



**Request for Application (RFA) for
Comprehensive Support & Improvement Schools
(CSI)
Title I Sec.1003 [a]**

**Every Student Succeeds Act
CFDA Number: 84.010A**

**Deadline to Submit RFA:
February 12, 2018**

*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 Interventions¹

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.

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

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 Program²

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, 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)).

² The NM Leadership Innovation Program is akin to the Principals Pursuing Excellence Program.

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 system³.

PED is making multi-year awards (2017-2021), through the period of availability of funds⁴, to successful applicants.

Estimated funds available: **\$6,121,460.00** (for the 2017-2018 SY⁵)

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 \$150,000⁶.
- 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.
- 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.

Project Period Timeline	
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

³ ESSA § 1003(b)

⁴ Continuing awards are dependent upon continued appropriation from congress.

⁵ Continuing awards are dependent upon continued appropriation from congress.

⁶ Funding will be determined based on school size on a sliding scale.

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. 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.

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.) 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 PED⁷.

In addition, LEAs will be responsible for submitting monthly, quarterly and/or annual reports on school progress⁸ 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])

⁷ 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.

⁸ Templates will be provided by PED.

- 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

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

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

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 program⁹.

The SEA may impose additional award conditions¹⁰ 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

⁹ 2 CFR Part 200 §200.338 Remedies for Noncompliance

¹⁰ §200.207 Special Conditions

maintenance of all grant requirements, the leftover funds may be used to fund the next highest ranking applications.

LEA Comprehensive Support and Improvement Competitive Grants Application Cover Sheet

LEA Information		
LEA/State Charter Name: Health Leadership High School		LEA NCES ID #: 553001
Mailing Address: 1900 Randolph Road SE Albuquerque NM 871062		
Phone: (505) 750-4547		Fax: (505) 214-5939
Superintendent/Charter Director: Blanca A. Lopez		Email: Blanca@healthleadershiphighschool.org
Title I Director: Blanca A. Lopez		Email:
Federal Programs Director: Blanca A. Lopez		Email:
Business Manager: David Vigil		Email: David@healthleadershiphighschool.org
Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools LEA Lead: Amber Reno		Email: amber@healthleadershiphighschool.org
LEA will Apply for the Following Eligible School(s)		
Name of School	School NCES ID #	Proposed Intervention Model
Health Leadership High School	553001	Competitive Grant for 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

LEA Name:	Health Leadership High School
Submitting on Behalf of (name of school):	Health Leadership High School
Number of Students Served:	180
Number of Certified Licensed Staff:	14.5

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.

HLHS completed a root cause analysis for the NM Dash Plan as part of our annual and 90 day improvement plan for 2017/18 school year. Our data review showed:

Proficiency Data Over Time (on school report card):
 2015: 2% proficient in math; 2% proficient in reading
 2016: 2% proficient in math; 9% proficient in reading
 2017: 2% proficient in math; 5% proficient in reading

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

Short Cycle Comparative Growth Data (Discovery)
 2015-2016: 87% of students made average to above average growth in math; 81% of students made average to above average growth in reading.
 2016-2017: 85% of students made average to above average growth in math; 87% of students made average to above average growth in reading.

Winter 2018 STAR Renaissance Assessment Data

Reading:

9th Grade-9% At/Above Benchmark; 3% On Watch; 26% Intervention; 62% Urgent Intervention
 10th Grade- 3% At/Above Benchmark; 17% On Watch; 17% Intervention; 64% Urgent Intervention
 11th Grade-10% At/Above Benchmark; 5% On Watch; 17% Intervention; 68% Urgent Intervention
 12th Grade-7% At/Above Benchmark; 18% On Watch; 25% Intervention; 50% Urgent Intervention

Math:

9th Grade-10% At/Above Benchmark; 20% On Watch; 25% Intervention; 45% Urgent Intervention
 10th Grade-26% At/Above Benchmark; 17% On Watch; 17% Intervention; 39% Urgent Intervention
 11th Grade-19% At/Above Benchmark; 28% On Watch; 16% Intervention; 38% Urgent Intervention
 12th Grade-12% At/Above Benchmark; 12% On Watch; 29% Intervention; 47% Urgent Intervention

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

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

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

In terms of assessment, the school provides adequate ELL support through ESL courses and sheltered instruction in all projects. Students participate in the Star Renaissance short cycle assessment, PARCC, SBA and WIDA as mandated by the State. In terms of curricular and instructional strengths, the school has already implemented a core Math instruction block, having noted the challenges our students face, and the difficulty providing rigorous and sufficiently deep math instruction in authentic health-related product.

After careful review of HLHS capacity, strengths and needs we recognize there is an absence of explicit supplemental instruction for students requiring below grade level Math and Literacy skill development.

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.

All projects that carry an English credit are aligned the Common Core State Standards. Projects are designed and tuned every trimester in order to ensure they are appropriately rigorous and tied to standards. Students take Integrated Math Practices 1 thru 3 through a core Math block ensuring appropriate and sequenced Math instruction.

