Tier 2/3 students were also used in a gain score ANOVA to measure differences in growth. An additional analysis of their mean scores was also conducted using ANCOVA. Both analyses indicated that the CAI group demonstrated greater gains. A third analysis was conducted in order to determine how accurately the STAR Math assessment program could predict student success (reaching either a Proficient or Advanced level) on the state assessment. While the STAR Math program did not accurately predict the students' level in every case, the logistic regression analysis did indicate that the program was successful in identifying struggling students.

- **Edgenuity:** A study of a specific language arts and mathematics software program: Is there a correlation between usage levels and achievement? DiLeo, J. (2007)

**Summary of Results:**

Being an ex post facto design, the study used data from students in five elementary schools in one district. Having partnered with state-supported independent researchers for the Enhancing Education through Technology (EETT), the district had already divided classes of teachers and students into groups that used Compass Learning software in one of three ways: mathematics only, language arts only, and both mathematics and language arts. This arrangement allowed the study to more easily examine whether or not the correlation between usage and achievement scores varied by subject area. The study used independent t-tests to discern the relationship between usage and achievement. To nullify the effects of demographic variables of gender, SES, iii identification as learners with special needs, and prior achievement levels, ANCOVA analyses were conducted. Results showed a significant relationship between Compass Learning Odyssey language arts and

mathematics software and achievement as measured on the Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA). An interesting result was the finding that, on the PSSA reading posttest, users of mathematics software outperformed users of language arts software. Both groups showed greater gains than did students in the server-based version of the software. Regarding demographic variables, gender had no effect on achievement gains. The effect of socioeconomic status was significant among users of mathematics software; conversely, the effects of prior achievement level and identification as learners with special needs were significant among users of language arts software. This study supports the hypothesis that educational software enhances student achievement. Evidence gained in this study also identifies areas of technology-based instruction in need of further study.

#### **D. Theory of Action**

**Clearly and convincingly details a Theory of Action that will support implementation of the evidence-based intervention.**

Our Theory of Action:

Carlos F. Vigil Middle School students are clearly underperforming their peers statewide in ELA and Math. The root cause identified through our 90-Day Planning is that teachers are under-resourced and in need of professional development focused on delivering a rigorous, Common Core State Standards based curriculum.

Intensive professional development for teachers in ELA and Math will support them in developing rigorous, engaging, standards-based units of study. Training in “Capturing Kids’ Hearts” will support teachers in strengthening positive classroom management and relationship/rapport building. Training in implementing intervention programs with fidelity, including ongoing progress monitoring and data analysis, will allow teachers to monitor and adjust their instruction based on student progress. Ongoing collaboration will provide a collegial setting for measuring progress toward grade level, department and overall school goals.

If we implement the above evidence based strategies with fidelity, then we would expect reasonable gains in ELA and mathematics, schoolwide.

[Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

#### **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).**

<b>Planning and Year 1 (2018-2019)</b>	
<p><b>Salary</b>                  Staff will start school five days before the mandated district start date for SY 2018-2019 for planning and training. Staff will be paid their daily rate, including benefits. <u>District and site level Title 1 and/or Title 11 funds will be utilized to offset these costs.*</u></p>	\$ 57,380
<p><b>Intervention, Short Cycle and Interim Assessments</b>  <i>Odyssey Math</i> and <i>Odyssey ELA</i> (owned by Edgenuity) is a web-based program developed by Compass Learning for instruction in grades K-8. The online program includes a Math and ELA curriculum, as well as formative assessments designed to differentiate instruction and drive data driven instruction. The program is designed to generate individualized sequences of instruction to address individual student needs. An initial training will take place during one of the above mentioned five days and will continue throughout the school year, along with job embedded coaching.</p>	\$ 15,615
<p><b>Staff Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Training with continued support throughout the school year for staff, students and administration in <i>Capturing Kids' Hearts</i>. <i>Capturing Kids' Hearts</i> strengthens students' connectedness to others through enhancing healthy bonds with teachers and establishing consistent rules of conduct. Initial training is two full days which will take place during the above mentioned five days.</li> </ul>	\$ 50,000
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Southern Regional Education Board/High Schools That Work (SREB/HSTW)</i> assists schools in building commitment to school reform and provides professional development to school staff. <i>SREB/HSTW</i> will support Carlos F. Vigil Middle School in further aligning the core curriculum to the Common Core State Standards, developing interim common assessments and designing standards based units. An initial training will take place during one of the above mentioned five days, and further training and job embedded coaching will take place throughout the school year.</li> </ul>	\$ 66,165
<p><i>Supplies and Materials</i> will be absorbed by the school's operational budget.</p>	
Total Year 1	\$189,160 *

