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1. **Background**

Under the New Mexico Public Education Department’s (NMPED) approved Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA), the state’ 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.

1. **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.

1. **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>

1. **Evidence-based Interventions[[1]](#footnote-1)**

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

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

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

The PED will not provide a list of potential evidence-based interventions for school turnaround

programs for use by LEAs in schools identified as CSI that choose to apply for the Competitive Grants for School Improvement. It is incumbent upon the LEA to demonstrate that the selected intervention falls into one of the three ESSA tiers of evidence in Category 1 (see table1).

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

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

1. **LEA Organizational Conditions**

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

* University of Virginia School Turnaround Program
* National Institute for School Leadership Executive Development Program
* New Mexico Leadership Innovation Program[[2]](#footnote-2)

**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)).

**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.

1. **Funding**

For the 2017-2018 SY, ESSA requires states to set aside seven percent of Title I, Part A funds for school improvement activities. Ninety-five percent of these funds must pass through to LEAs to support CSI schools, consistent with the state’s new accountability system[[3]](#footnote-3).

PED is making multi-year awards (2017-2021), through the period of availability of funds[[4]](#footnote-4), to successful applicants.

Estimated funds available: **$6,121,460.00** (for the 2017-2018 SY[[5]](#footnote-5))

1. **Maximum Funding Amounts**
* The planning period total funding requested may be no greater than $30,000.00.
* The year-one implementation period total funding request may be no greater than $150,000[[6]](#footnote-6).
* 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.
1. **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 |

1. **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.

1. **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.

1. **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.

1. **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.

1. **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.

1. **Reporting Requirements**

The lead points of contact at the LEA responsible for oversight, monitoring, and support of the CSI School are required to participate in progress site visits and monitoring telephone calls with PED[[7]](#footnote-7).

In addition, LEAs will be responsible for submitting monthly, quarterly and/or annual reports on school progress[[8]](#footnote-8) that may include, but are not limited to:

**NM DASH**

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

**Leading Indicators**

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

**Lagging indicators**

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

**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.
1. **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%** |

1. **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.
6. **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:

1. Temporarily withhold cash payments pending correction of the deficiency by the subgrantee

or more severe enforcement action by the SEA.

1. Disallow all or part of the cost of the activity or action not in compliance.
2. Wholly or partly suspend or terminate the award.
3. Recommend the USED initiate suspension or department proceedings as authorized under 2

CFR part 180.

1. Withhold further Federal awards to the project or program[[9]](#footnote-9).

The SEA may impose additional award conditions[[10]](#footnote-10) as needed, which may include the following:

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

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

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

|  |
| --- |
| **LEA Information** |
| **LEA/State Charter Name: Vista Grande High School/Taos Municipal Schools** | **LEA NCES ID #: 076012** |
| **Mailing Address: 213 Paseo del Canon East, Taos, NM 87571** |
| **Phone:** 575-758-5100 | **Fax:** 575-758-5102 |
| **Superintendent/Charter Director:** Isabelle St Onge  | **Email:** isabelle.stonge@vghs.org |
| **Title I Director:** Melissa Sandoval | **Email:** melissa.sandoval@taosschools.org |
| **Federal Programs Director:** CJ Grace | **Email:** cj.grace@taosschools.org |
| **Business Manager:** Deanna Gomez/Bobby Spinelli | **Email:** bobby.spinelli@taosschools.orgdeanna@deannagomez.biz |
| **Comprehensive Support and Improvement Schools LEA Lead:**  | **Email:**  |
| **LEA will Apply for the Following Eligible School(s)** |
| **Name of School** | **School NCES ID #** | **Proposed Intervention Model** |
| Vista Grande High School | 076012 | Transformation model |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

**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 betyped, 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:** | Taos Municipal Schools |
| **Submitting on Behalf of (name of school):** | Vista Grande High School |
| **Number of Students Served:** | an average of 96 students including students who attend a night school |
| **Number of Certified Licensed Staff:** | 8 teachers, 1 title 1 tutor, 1 social worker, 1 transition specialist |

**I. LEA Organizational Culture**

**A. LEA Overview**

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

The VGHS comprehensive needs assessment was structured based on the Council of Chief State School Officers and West Ed’s The Center on School Turnaround tactical guide. As a school identified for comprehensive support and improvement, a school-level needs assessment is mandatory under ESSA. The comprehensive needs assessment attempts to assess all aspects of the school and its context. Currently, the VGHS needs assessment is based on an assumption of moderate performance and improvement trajectory. As a result, the comprehensive needs assessment process was a combination of a self-assessment performed by the school director and the leadership team and a coached assessment with support from an outside consultant selected by the school. The needs assessment outlines the available data to identify needs and challenges, determine root causes, and set priorities for future action.