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

Teachers are expected to participate in tuning protocols, work with instructional coach and director of curriculum. Teachers also participate in weekly PD to support instructional practices, review assessment data and modify curriculum to meet the diverse needs of learners.

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

HLHS operates on a trimester system. As such, STAR Renaissance Math and Reading assessments, the state-approved interim assessment employed at the school, are administered once during each trimester. The testing windows for SY 2017-2018 are:

Trimester One: 9/25/17-10/23/17

Trimester Two: 1/4/18-2/2/18

Trimester Three: 5/1/18-5/31/1

After the testing window closes, assessment data is distributed to the students' advisors and teachers. We are in the early stages of learning how to use this assessment data to inform grouping practices and to aid teachers in differentiating levels of instructional materials, but we are making headway. This is the first year implementing this interim assessment, and one area we are asking for support is in additional training to develop our data fluency as a staff and improve our ability to use assessment data fully and effectively.

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

STAR Renaissance is a state approved interim assessment, aligned with the CCSS. Our Math Core block employs the Integrated Math Practices curriculum and is also aligned with CCSS. The teacher is still required to develop planning documents that outline the driving questions and learning outcomes assessed in each lesson. The LOs are aligned to CCSS.

All other HLHS credits are addressed through authentic health-related projects. The design process for each project requires teachers to outline the products/assessments students will experience throughout the project. Each assessment opportunity is linked to a learning outcome that must be aligned to the appropriate CCSS for the course. Projects are tuned by groups of teachers and other instructional leaders before they are implemented in order to ensure their rigor.

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

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

As previously noted, we hope to improve in this regard. At this juncture, post-interim-assessment analysis is limited to the following activities:

- Within a week of the testing window closing, one morning PD session is dedicated to reviewing schoolwide assessment data and providing teachers with an opportunity to get support as they review other reports.
- Because teachers only have online access to the reports for their advisees, teachers are provided email copies of reports for students in their courses.
- Co-teachers have common prep time during which they can use assessment data to inform grouping decisions, plan for differentiation of materials and instruction, and modify plans.
- The Instructional Coach and Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment are available for one-on-one support.

C. LEA Support and Accountability

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

Blanca A. Lopez – Executive Director
Amber Reno – Curriculum and Assessment Director
Louis Gonzalez – Instructional Coach

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

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

Spring 2018: The remainder of 2018 would be a planning and preparation period. During this time the Director of Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment would work with the Instructional Coach to identify talent to interview and hire for the role of the intervention coach (1.0). This person will receive professional development from STAR Renaissance around interim assessment data and the STAR 360 intervention software (Accelerated Math and Accelerated Reading). These three individuals would work to develop the implementation plan for the 2018-2019 SY. A draft of this plan would be shared with HLHS's board and Joseph Escobedo of APS's Charter School Division no later than the HLHS June board meeting date.

SY 2018-2019: With funding support, at least two intervention blocks will be implemented during the day program and one block will be implemented during the evening re-engagement program by Trimester One of the 2018-2019 SY. The intervention coach will teach these programs, employing Accelerated Reading and Accelerated Math intervention software. As the instructor of the course, the intervention coach will provide reports on a monthly basis, to coincide with HLHS board meetings regarding the effects of the interventions on students. These reports will be shared with the board and forwarded to Joseph Escobedo of APS's Charter School Division monthly. At the 30-day, 60-day, and 90-day reviews of NM Dash plans, the core team will evaluate the efficacy of the plan and consider adaptations.

The Intervention Coach will also be responsible for ongoing PD around our Interim Assessment data-analysis and responsiveness to assessment data. After each interim assessment is given, the intervention coach's report for that month will contain additional information that will be communicated to all parties.

SY 2019-2021: After reviewing the efficacy of the intervention block and software in the implementation year, adaptations to the intervention plan will be made.

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.
- ❑ Individual student assessment data will continue to be discussed with students in advisory; with students and families in formal family meeting times; and with students and families whenever there is a concern regarding math and literacy skills.
 - ❑ General assessment data will be discussed at each open house. During the first open house of 2018-2019, a special session will be held to discuss the intervention block. At subsequent open house meetings, sessions will be held to discuss interim assessment data and how that data supports the efficacy of the intervention block and STAR 360 software.
 - ❑ The school's website will be used to inform the community of the initial plan. This plan will include a rationale, including assessment data, and a discussion of the intervention software.

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).