<b>Year 2 (2019-2020)</b>	
<p><b>Salary</b> Staff will utilize the two “front loaded” District In-service days at the start of SY 2019-2020 for continued planning, data analysis (PARCC, WIDA, short cycle assessments, etc.) and curriculum work.</p>	\$ 0
<p><b>Intervention, Short Cycle and Interim Assessments</b> <i>Odyssey Math</i> and <i>Odyssey ELA</i> (owned by Edgenuity) is a web-based program developed by Compass Learning for instruction in grades K-8. The online program includes a Math and ELA curriculum, as well as formative assessments designed to differentiate instruction and drive data driven instruction. The program is designed to generate individualized sequences of instruction to address individual student needs. Continued training and job embedded coaching will take place throughout the school year.</p>	\$ 15,615
<p><b>Staff Development</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued support throughout the school year for staff, students and administration in <i>Capturing Kids’ Hearts 2</i>. <i>Capturing Kids’ Hearts 2</i> strengthens students’ connectedness to others through enhancing healthy bonds with teachers and establishing consistent rules of conduct.</li> </ul>	\$ 36,250
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Southern Regional Education Board/High Schools That Work (SREB/HSTW)</i> assists schools in building commitment to school reform and provides professional development to school staff. <i>SREB/HSTW</i> will support Carlos F. Vigil Middle School in further aligning the core curriculum to the Common Core State Standards, developing interim common assessments and designing standards based units. Continued training and job embedded coaching will take place throughout the school year.</li> </ul>	\$ 67,880
<p><i>Supplies and Materials</i> will be absorbed by the school’s operational budget.</p>	\$ 0
<b>Total Year 2</b>	<b>\$ 119,745</b>

<b>Year 3 (2021-2022)</b>	
<b>Salary</b>	
Staff will utilize the two “front loaded” District In-service days at the start of SY 2020-2021 for continued planning, data analysis (PARCC, WIDA, short cycle assessments, etc.) and curriculum work.	\$ 0
<b>Intervention, Short Cycle and Interim Assessments</b>	\$ 15,615
<i>Odyssey Math</i> and <i>Odyssey ELA</i> (owned by Edgenuity) is a web-based program developed by Compass Learning for instruction in grades K-8. The online program includes a Math and ELA curriculum, as well as formative assessments designed to differentiate instruction and drive data driven instruction. The program is designed to generate individualized sequences of instruction to address individual student needs. Continued training and job embedded coaching will take place throughout the school year.	
<b>Staff Development</b>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued support throughout the school year for staff, students and administration in <i>Capturing Kids’ Hearts Recharged</i>. <i>Capturing Kids’ Hearts Recharged</i> strengthens students’ connectedness to others through enhancing healthy bonds with teachers and establishing consistent rules of conduct.</li> </ul>	\$ 19,250
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Southern Regional Education Board/High Schools That Work (SREB/HSTW)</i> assists schools in building commitment to school reform and provides professional development to school staff. <i>SREB/HSTW</i> will support Carlos F. Vigil Middle School in further aligning the core curriculum to the Common Core State Standards, developing interim common assessments and designing standards based units. Continued training and job embedded coaching will take place throughout the school year.</li> </ul>	\$ 58,080
<i>Supplies and Materials</i> will be absorbed by the school’s operational budget.	
Total Year 3	\$ 92,945

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

Currently, Carlos F. Vigil Middle School receives \$117,000 in Title 1 funds and \$8,000 in Title 11, as well as \$22,000 in operational funds. The majority of the three-year grant will be spent on purchasing school improvement programs and professional development. In terms of sustaining the whole-school change described in this application, we foresee our expenses will be largely in continued professional development (and training any new staff the school receives)