The needs assessment combines qualitative and quantitative data to describe the school context and student performance and engagement. This needs assessment further examined personnel policies and climate and culture. A comprehensive needs assessment should be reviewed and revised through an onsite review process. This current needs assessment has undergone the first onsite review process and plans are made to collect additional data so that it reflects a more comprehensive picture of the school’s needs. For example, student focus groups were held two years ago to inform a needs assessment, but this process has not been repeated. This needs assessment also lacks clear data on family engagement. Also, the VGHS interim assessment method was deemed unreliable and lacked validity for the 2017-18 academic year; the school will be using NWEA MAPS interim assessment next year.

Data are collected and analyzed continually at VGHS by an external consultant for dissemination to the governing council, administration, and teachers as part of the comprehensive needs assessment process. The school leadership team, and whole faculty when appropriate, met to determine roots causes and explore next steps in interventions and to set priorities. The results of the current comprehensive needs assessment are included below.

**Purpose:** Vista Grande High School (VGHS) has been identified as school in need of comprehensive school improvement based on low graduation rates. This needs assessment was conducted in order to examine the data to determine the areas with the highest potential to guide improvement. This analysis will be used to guide the root cause analysis for strategic planning purposes.

**Context:** Vista Grande High School (VGHS) was founded as a district-affiliated, public charter school in 2006; its recent re-charter effort was successful and granted another 5-year period of operation. As a district charter school, the hosting LEA, Taos Municipal Schools, provides annual oversight of the four charter goals, in accordance to the NM Charter School Division guidelines and the Charter Performance Framework. As a charter school, VGHS has an autonomous governing council which is responsible for evaluating the school director evaluation, managing the school budget, and monitoring the performance framework. The school director functions as superintendent, CEO, and school principal.

VGHS serves a diverse student population in grades 9-12 in Taos County. The school also includes a Night Flyers program of blended learning for older, nontraditional students who have dropped out of school and want to return to complete their high school degree. Of the student population, 32 per cent are Native American/Pacific Islander, 62 per cent are Hispanic, and 6 per cent are Caucasian. The percentage of families qualifying for Free and Reduced Lunch through the direct certification program is 89.46. Additionally, the school holds a SAM designation due to having a high percentage of Special Education students at 32%, an older population of students and number of students receiving free and reduced lunch.