Proficiency Data Over Time (on school report card):

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

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

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

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

Short Cycle Comparative Growth Data (Discovery)

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

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

Winter 2018 STAR Renaissance Assessment Data

Reading:

9th Grade-9% At/Above Benchmark; 3% On Watch; 26% Intervention; 62% Urgent Intervention

10th Grade- 3% At/Above Benchmark; 17% On Watch; 17% Intervention; 64% Urgent Intervention

11th Grade-10% At/Above Benchmark; 5% On Watch; 17% Intervention; 68% Urgent Intervention

12th Grade-7% At/Above Benchmark; 18% On Watch; 25% Intervention; 50% Urgent Intervention

Math:

9th Grade-10% At/Above Benchmark; 20% On Watch; 25% Intervention; 45% Urgent Intervention

10th Grade-26% At/Above Benchmark; 17% On Watch; 17% Intervention; 39% Urgent Intervention

11th Grade-19% At/Above Benchmark; 28% On Watch; 16% Intervention; 38% Urgent Intervention

12th Grade-12% At/Above Benchmark; 12% On Watch; 29% Intervention; 47% Urgent Intervention

A review of existing assessment data makes clear the need for additional interventions in the areas of Math and Reading.

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

The school has 11 teachers. One is in the minimally effective category; he is a brand new teacher who joined our staff in January of 2017. 7 teachers are effective, and 3 are highly effective.

Two of the highly effective teachers have 30+ years of teaching and the third teacher is a fairly new teacher in her second year of teaching.

Elements selected based on the teacher evaluations and student needs:

PBL requires that our teachers plan upfront and maintain a calendar of activities throughout the semester. The "mushy middle" is a struggle for our new teachers. With the help of our Instructional Coach and Curriculum Director, we will build strategies to make changes needed and support our teachers in the construction of the projects and ensure that there are Reading and Math activities included in each project. The use of data to lead instruction will be the job of the curriculum director, instructional coach, and intervention coach (if hired). Placing students in the correct project and supporting teachers will be the job of the RTI coach we will hire. Also, students who need extra support will have dedicated time during the school day for tutoring or Math and Reading interventions through the Renaissance program.

B. NM DASH Plans

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

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

C. Collaboration Structures

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

- Schedule of grade-level, grade-band, or content area collaboration meetings, including frequency and length and a process and procedures utilized during collaboration meetings (e.g. agendas, protocols)
 - Systems in place for principal and/or other instructional leaders to support and hold teachers accountable for meeting effectiveness.
- HLHS holds morning PD 3x/week on T, W, and F. Leadership and the Instructional Coach meet weekly to plan morning PD. Teaching staff is regularly empowered to lead morning PD. This includes Literacy and Math teams leading morning PD at least 4x per trimester.
 - Co-teachers have daily collaborative planning time. There are a number of expectations of teachers regarding the design and archival of their projects that allow for leadership and the instructional coach to support teachers and ensure that co-planning time is effectively used.
 - Each trimester there is extended PD time that includes the use of tuning protocols that help to ensure project alignment with CCSS.

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).

As part of the NM DASH process, the school leadership identified a core team who completed a root cause analysis and review of all existing assessment data. Needs were identified and focus areas were prioritized by directors, staff, and governing board members. The intervention being proposed in this grant application is an extension of that work.

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.

State approved vendor for short cycle assessment and intervention, STAR Renaissance Accelerated Reading and Accelerated Math.

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

This intervention is appropriate to the needs of the school as evidenced by the careful review of our assessment data, which illustrated the need for research-based response to the overwhelming need of our students to build below-grade level math and reading skills.

Identify the school's chosen intervention(s).

HLHS proposes hiring a (1.0) Intervention Coach to implement an intervention block that would employ the STAR Renaissance intervention software: Accelerated Math and Accelerated Reading.

The Intervention Coach would use data from the program to communicate with students' advisors and teachers in order to support them making data-driven instructional decisions.

Additionally, we would staff intervention labs with tutors from nearby colleges, which would also employ Accelerated Math and Accelerated Reading software but would serve more students than the intensive intervention blocks.

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.

- Use of the STAR 360 Accelerated Reading Software meets the top tier of evidence in ESSA. During the 2010-11 school year, a 13 state study was conducted involving 140 local literacy initiative programs. "The average pr-post change in STAR Reading scores was 8.2 NCEs, which was statistically significant."
http://www.policystudies.com/policystudies.com/files/Save_the_Children_Rural_Literacy_Programs_Evaluation_2011-11.pdf
- Ysseldyke, J., & Tardrew S. (2007) Use of progress monitoring system to enable teachers to differentiate math instruction. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 24(1), 1-28.
- Springer, R. M. Pugalee D., & Algozzine, B. (2007). Improving mathematics skills of high school students. *Clearing House*, 81(1). 37-44.

D. Theory of Action

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

It is our theory that our staff will benefit from more support using both the interim assessment data that STAR Renaissance provides and the additional data that will come from the intervention software. The Intervention Coach would support the staff in becoming more data fluent, and in turn, the changes to adult behavior would have positive effects on learners in all courses.

Moreover, we know that many of our students will benefit from more intensive interventions to develop below-grade level skills in reading and math. By implementing an evidence-based intervention block, we expect identified students' reading and math skill development to increase at a rate greater than 1.5 grade levels per academic year.

Because of the great number of students below grade level in reading and math, we recognize a need to provide intervention to additional students, beyond those at the lowest skill levels. In order to provide intervention services to more students, an intervention lab would be staffed by college tutors who would be overseen by the intervention coach.