<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Southern Regional Education Board/High Schools That Work (SREB/HSTW)</i> assists schools in building commitment to school reform and provides professional development to school staff. <i>SREB/HSTW</i> will support Carlos F. Vigil Middle School in further aligning the core curriculum to the Common Core State Standards, developing interim common assessments and designing standards based units. Continued training and job embedded coaching will take place throughout the school year.</li> </ul> <p><i>Supplies and Materials</i></p>	<p><i>SREB/HSTW</i> believes strongly in a gradual release model. After working with <i>SREB/HSTW</i> for three years, Carlos F. Vigil will have many teacher leaders to provide support to their peers. Should the school feel the need to have <i>SREB/HSTW</i> support in Year 4 and/or beyond, the fee is \$2,420/day, which would be paid for using site-level Title 11 funds.</p> <p><i>Supplies and Materials</i> will be absorbed by the school's operational budget.</p>
---	---

**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.**

The only LEA-level administration and support expenses to be funded by the CSI grant are normal indirect cost. Espanola Public Schools' indirect cost rate is 4.39%:

Year 1 - \$180,000 x 4.39% = \$7,902  
 Year 2 - \$119,745 x 4.4% = \$5,269  
 Year 3 - \$92,945 x 4.4% = \$4,089

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

Year	Alignment of other federal, state and local resources
1	Espanola Public Schools will support the Carlos F. Vigil Middle School CSI grant by providing \$17,062 District Title 11 funds for professional development activities.
2	District and site Title 1 and 11 funds will be utilized to support the activities of the grant (i.e., substitutes, registrations, etc.) The school's operational budget will absorb the cost of supplies and materials.
3	District and site Title 1 and 11 funds will be utilized to support the activities of the grant (i.e., substitutes, registrations, etc.) The school's operational budget will absorb the cost of supplies and materials.

Click or tap here to enter text.

**B. Budget Forms**

- A complete Budget Summary Chart for the entire project period (planning period and two-years of implementation) (as an attachment). **Please see Appendix C: Budget Forms.**

**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.**

## **Appendix A: Letter of Intent Example**

*Insert Date*

Secretary-Designate Christopher N. Ruszkowski  
Public Education Department  
300 Don Gaspar Avenue  
Santa Fe, NM, 87501

Dear Secretary Ruszkowski:

The *(insert district)* intends to apply for a CSI competitive grant for the 2018-2021 school years on behalf of the following school(s):

*(insert name of school or schools)*

Sincerely,

Insert name of Superintendent  
Superintendent, *(insert district name)*

*cc: insert names of school board president, school principal, and any other locally identified district, community or school board members.*

## **Appendix B: 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.

<b>LEA:</b>
-------------

<p><b>The Board of Education commits to the following:</b></p>
--

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Provide the prioritized support, autonomy, and accountability for urgent and sustainable success, including:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>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.</li><li>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.</li><li>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.</li><li>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.</li><li>e. The BOE commits to successful completion of the evidence-based intervention in the event of LEA or school leadership changes.</li></ol></li></ol> |
|---|

<p><b>The LEA commits to the following:</b></p>
---

- |   |
|---|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>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</li><li>2. Provide the prioritized support, autonomy, and accountability for urgent and sustainable success, including:<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Partner with principal to establish a comprehensive school 90-day plan that is aligned with the LEA's strategic plan</li><li>b. Partner with principal on critical decisions like staffing, scheduling, budgeting, targeted professional development, and other operational issues</li><li>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</li><li>d. Proactively engage all stakeholders to acknowledge current reality and present a bold vision for the future of the school</li><li>e. Hold turnaround schools and principals accountable through a robust monitoring system as defined by the LEA</li></ol></li></ol> |
|---|

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

---

President, Board of Education Signature

Date

---

Superintendent Signature

Date

---

School Leadership Signature

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.

_____ Superintendent/Charter Director Printed Name	_____ Date
---	---------------

_____ 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.

_____ Board President Printed Name	_____ Date
---------------------------------------	---------------

_____ Board President Signature (blue ink)	_____ Date
---	---------------

**Appendix C: Scoring Guide**

<b>CSI RFA Title I Sec. 1003[a] Scoring Guide</b>	<b>Points</b>	<b>Percent</b>
<b>I. LEA Organizational Culture</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>30%</b>
A. LEA Overview	10	
B. Instructional Infrastructure	10	
C. LEA Support and Accountability	10	
<b>II School Level Context</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15%</b>
A. School Overview	5	
B. NM DASH Plans	5	
D. Collaboration Structures	5	
<b>III Evidence-Based Interventions</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>40%</b>
A. Root Cause and Focus Areas	10	
B. Choice of Evidence-Based Interventions	20	
C. Sources of Evidence	5	
D. Theory of Action	5	
<b>IV. Budget</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>15%</b>
A. Budget Narrative	10	
B. Budget (Excel Files)	5	
<b>Total</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100%</b>