Personnel demographics of the staff employed at Vista Grande High School include four Native American staff, including the Tiwa language and culture teacher. The remaining staff are Caucasian, two of which are of Hispanic ethnicity. The school employs an art teacher, three math/science teachers, one special education teacher, one part-time educational assistant, three humanities teachers, two administrative support staff, a receptionist, and two social workers - one fulltime and one social worker for special education students.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Type of Data Analyzed | Area of Need | Description of data in each area |
| PARCC Short-cycle End of course exams | ELA | * Students enter the 9th grade with below grade level proficiency rates in ELA.
* An achievement gap exists between non-FRL and non-SPED students and the FRL and SPED students.
* Lower correct response rate for informational text.
* Points earned for prose constructed response items ranges from 3-28% of possible points with lower scores on literary analysis and research simulation tasks, particularly when combined with science and the technical subjects.
* On the writing portion of the PARCC on written expression and knowledge of writing, students earn only 8-10% of possible points in the lower grades and around 20% for 11th graders.
 |
| PARCC Short-cycle End of course exams | Mathematics  | * Students enter the 9th grade with below grade level proficiency rates in math.
* An achievement gap exists between proficiency levels of Caucasian and Native or Hispanic students.
* An achievement gap exists between non-FRL and non-SPED students and the FRL and SPED students.
* Correct response rates are low on Type I PARCC tasks and almost no points are earned on constructed response-based Type II and III tasks.
* Failure rates on math EoCs is around 85%.
 |
| SBA End of course exams | Science  | * Proficiency rates are low for all students.
* Students consistently do not earn points on short answer and open-ended items on the SBA.
* Failure rate on science EoCs is between 64 and 79%
 |
| End of course exams | Social Studies | Failure rates on social studies EoCs is between 47 and 93% |
| School Report Card 2017 | Lowest performing students | The school grade for growth of lowest performing students is an F. Overall growth was near zero, which indicates “this group performed as expected based on their academic history.” |
| PEAR Institute survey: Partnerships in Education and Resilience (in collaboration with Harvard Medical School Teaching Hospital | Social emotional health  | Holistic Student Assessment results:* VGHS students present more challenges than resiliencies.
* Student resiliencies align to action orientation, emotion control, and assertiveness, particularly among girls.
* Relationships with peers is the greatest challenge, followed by academic motivation, optimism, and school bonding. They also rate low on perseverance.
* Students, in general, show difficulties with hyperactivity, conduct problems, emotional symptoms and peer problems.
* They rate low on trust, empathy, reflection, and optimism.
 |
| Power School | Attendance Rate |  88% |
| School Report Card 2017 | Graduation Rate | 64% |
| Opportunity to Learn Survey School Report Card 2017 | Student perceptions of learning and school environment | School report card grade is a B for Opportunity to Learn.Students perceive strengths of teachers at VGHS to be a focus on revising mistakes and holding high expectations of them. Overall, improvement could be made in the area of checking for understanding in ways that lead to flexible teaching to address learning issues as they occur. |
| School Report Card 2017Student Survey | College and Career Readiness | The school received an A on the College and Career Readiness category on the report card. Students are participating in college and career readiness opportunities and demonstrating success. |
| Curriculum maps and pacing guides | Core curriculum aligned vertically and with state standards | The core curriculum is aligned to state standards. The curriculum maps need revision and pacing guides do not exist. Vertical alignment has not occurred. |
| NM Teach (external observer) | Effective instructional strategies and tiered interventions | Questioning and Discussion Techniques: 22% minimally effective, 77% effectiveStudent engagement: 22% minimally effective, 55% effective, 22% highly effectiveSetting instructional outcomes: 12% minimally effective, 75% effective, 12% exemplary |
| NM Teach (external observer) | Use of formative and progress monitoring assessments to improve instruction | Assessment in instruction: 77% effective, 11% highly effective, 11% exemplaryUse assessment to modify instruction: 77% effective, 22% highly effectiveDesigning student assessment: 25% minimally effective, 50% effective, 25 % highly effective |
| Student-led conference feedback surveys | Family Engagement |  The number one reason families choose VGHS is due to its small school size with a low teacher to student ratio. |
| 2017-18 Strategic PlanPD Sign-in sheets | Professional Development (PD) |  All teachers participate in PD after regular school hours and PLCs after regular school hours, which occur weekly for PD and twice a month for PLCs. VGHS teachers work an 8 hour day two days per week until 4:30 for the PD and PLCs.PD is aligned to the strategic plan and includes follow up feedback on offerings. |
| 2017-18 Strategic Plan | PD to support individual teacher skills |  Student-centered instructional coaching is offered at VGHS with a certified coach. Most teachers request participation in a coaching cycle. All teachers participate in PD. |

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

This systematic review of curriculum, instruction, and assessment is based on reporting on NMTEACH Domain 1: Planning and preparation, an analysis of teacher-developed curriculum maps and pacing guides, and teacher grading practices. VGHS is in clear need of a curriculum, instruction, and assessment revision based on clear protocols and requirements and grounded in targeted professional development. A process of vertical alignment would also be beneficial in the revision process.