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).

The budget will be divided as follows:

One planning period and 3 years of implementation. During the planning period we will assess our students using short cycle assessment for reading and math. The lowest students will be assigned to 30 minutes of RTI a day. The instructional coach and Director of Curriculum and Assessment will work with teachers and staff to ensure proper implementation of the program. During the summer we will hire an Intervention Coach to teach the RTI classes for the next three years of implementation. We will also contact both CNM and UNM to get a pool of tutors that can come to our school before, during and after school to work with students in the tutoring lab. Training on math and reading strategies will also be planned and provided to our teachers.

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

Other sources of income to support this effort will be our operating funds and private grants..

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

HLHS changed from Discovery Ed to The Renaissance short cycle assessment this year because the State Department did not recognize Discovery Ed. as a valid program for short cycle testing. In addition, the school is committed to using Accelerated Math and Accelerated Reading 360 to give students in the lowest levels the extra support they need. Training teachers and staff will be a major part of the use of money because we want to train the trainers to sustain the program in the future.

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 School is asking for 10% of total funding for each period of implementation in order to support our students with manipulatives for Math, books for reading, paper, writing utensils, and chromebooks as needed.

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

The school is committed to this program and will utilize other sources of income to support it such as Title 1, Title 2, operating budget and private grants .

B. Budget Forms

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

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

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.

LEA:

The Board of Education commits to the following:

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

The LEA commits to the following:

1. Assuring that each school the LEA proposes to serve will receive all of the State and local funds it would have received in the absence of funds received under Title 1, Part A, Sec. 1003a
2. Provide the prioritized support, autonomy, and accountability for urgent and sustainable success, including:
 - a. Partner with principal to establish a comprehensive school 90-day plan that is aligned with the LEA's strategic plan
 - b. Partner with principal on critical decisions like staffing, scheduling, budgeting, targeted professional development, and other operational issues
 - c. Put into place rigorous and aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year along with efficient data collection and distribution for use at the school level
 - d. Proactively engage all stakeholders to acknowledge current reality and present a bold vision for the future of the school
 - e. Hold turnaround schools and principals accountable through a robust monitoring system as defined by the LEA
3. Ensure that conditions are in place at the school level to support turnaround, including:
 - a. Rigorous aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year
 - b. Deep item analysis of interim assessments 3-4 times per year with one-on-one teacher-leader (principal, assistant principal, instructional coach) analysis meetings
 - c. Teacher action plans addressing root cause analysis of interim assessment data will be developed by all teachers and leaders prior to one-on-one teacher-leader analysis meetings
 - d. Structured weekly collaboration time for ongoing data analysis by PLCs

- e. Student and staff culture of learning
- f. Short-cycle observation walkthroughs and one-on-one teacher-leader feedback meetings
- 4. Message the evidence-based intervention to all stakeholders to include school board members and collective bargaining units as necessary
- 5. Develop a sustainability plan prior to the end of Year 3

School Leadership Commits to the Following:

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

<i>Adrianna Barboza</i>	2-22-18
President, Board of Education Signature	Date
<i>Raqueel Reedy</i>	2/22/18
Superintendent Signature	Date
<i>Blanca Lopez</i>	2-22-18
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.

<u>Blanca Lopez</u>	<u>2-22-18</u>
Superintendent/Charter Director Printed Name	Date

<u>Blanca Lopez</u>	<u>2-22-18</u>
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.

<u>David E Peercy</u>	
Board President Printed Name	Date

<u>David E Peercy</u>	<u>2/21/2018</u>
Board President Signature (blue ink)	Date

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

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not provide a schedule for administering common interim assessments in ELA and Math 	<p>CCSS at each grade level’s scope and sequence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a partial/somewhat convincing description of the process for test-in-hand analysis and adaptation of instructional plans based on interim assessment data. Provides a partial/incomplete schedule for administering common interim assessments in ELA and Math 	<p>CCSS at each grade level’s scope and sequence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides a clear and convincing description of the process for test-in-hand analysis and adaptation of instructional plans based on interim assessment data. Provides a comprehensive schedule for administering common interim assessments in ELA and Math
---	--	--

**I. LEA Organizational Culture:
C: LEA Support and Accountability**

Points: 10 max

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

	course-corrections as applicable)	course-corrections as applicable)
--	-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

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

<p>other instructional leaders to support or hold teachers accountable for meeting effectiveness.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides partial/somewhat convincing description of the systems in place for principal and/or other instructional leaders to support and/or hold teachers accountable for meeting effectiveness. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides clear and convincing description of the systems in place for principal and/or other instructional leaders to support and hold teachers accountable for meeting effectiveness.
--	--	--

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

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

<p>III. Evidence-Based Interventions</p>		
<p>C. Sources of Evidence</p>		<p>Points: 5 max</p>
<p>Insufficient (0 points)</p>	<p>Approaching (3 points)</p>	<p>Meets Expectations (5points)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Does not identify any 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. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies unvetted or obscure sources of evidence used to determine the interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that are relevant and 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identifies well vetted and reputable sources of evidence used to determine the interventions meeting the top three tiers of evidence that are

	appropriate to the needs of the school.	relevant and appropriate to the needs of the school.
--	---	--