<b>I. LEA Organizational Culture:</b> <b>A: LEA Overview</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Points: 10 max</b></span>		
<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (5 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (10 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not 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.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe a systematic review of existing LEA capacity, strengths, and needs related to curriculum, instruction, <b>or</b> assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a <b>partial or somewhat convincing</b> description of 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.</li> <li>Provides a <b>partial or somewhat convincing</b> description of a systematic review of existing LEA capacity, strengths, and needs related to curriculum, instruction, <b>and/or</b> assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> description of 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.</li> <li>Provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> description of a systematic review of existing LEA capacity, strengths, and needs related to curriculum, instruction, <b>and</b> assessment.</li> </ul>
<b>I. LEA Organizational Culture:</b> <b>B: Instructional Infrastructure</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Points: 10 max</b></span>		
<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (5 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (10 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the process used to ensure alignment between grade level scope and sequence and the CCSS for ELA/Reading <b>or</b> math.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the system of support and accountability for teachers and leaders in implementing rigorous standards-aligned instruction.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the LEA’s cycle of data-driven instruction <b>or</b> identify interim assessments being used.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the process used to ensure interim assessment alignment with CCSS at each grade level’s scope and sequence.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the process for test-in-hand analysis and adaptation of instructional plans based on interim assessment data.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> provide a schedule for</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of the process used to ensure alignment between grade level scope and sequence and the CCSS ELA/Reading <b>and/or</b> math.</li> <li>Provides a <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of the system of support and accountability for teachers and leaders in implementing rigorous standards-aligned instruction.</li> <li>Provides a <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of the LEA’s cycle of data-driven instruction <b>and/or</b> identification of interim assessments being used.</li> <li>Provides a <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of the process used to ensure interim assessment alignment with CCSS at each grade level’s scope and sequence.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the process used to ensure alignment between grade level scope and sequence and the CCSS ELA/Reading <b>and</b> math.</li> <li>Provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the system of support and accountability for teachers and leaders in implementing rigorous standards-aligned instruction.</li> <li>Provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the LEA’s cycle of data-driven instruction <b>including</b> identification of interim assessments being used.</li> <li>Provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the process used to ensure interim assessments alignment with CCSS at each grade level’s scope and sequence.</li> </ul>

<p>administering common interim assessments in ELA and Math</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of the process for test-in-hand analysis and adaptation of instructional plans based on interim assessment data.</li> <li>• Provides a <b>partial/incomplete</b> schedule for administering common interim assessments in ELA and Math</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the process for test-in-hand analysis and adaptation of instructional plans based on interim assessment data.</li> <li>• Provides a <b>comprehensive</b> schedule for administering common interim assessments in ELA and Math</li> </ul>
---	--	--

**I. LEA Organizational Culture:  
C: LEA Support and Accountability** **Points: 10 max**

<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (5 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (10 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does <b>not</b> identify specific senior leadership that will direct and coordinate LEA participation in supporting the CSI school.</li> <li>• Does <b>not</b> provide an organizational chart (or charts) identifying the structures at the LEA level that are responsible for providing support and accountability to CSI schools.</li> <li>• Does <b>not</b> describe/discuss the specific cycle of planning, action, evaluation, feedback, and adaptation between the LEA and the school leadership.</li> <li>• Does <b>not</b> describe 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. (<b>No</b> analyses of evidence and leading indicator data to determine the impact of key strategies <b>or</b> planned/approved course-corrections as applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identifies <b>only one or two</b> specific senior leadership that will direct and coordinate LEA participation in supporting the CSI school.</li> <li>• Provides a <b>partial/incomplete</b> organizational chart (or charts) identifying the structures at the LEA level that are responsible for providing support and accountability to CSI schools.</li> <li>• Provides a <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description/discussion of the specific cycle of planning, action, evaluation, feedback, and adaptation between the LEA and the school leadership.</li> <li>• Provides a <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of 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. (<b>May</b> include analyses of evidence and leading indicator data to determine the impact of key strategies <b>and/or</b> planned/approved course-corrections as applicable)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Clearly identifies <b>all</b> specific senior leadership that will direct and coordinate LEA participation in supporting the CSI school.</li> <li>• Provides a <b>comprehensive</b> organizational chart (or charts) identifying the structures at the LEA level that are responsible for providing support and accountability to CSI schools.</li> <li>• Provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> description/discussion of the specific cycle of planning, action, evaluation, feedback, and adaptation between the LEA and the school leadership.</li> <li>• Provides a <b>clear and convincing</b> description of 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. (<b>Includes</b> analyses of evidence and leading indicator data to determine the impact of key strategies <b>and</b> planned/approved course-corrections as applicable)</li> </ul>