Curriculum, instruction, and assessment require improvement in alignment to standards and inclusion of college and career readiness skills. Teachers write curriculum that is responsive to student needs and interests and that is also thematic across content areas. Writing curriculum is a unique and challenging skill set not possessed by most teachers. Though a curriculum map that includes aligned formative and summative assessments with a pacing guide of timelines and benchmarks has been required to be produced by teachers, it is a partial product. Teachers have not created syllabi for their courses.

Through formative reviews of lesson plans for Domain 1 in the NMTEACH process, the observation is made that curriculum is not aligning to state standards with fidelity and is often below grade level content and skills. Therefore, administration is aware that the appropriate curriculum is not provided to meet learning requirements and equity.

**B. Instructional Infrastructure**

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

The curriculum grade level scopes and sequences need revision to ensure alignment to Common Core standards in ELA and math, including the standards for reading and writing in history, science and the technical subjects. The process for this revision would be to begin with a template with clear guidelines and expectations for the creation of the curriculum map and accompanying pacing guides. At VGHS, the curriculum map also requires the translation of standards into long-term and supporting learning targets aligned to formative and summative assessments. The following checklist of guiding questions could provide the framework for the creation of the aligned assessment plans.

**Curriculum Assessment Questions Checklist**

**Questions to ask as assessments are collected or developed and included in curriculum guides:**

**I. Centered on learning objectives**

Does my curriculum include classroom and summative sample assessment items keyed to measurable learning objectives that provide teachers adequate guidance in monitoring student performance on the objectives?

Does my curriculum include required district interim assessments for those objectives about which we must collect district-wide data?

Does my curriculum provide pre-assessments for objectives where that is appropriate?

**II. Clear and appropriate users and uses**

How will district-collected data be used, and by whom? e.g.:

For teacher collaboration around student mastery of objectives

To measure our progress (by school? by disaggregated groups? etc.)

To inform curriculum revision

To shape professional development

To predict student performance on high stakes tests

Other?

Given its intended use(s), how will data be collected and reported?

Which assessments must be administered to students on a required schedule and what is that timing window?

What professional development must my department provide regarding the purposes and uses of assessments within the curriculum and regarding interpretation of student work to guide subsequent instruction?

**III. Assessment Method**

Are the assessments included in my curriculum documents – whether samples or required – in the appropriate format given their intended use and the kind of knowledge or thinking they must measure? (Formats: selected response, essay/constructed response, performance assessment, or personal communications/teacher observation)

Are my assessments aligned to the context(s) in which mastery will be required in state or other high stakes assessments?

Are assessments aligned to the cognitive type - the level of mastery or depth of knowledge expected in the standard?

**IV. Quality**

Does each assessment gather enough information to make generalizations about student learning of the objective? If not, are several assessments part of a bigger plan to gather sufficient information across time?

Is each assessment reliable – would it yield substantially similar results, given similarly prepared students, across classrooms? (i.e. is it trustworthy?)

Is each assessment valid – does it really measure the targeted objective(s)?

Is there anything in the assessment that would prevent a student from adequately demonstrating what he really knows or can do? (Absence of bias, lack of clarity, etc.)

If the assessment is a performance assessment, is the rubric clear and does it measure both mastery of the objective(s) and key aspects of a quality performance?

(based on Stiggins et al., 2004)

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

The support and accountability for teachers and leaders in implementing standards-aligned instruction are tied to the NM DASH strategic plan for the school, the NMTEACH rubric elements, and the EL Education Core Practices and Benchmarks (due to the charter requirement to implement strategies as an EL-inspired school). EL Education is a comprehensive school transformation model, and the Core Practices are a collection of research-based educational strategies shown to dramatically increase student achievement on standardized measures. While VGHS is no longer with EL Education, the school’s charter remains aligned to the model and the Core Practices. (EL Education at www.eleducation.org).

Support for teachers to implement rigorous standards-aligned instruction takes place through consistent whole group, small group, and embedded professional development (PD) throughout the school year. Whole group PD topics are aligned to the strategic plan and the EL Education Core Practices and based on end-of-year and initial formative walkthroughs and summative NMTEACH evaluation results, as well as interim and PARCC/SBA assessment analysis. PD at VGHS is designed according to the characteristics of effective professional learning opportunities. It is strategic and sequenced to build teacher knowledge and skills. It is designed to cultivate positive school culture and to engage the adult learner. The instructional coach facilitates PD by modeling strong instructional strategies and assessment practices. And, it honors the teacher by quickly moving from theory to application with direct transference to the classroom.