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

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

<p>chosen evidence-based intervention.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides partial/somewhat convincing demonstration of how the LEA and schools will align other available federal, state, and local resources to support the chosen evidence-based intervention. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides clear and convincing demonstration of how the LEA and schools will align other available federal, state, and local resources to support the chosen evidence-based intervention.
<p>IV. Budget: B. Budget Forms (Excel File) Points: 5 max</p>		
<p>Insufficient (0 points)</p>	<p>Approaching (3 points)</p>	<p>Meets Expectations (5 points)</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did not submit a Budget Summary Chart for the project period (six months of planning and two-years of implementation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted a partial/incomplete Budget Summary Chart for less than the entire project period (six months of planning and two-years of implementation). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted a complete and detailed Budget Summary Chart for the entire project period (six months of planning and two-years of implementation).

Appendix C:
Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI)
Budget Summary Chart



Comprehensive Support Improvement Schools (CSI) Overall Budget Summary								
Budget Expenditures	FY 2018 Planning Period (March to June, 2018)		FY 2019 Year One Implementation (July, 2018 to June, 2019)		FY 2020 Year Two Implementation (July, 2019 to June, 2020)		FY 2021 Year Three Implementation (July, 2020 to June, 2021)	
	Budget	Percent	Budget	Percent	Budget	Percent	Budget	Percent
School-Level Expenditures	\$ 5,000.00	26.1%	\$ 135,000.00	90.0%	\$ 135,000.00	135000.0%	\$ 135,000.00	90.0%
Supplies and Materials	\$ 14,157.40	73.9%	\$ 15,000.00	10.0%	\$ 15,000.00	10.0%	\$ 15,000.00	10.0%
TOTAL SCHOOL FUNDING REQUEST	\$ 19,157.40	100.0%	\$ 150,000.00	100.0%	\$ 150,000.00	135010.0%	\$ 150,000.00	100.0%
LEA-Level Expenses (Indirect Costs)	\$ -	0.0%	\$ -	0.0%	\$ -	0.0%	\$ -	0.0%
TOTAL BUDGET	\$ 19,157.40		\$ 150,000.00		\$ 150,000.00		\$ 150,000.00	

Appendix C: Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI) Budget Summary Chart



Planning Period for LEA/Schools Budget Summary	
Expenditure Description	TOTAL BUDGET
School-Level Activities	
Training for teachers on Renaissance assessment and implementation of Accelerated Math and Accelerated Reader 360 programs. \$5,000.00	
Training for teachers and administration on the use of data from short cycle assessment to drive remediation and improve academic skills. \$5,000.00	
Purchase of Renaissance Accelerated Math and Reading Programs.	
Purchase of school-wide short-cycle assessment for Math and Reading. \$14,157.00	
Reading and Math consultants to work with intervention coach. \$4000.00	
TOTAL SCHOOL-LEVEL ACTIVITIES (Must be at least 90% of funding request)	\$ -
Supplies and Materials	
Purchase of school clerical supplies and materials. \$1,843.00	
TOTAL SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (Can't exceed 10% of funding request)	\$ -
TOTAL PLANNING PERIOD FUNDING REQUEST FOR SCHOOL	\$ -
	\$20,157.40
LEA-Level Activities (Indirect Costs)	
TOTAL LEA-LEVEL ACTIVITIES (At PED approved rate)	\$ -
	\$30,000
TOTAL PLANNING PERIOD BUDGET	\$ -

Appendix C:

Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI) Budget Summary Chart



Year One Implementation for LEA/Schools Budget Summary	
Expenditure Description	TOTAL BUDGET
School-Level Activities	
Implementaation of Renaissance Accelerated Reading and Math program and short cycle assessment - \$8,8000	
Professional development to support teachers the use of data to implement Reading and Math interventions - \$10,000	
1 full time intervention teacher - \$72,000	
Tutoring Lab to support students in Reading and Math, before, during and after school - \$44,200	
TOTAL SCHOOL-LEVEL ACTIVITIES (Must be at least 90% of funding request) \$135,000	\$ -
Supplies and Materials	
Supplies and materials to support teachers and tutores in implementing RTI program. \$15,000	
TOTAL SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (Can't exceed 10% of funding request) \$15,000	\$ -
TOTAL YEAR-ONE FUNDING REQUEST FOR SCHOOL	\$ -
LEA-Level Activities (Indirect Costs)	
TOTAL LEA-LEVEL ACTIVITIES (At PED approved rate)	\$ -
TOTAL YEAR-ONE BUDGET	\$ -

Appendix C:

Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI) Budget Summary Chart



Year Two Implementation for LEA/Schools Budget Summary	
Expenditure Description	TOTAL BUDGET
School-Level Activities	
Implementaation of Renaissance Accelerated Reading and Math program and short cycle assessment - \$8,8000	
Professional development to support teachers the use of data to implement Reading and Math interventions - \$10,000	
1 full time intervention teacher - \$72,000	
Tutoring Lab to support students in Reading and Math, before, during and after school - \$44,200	
TOTAL SCHOOL-LEVEL ACTIVITIES (Must be at least 90% of funding request) \$135,000.00	\$ -
Supplies and Materials	
Supplies and materials to support teachers and tutores in implementing RTI program. \$15,000	
TOTAL SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (Can't exceed 10% of funding request) \$15,000	\$ -
TOTAL YEAR-TWO FUNDING REQUEST FOR SCHOOL \$150,000	\$ -
LEA-Level Activities (Indirect Costs)	
TOTAL LEA-LEVEL ACTIVITIES (At PED approved rate)	\$ -
TOTAL YEAR-TWO BUDGET	\$ -

Appendix C:

Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools (CSI) Budget Summary Chart

Year Three Implementation for LEA/Schools Budget Summary	
Expenditure Description	TOTAL BUDGET
School-Level Activities	
Implementaation of Renaissance Accelerated Reading and Math program and short cycle assessment - \$8,8000	
Professional development to support teachers the use of data to implement Reading and Math interventions - \$10,000	
1 full time intervention teacher - \$72,000	
Tutoring Lab to support students in Reading and Math, before, during and after school - \$44,200	
TOTAL SCHOOL-LEVEL ACTIVITIES (Must be at least 90% of funding request) \$135,000	\$ -
Supplies and Materials	
Supplies and materials to support teachers and tutores in implementing RTI program. \$15,000	
TOTAL SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS (Can't exceed 10% of funding request) \$15,000	\$ -
TOTAL YEAR-THREE FUNDING REQUEST FOR SCHOOL \$15,000	\$ -
LEA-Level Activities (Indirect Costs)	
TOTAL LEA-LEVEL ACTIVITIES (At PED approved rate)	\$ -
TOTAL YEAR-THREE BUDGET	\$ -

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



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

Step 1 – Build Core Team

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

Guiding Questions –

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

Team Member	Position	<u>Rationale:</u> What strengths/perspective does this person bring to the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school’s current reality?
Blanca Lopez	Executive Director	Blanca has been the Executive Director at HLHS since 2013. She has extensive experience in education, working sixteen years as a school leader and twenty years in the classroom before that. It is important to note that in addition to several other areas of endorsement, she holds a teaching endorsement in Bilingual Education and Special Education, bringing a critical perspective to the core team’s work. She is familiar with the improvement efforts at HLHS and is very familiar with the strengths and weaknesses of the teaching staff.

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

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

Step 2 – Analyze Data & Set Student Achievement Goals

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

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

Proficiency Data Over Time (on school report card):

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

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

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

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

Short Cycle Comparative Growth Data (Discovery)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

SMART Checklist

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

Step 3 – Identify Focus Areas

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

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

Focus Areas & Guiding Questions –

1. Standards Alignment

All grade levels have identified essential standards.

Guiding questions –

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

2. Tier I (core) instruction

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

Guiding questions –

- What percent of your students are achieving grade-level expectations or making significant growth? If at least 80% are not attaining proficiency, what are you doing to ensure that your school is making significant progress toward this goal?

- What evidence do you have that the level of rigor of the tasks students perform during the lesson is aligned to the rigor of the CCSS?

3. *Data-driven instruction*

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

Guiding questions –

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

4. *Tier I interventions*

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

Guiding questions –

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

5. *Observation and feedback cycles*

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

Guiding questions –

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

6. *Collaboration*

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

Guiding questions –

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

7. *Ongoing, job embedded professional development*

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

Guiding questions –

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

8. *Tier II (SAT) process*

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

Guiding questions –

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

9. *School leadership and systems*

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

Guiding questions –

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

10. *School culture*

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

Guiding questions –

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

<p><i>Focus Area:</i> What are the 2-3 highest-leverage Focus Areas (best practices – see pp. 3-5) that must be addressed to reach the student achievement goals?</p>	<p><i>Data Connection:</i> What quantitative and qualitative data led you to these Focus Areas? How do you know that these are the highest-leverage areas of focus?</p>
<p>Tier I (core) instruction</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● 95% of students did not demonstrate proficiency on the ELA PARCC Assessments in 2017. This is 4% less students demonstrating proficiency on this assessment than in the previous year. ● For the last three years, 98% of students did not demonstrate proficiency on the Math PARCC Assessments. ● Teachers have noted the difficulty of providing rigorous math instruction within our primary instructional model, which is Project Based Learning. Despite the various applications of math content in the health field and within projects, the amount of time needed to adequately build background knowledge and computational skills is difficult to incorporate in a robust and authentic health project. ● Our instructional model requires regular disciplined inquiry by students. As such, students interact with texts in all projects. This provides us with ample opportunity to teach and reinforce reading and writing strategies within projects. Teachers are interested in identifying high-leverage strategies that can be implemented across all projects. ● Although classroom walkthroughs and project plans reflect regular disciplined inquiry, there is question about the complexity of texts students interact with and the level of rigor associated with reading and writing tasks in projects that are not explicitly linked to English credits.