<b>II. School Level Context:</b>		
<b>A. School Overview</b>		<b>Points: 5 max</b>
<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (3 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (5 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the results of in-depth student achievement data analysis, including the percent of students scoring at each level on PARCC <b>or</b> Istation (if applicable).</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> 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, <b>or</b> ineffective as identified by the most recently released NM TEACH data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of the results of in-depth student achievement data analysis, including the percent of students scoring at each level on PARCC <b>and/or</b> Istation (if applicable).</li> <li>Provides <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of 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, <b>and/or</b> ineffective as identified by the most recently released NM TEACH data.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the results of in-depth student achievement data analysis, including the percent of students scoring at each level on PARCC and Istation (if applicable).</li> <li>Provides <b>clear and convincing</b> description of 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.</li> </ul>
<b>II. School Level Context:</b>		
<b>B. NM DASH Plans</b>		<b>Points: 5 max</b>
<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (3 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (5 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did <b>not</b> submit a NM DASH Offline Planning Workbook or 90-Day Complete Detail Printout.</li> <li>Did <b>not</b> submit a NM DASH Feedback Tool.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted a <b>partial/incomplete</b> NM DASH Offline Planning Workbook or 90-Day Complete Detail Printout.</li> <li>Submitted a <b>partial/incomplete</b> NM DASH Feedback Tool.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted a <b>completed</b> NM DASH Offline Planning Workbook or 90-Day Complete Detail Printout.</li> <li>Submitted a <b>completed</b> NM DASH Feedback Tool.</li> </ul>
<b>II. School Level Context:</b>		
<b>C. Collaboration Structures</b>		<b>Points: 5 max</b>
<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (3 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (5 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the schedule of grade-level, grade-band, or content area collaboration meetings, including frequency and length <b>or</b> a process and procedures utilized during collaboration meetings.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the systems in place for principal and/or other instructional leaders to support <b>or</b> hold teachers accountable for meeting effectiveness.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of the schedule of grade-level, grade-band, or content area collaboration meetings, including frequency and length <b>and/or</b> a process and procedures utilized during collaboration meetings.</li> <li>Provides <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of the systems in place for principal and/or other instructional</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the schedule of grade-level, grade-band, or content area collaboration meetings, including frequency and length <b>and</b> a process and procedures utilized during collaboration meetings.</li> <li>Provides <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the systems in place for principal and/or other instructional leaders to support <b>and</b> hold teachers accountable</li> </ul>

	leaders to support <b>and/or</b> hold teachers accountable for meeting effectiveness.	for meeting effectiveness.
--	---	----------------------------

**III. Evidence-Based Interventions**  
**A. Root Cause and Focus Areas** **Points: 10 max**

<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (5 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (10 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the process used by the LEA in collaboration with the school to identify needs and performance challenges, complete root cause, <b>or</b> identify focus area(s).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description of the process used by the LEA in collaboration with the school to identify needs and performance challenges, complete root cause, <b>and/or</b> identify focus area(s).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the process used by the LEA in collaboration with the school to identify needs and performance challenges, complete root cause, <b>and</b> identify focus area(s).</li> </ul>