Small group professional learning is structured flexibly as grade-level or department teams, depending on the needs of the teachers. When meeting as grade-level teams, curriculum and projects are crafted and refined; these teams also discuss and plan for interventions for students who are struggling. Department teams engage in a bi-monthly professional teaching-learning cycle (PTLC) in which standards are deconstructed and aligned to appropriate cognitively demanding tasks. These tasks are the foundation for quality lesson planning with explicit attention to scaffolding, vocabulary and discourse, and assessment. The following PTLC entails bringing in and analyzing student work from the chosen task to work as a group to determine next steps and any necessary differentiation.

Teachers at VGHS are also offered the opportunity to choose an embedded PD option – student-centered instructional coaching. A typical coaching cycle lasts for 6-8 weeks and requires at least one co-teaching session and one opportunity co-planning. The focus of student-centered coaching is on student work and formative assessment to plan instruction and differentiation. Coaching is an option at VGHS that most teachers choose. The coach is a certified student-centered instructional coach.

Professional learning is supported by walkthroughs and formative observations by the director or an external consultant. These observations are aligned to the PD topics to hold teachers accountable to implementation of professional learning. The observation forms are designed in alignment with specific elements of the NMTEACH rubrics. Some results are used to monitor school wide patterns in instruction and other results are for individual teacher formative feedback. The school principal and instructional coach also provide frequent formative feedback on lesson plans using Domain 1 elements from the NMTEACH rubrics.

The results of NMTEACH summative evaluations are also monitored and used to give feedback to teachers. The process at VGHS is to conduct the first evaluative observation by an objective, external reviewer at the end of the fall semester so that teachers can have a clear vision of the revisions needed before the final observation. Finally, the teacher Professional Development Plans are encouraged to be aligned to the school strategic plan goals.

While these solid structures are in place at VGHS, revision is necessary. The processes are not necessarily implemented to the highest degree possible. For example, teacher PDPs could be monitored and used more effectively to guide professional learning. Also, the director of a charter school fulfills many roles that are usually delegated in a district office. As a result, the walkthrough and observation accountability can often be lagging. Finally, the whole group PD process has been undergoing revision to be paced more effectively for teachers.

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

Prior to the current academic year, VGHS used Discovery Education interim assessments three times a year. These tests, while in hindsight might not have had the best alignment to PARCC, provided an opportunity for test-in-hand error analysis. With Discovery interim tests no longer available, the school chose to use a program, Edulastic, that is free and allows teachers to construct their own assessments. This decision was made with the best intentions of providing teachers with more control over the data collected and analyzed so that it more closely aligned to their current instruction and to the “power standards” of the grade level. This issue, however, was that test design is difficult, so the school did not get high quality data or growth indicators.

Learning from that mistake, VGHS is planning to contract with NWEA next year and use MAPs Growth interim testing. The school plans to purchase the entire assessment suite that includes MAPs Skills as well. MAPs skills allows for progress monitoring that is personalized to the student. The Skills app also provides the teacher the ability to conduct error analyses of items missed in order to inform instruction.

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

VGHS has ensured that the interim assessments or short-cycle assessments align with the CCSS and each grade level’s scope and sequence by reviewing data published by the provider of interim assessments. After careful consideration and a difficult year with a poor predictor of students achievement VGHS has selected the NWEA Maps suite as the interim assessment provider for VGHS.

X 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).

Test-in-hand error analysis of interim data is crucial for solid, data-driven instruction and for implementing quality Response to Intervention (RtI) and progress monitoring. At VGHS, interim assessment data are analyzed by the instructional coach and the school director for trends and to monitor proficiency rates overall and full academic year growth (FAY) for the purpose of charter monitoring according to the charter performance framework agreement. Additionally, the instructional coach meets one-on-one with each teacher following a data analysis protocol.