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

Step 4 – Conduct Root Cause Analysis

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

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

Guiding Questions –

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

<i>Focus Area (selected in Step 3)</i>	<i>Root Cause Statement</i>	<i>Evidence to Support</i>
Tier I (core) instruction	<p>There are no explicit school wide expectations regarding high-impact literacy and math practices occurring in all projects.</p> <p>Providing rigorous math instruction within authentic health projects is difficult because of the need to build the foundational knowledge and skills that are prerequisite to the authentic needs for math within the projects.</p>	<p>-Evidenced in walk throughs, project design documents and prep hour conversations between the CIA Director, Instructional Coach, and project teachers.</p> <p>-Walkthrough tool does not support monitoring and tuning literacy and math instruction in all projects.</p> <p>Assessments (short-cycle, PARCC, and teacher created) occurring in previous years' support teacher reflection.</p>
Data-driven instruction	Teachers have not received adequate professional learning support to effectively and consistently enact the mastery-based assessment and feedback model.	Historical PD agendas reflect that the focus on schoolwide and network PD has been on project design work rather than on the assessment model and how to use assessment results to inform feedback, teaching, and learning.

Step 5 – Create Desired Outcomes & Define Critical Actions

Create Desired Outcomes:

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

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

Guiding Questions for Setting Desired Outcomes –

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

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



Define Critical Actions:

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

Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Options) -

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

Guiding Questions for Critical Actions (Decisions) -

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

Focus Area: Tier 1 (core) instruction

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

CRITICAL ACTIONS

<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Critical Action to Address Root Cause & Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Resources Needed/Source</i>	<i>Person(s) Responsible</i>	<i>Person(s) Involved</i>
8/14/17	The published master schedule will include core math blocks	Master schedule template	A. Reno	V. Mota (registrar)
11/3/17	Literacy and Math team membership will be determined by the end of the Oct/Nov PD week and a schedule for trimester 2 meetings and PD will be developed	Calendar template	A. Reno	All teachers; Instructional Coach

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

Focus Area: Data-driven instruction

Desired Outcome: All teachers' professional development plans will include a goal related to designing and using assessment data; biweekly prep-hour meetings between project teachers and the curriculum, instruction, and assessment team will always include discussion of assessment and feedback practices; each trimester (for trimesters 2 and 3) there will be at least two critical friend protocols enacted in order to examine teacher assessment and feedback practices.

CRITICAL ACTIONS

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

	<i>Cause & Achieve Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Needed/Source</i>	<i>Responsible</i>	
7/27/17	All HLHS teachers will attend the Network Summer PD Session: Mastery Assessment , in an effort to begin building a more consistent, shared understanding of our assessment model	Excerpts from <i>Pathways to Proficiency</i> Network Collaboration	A. Reno	CIA Directors from other network schools All teachers
9/8/17	Friday morning PD focuses on the data included in our school report card. Teachers begin brainstorming strategies for addressing students' literacy and math needs.	PD Time Copies of school report card	A. Reno	All teachers Leadership Testing Coordinator
10/11/17	All teachers PDPs will include a goal related to assessment and feedback. This school wide initiative will drive PD planning and become a critical focus of the professional conversations between teachers, the IC, and the CIA Director.	<i>Pathways to Proficiency</i>	A. Reno	All teachers Instructional Coach
10/16/17 through 5/25/18	Teachers will participate in bi-weekly prep-hour conversations with the CIA Director. Every conversation will include discussion of assessment practices, helping to build shared understanding of the assessment model, ensuring that teachers are planning for students to have multiple opportunities to demonstrate proficiency, receive feedback and additional instruction before attempting to demonstrate proficiency again.	<i>Pathways to Proficiency</i> Bi-weekly meetings during prep times between teachers and the CIA Director.	A. Reno	All Teachers Instructional Coach
11/6/17	All teaching staff will	<i>Pathways to</i>	A. Reno	All teachers

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

Step 6 – Monitor Implementation

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

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

Guiding Questions –

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

Focus Area: Tier 1 (core) instruction

Desired Outcome:

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

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

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

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

Focus Area: Data-driven instruction

Desired Outcome:

All teachers' professional development plans will include a goal related to designing and using assessment data; bi-weekly prep-hour meetings between project teachers and the curriculum, instruction, and assessment team will always include discussion of assessment and feedback practices; each trimester (for trimesters 2 and 3) there will be at least two critical friend protocols enacted in order to examine teacher assessment and feedback practices.