**III. Evidence-Based Interventions**  
**B. Choice of Evidence-Based Interventions** **Points: 20 max**

<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching 10 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (20 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does <b>not</b> identify interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that schools in need of comprehensive support and improvement may choose to address the root cause.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> determine the interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that are relevant and appropriate to the needs of the school.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> identify the school’s chosen intervention(s).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies <b>only one or two</b> interventions that <b>may or may not</b> meet the top three tiers of evidence that schools in need of comprehensive support and improvement may choose to address the root cause.</li> <li>Provides <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> determination of the interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that <b>may be</b> relevant and appropriate to the needs of the school.</li> <li>Provides <b>partial/incomplete</b> identification of the school’s chosen intervention(s).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Clearly and convincingly</b> identifies interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that schools in need of comprehensive support and improvement may choose to address the root cause.</li> <li>Provides <b>clear and convincing</b> determination of the interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that <b>are</b> relevant and appropriate to the needs of the school.</li> <li>Provides <b>clear and complete</b> identification of the school’s chosen intervention(s).</li> </ul>

**III. Evidence-Based Interventions**  
**C. Sources of Evidence** **Points: 5 max**

<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (3 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (5points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does <b>not</b> identify <b>any</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies <b>unvetted or obscure</b> 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.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identifies <b>well vetted and reputable</b> 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.</li> </ul>

**III. Evidence-Based Interventions**

<b>D. Theory of Action</b>		<b>Points: 10 max</b>
<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (5 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (10 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does <b>not</b> detail a Theory of Action that will support implementation of the evidence-based intervention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Somewhat/partially</b> details a Theory of Action that <b>may</b> support implementation of the evidence-based intervention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Clearly and convincingly</b> details a Theory of Action that will support implementation of the evidence-based intervention.</li> </ul>

<b>IV. Budget:</b>		<b>Points: 10max</b>
<b>A. Budget Narrative</b>		
<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (5 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (10 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does <b>not</b> provide a budget narrative <b>and/or</b> does <b>not</b> identify and explain proposed costs for LEA and school-level activities for the entire project period (six months of planning, three years of implementation).</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> identify <b>any</b> other sources of income that will support and sustain the whole-school change described in this application.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> describe the strategies for why <b>or</b> how the LEA/school will sustain these actions past the whole project period of the grant.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> provide description or justification of <b>any</b> 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.</li> <li>Does <b>not</b> provide a demonstration of how the LEA and schools will align other available federal, state, and local resources to support the chosen evidence-based intervention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides a <b>partial/incomplete</b> budget narrative that identifies and explains <b>some</b> proposed costs for LEA and school-level activities for the entire project period (six months of planning, three years of implementation).</li> <li>Identifies <b>only one or two</b> other sources of income that will support and sustain the whole-school change described in this application.</li> <li>For each major activity, provides <b>partial/incomplete</b> description of the strategies for why <b>and/or</b> how the LEA/school will sustain these actions past the whole project period of the grant.</li> <li>Provides <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> description <b>and/or</b> justification of 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. May also include normal indirect costs to be claimed at the PED-approved rate for the district.</li> <li>Provides <b>partial/somewhat convincing</b> demonstration of how the LEA and schools will align other available federal, state, and local resources to support the chosen evidence-based intervention.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provides an <b>appropriate and complete</b> budget narrative that identifies and explains <b>all</b> proposed costs for LEA and school-level activities for the entire project period (six months of planning, three years of implementation).</li> <li><b>Clearly and convincingly</b> identifies <b>all</b> other sources of income that will support and sustain the whole-school change described in this application.</li> <li>For each major activity, provides <b>clear and convincing</b> description of the strategies for why <b>and</b> how the LEA/school will sustain these actions past the whole project period of the grant.</li> <li>Provides <b>clear and convincing</b> description and justification of 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. May also include normal indirect costs to be claimed at the PED-approved rate for the district.</li> <li>Provides <b>clear and convincing</b> demonstration of how the LEA and schools will align other available federal, state, and local resources to support the chosen evidence-based</li> </ul>

		intervention.
<b>IV. Budget:</b>		
<b>B. Budget Forms (Excel File)</b>		<b>Points: 5 max</b>
<b>Insufficient (0 points)</b>	<b>Approaching (3 points)</b>	<b>Meets Expectations (5 points)</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Did <b>not</b> submit a Budget Summary Chart for the project period (six months of planning and two-years of implementation).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted a <b>partial/incomplete</b> Budget Summary Chart for <b>less than</b> the entire project period (six months of planning and two-years of implementation).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Submitted a <b>complete and detailed</b> Budget Summary Chart for the <b>entire</b> project period (six months of planning and two-years of implementation).</li> </ul>