PROGRESS INDICATORS

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

<i>Indicator Date</i>	<i>Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome</i>	<i>Potential Adjustments</i>
10/11/17	100% of PDPs will include a goal related to assessment and feedback	CIA Director will work with teachers who need support with the PDP goal-setting form
Ongoing; after each formal	100% of teachers will improve assessment practices between their first and second formal observation.	Teachers who are excelling after the first observation cycle will provide mentorship, modeling, or



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

System to Monitor Implementation

Weekly Leadership Meetings:

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

Monthly Core Team Meetings:

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

Interim Assessment Data-Analysis Meetings:

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

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

Schedule for Administering Common Interim Assessments in ELA and Math

Trimester One: 9/25/17-10/23/17

Trimester Two: 1/4/18-2/2/18

Trimester Three: 5/1/18-5/31/1

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

Dis
Sch
Hi
Da
Co

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

Your p	
Solid Progress	Limited Pr
16	

Step 1 – Build Core Team	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress
Diverse backgrounds and viewpoints	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders likely to bring different viewpoints to discussions and a clear rationale for selection is provided.	In addition to principal and district representative, the core team includes teachers or instructional leaders and a rationale for selection is provided .	The core team consists of principal and district representative, and district representative teachers or instructional leaders and a rationale for selection must be provided.
Representation ¹	The core team has full representation from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	The core team has representation from two of the following : across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and community.	The core team has limited representation from across grade levels, of the student body (including subgroups), and/or community.

Step 1 Reflections and Feedback:
Diverse Backgrounds and Viewpoints: The core team includes principal, guiding council member, teachers, and the community. A clear rationale for the selection of members who have different viewpoints. **Solid Progress**
Representation: All grade levels, student sub-groups, and the community are represented in the make-up of the core team. **Solid Progress**

Step 2 – Analyze	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress
-------------------------	------------------	-----------------------	-------------------------

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

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

Step 2 Reflections and Feedback:

Summative goals: The most recent PARCC data was used to inform the achievement goals set by the Core Team **Solid Progress**
 Benchmark goals: Benchmark goals using the new interim assessment are clearly articulated in both ELA and math **Solid Progress**
 SMART: All SMART criteria has been met **Solid Progress**

<u>Step 3 – Focus Areas</u>	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress
High leverage and aligned	The 2-3 highest-leverage focus areas selected are aligned to deep data analysis and include qualitative and quantitative evidence.	The 2-3 focus areas selected are aligned to data analysis and include qualitative and/or quantitative evidence.	2-3 focus areas are selected

Step 3 Reflections and Feedback:

High leverage and aligned: The core team has clearly articulated the rational for the two focus areas using both qualitative and quantitative evidence **Progress**

<u>Step 4 – Root Cause Analysis</u>	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress
Clear hypothesis	Each focus area has a clear hypothesis	Each focus area has a clear hypothesis	Some or all of the focus areas have a clear hypothesis

² For assessment requirements and best practices, access: <http://ped.state.nm.us/assessmentaccountability/assessmentevaluation/2015/Testing>

	of the deepest underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges that will result in a substantial reduction of the performance challenge.	of the underlying root cause or causes of school performance challenges.	hypothesis of the cause of school performance challenges.
Evidence to support	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and quantitative data and are supported by evidence.	Root causes seem to have been generated through thoughtful analysis of qualitative and/or quantitative data.	Root causes are identified and connected to data analysis.

Step 4 Reflections and Feedback:

Clear Hypothesis: Hypotheses of the root causes are clear and reasonable **Solid Progress**

Evidence to support: The analysis of qualitative and quantitative data led to the identification of the stated root causes.

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

resources	needed to support them, including funding sources.	to support them.	
-----------	---	------------------	--

Step 5 Reflections and Feedback:

Desired Outcomes: The changes to adult behavior are clearly articulated **Solid Progress**
 Desired Outcomes: The desired outcomes are clearly focused on student achievement **Solid Progress**
 Critical Actions: Critical actions have a laser focus on achieving the desired outcomes **Solid Progress**
 Critical Actions: Each action is strategically owned by various individuals **Solid Progress**
 Critical Actions: Timelines are clear **Solid Progress**

Step 6 – Monitor Implementation	Exemplary	Solid Progress	Limited Progress
Progress Indicators	Strategically selected progress indicators identify the metrics and evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	All progress indicators identify the metrics and evidence used to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.	Some progress indicators identified, and they may include metrics or evidence to measure progress toward desired outcomes and goals.
Potential Adjustments to the 90-day Plan	For all progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress and unanticipated barriers.	For most progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers.	For some progress indicators, potential adjustments are identified based on possible accelerated progress or unanticipated barriers.
System to Monitor	The system to monitor implementation clearly details the procedure, timelines, and persons responsible.	The system to monitor implementation identifies the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.	The system to monitor implementation identifies one or more of the following: the procedure, timelines, and/or persons responsible.

Step 6 Reflections and Feedback:

Progress Indicators: All progress indicators identify metrics and evidence to measure progress **Solid Progress**
 Potential Adjustments: All but two indicators include the identification of possible adjustments based on acceleration or barriers **Solid Progress**
 Systems to Monitor: the system to monitor implementation section of the plan clearly articulates how, when, and by whom implementation will occur **Solid Progress**