The error analyses and planning for instruction take place within department team PD sessions. The outcome of these sessions is the weaving of areas in which most students need improvement into instructional plans. The results are also used to guide the provision of tier II interventions to students who are not mastering standards. This current year, teachers have been provided a series of whole group PD session to learn more about RtI and progress monitoring in response to interim assessment data analysis. A variety of protocols is used to guide data analysis, including Examining Data protocol (2

Adapted from National School Reform Faculty’s *Using Data: Collaborative Inquiry for School Improvement* and Doug Reeves’s *Data Mining for School Improvement*), Atlas: Learning from Data, Data Driven Dialogue, and Results Meeting Protocol.

VGHS is also applying for a Direct Student Services grant. With this grant, the school would hire a Personal Learning Plan (PLP) coordinator to enhance the data analysis and data-driven decision making at the school. Through this grant support, VGHS would be working to more fully implement personalized learning opportunities for students.

The RAND Corporation (2014) identified four aspects of effective personalized learning based on a study of 23 schools following a quasi-experimental design and resulting in an effect size of .41 in math and .29 in reading.  The growth increased after two years of implementation of these four aspects: learner profiles, a personalized learning plan, competency-based progression, and a flexible learning environment.  A staff position dedicated to creating and monitoring personalized learning is necessary for implementation and sustainability.

A crucial component of personalized learning is to have a dedicated process for analyzing student data and monitoring progress.  The data analysis requirements placed on teachers is making the work of teaching overwhelming.  One service to be provided by the program to help teaching be more sustainable and remain firmly data driven is the hiring of an individualized learning plan coordinator.  This person is essentially an in-house data analyst whose role is to collect, interpret, and organize reports summarizing data for stakeholders.  The instructional coach would work closely with the PLP coordinator.

The data sources include the previous year’s PARCC assessment scores drilled down to the item and standard alignment level, MAPs Growth interim assessment data combined with MAPs Skills intervention results, the progress indicated in the MATHia tutoring program, End-of-Course exam pass/fail rates, course completion and credit recovery, the Next Step Plans, and the Early Warning System.  The analyst would be responsible for providing reports to administration for the monitoring of the services and the teachers and teams of teachers for the purposes of informing instruction and intervention with progress monitoring.

Most importantly for personalized learning, this analyst will work directly with students in interpreting their own data in order to reflect on their progress, create action plans, and monitor their own progress.  The learner profiles and personalized learning plan, based on student data, can then be used to guide appropriate competency-based student placements as well as inform student-centered, responsive curriculum.  With a dedicated analyst, the teachers will be better supported in working toward implementing their learning from professional development in their classrooms to provide the other components of personalized, relevant learning.

**C. LEA Support and Accountability**

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

As a charter school affiliated with a district, the LEA’s role is merely to conduct an annual site visit and to monitor the charter performance framework goals. The charter school maintains governance, strategic planning, and fiduciary autonomy. As a result, the Taos Municipal School district and VGHS have created an agreement related to the direction and support of the CSI school that maintains charter autonomy and keeps the district apprised of the progress of the school.

The agreed upon structure requires that the charter school have senior leadership within the school to monitor the program and report data to the school district. The current school director, Isabelle St. Onge will work with Ms. CJ Grace and Ms. Melissa Sandoval at Taos Schools to support VGHS within the bounds of the VGHS/TMS charter

X 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)).

The Taos Municipal Schools organizational chart is attached.

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

The Superintendent of Taos Municipal Schools, Dr. Lillian Torrez requires a monthly report from VGHS. The report includes information regarding the: Academic Performance framework, Financial Performance Framework, and Organizational Performance Framework. The specific cycle of planning, action, evaluation, feedback and adaptation between TMS and VGHS is determined and outlined in the VGHS Charter and the contract between VGHS and TMS. Dr. Torrez has a charter leader quarterly meeting to support the relationship between LEA personnel and VGHS school leadership. This question is difficult for VGHS to respond to in a specific manner because the LEA (TMS) and school (VGHS) have a unique and productive relationship that is determined by the charter contract currently in place.

VGHS is seeking grant funding to include a relationship with a consulting firm that will monitor the school director and her instructional leadership. The consulting firm VGHS has selected is Miles Consulting. The support of the consultant will have a specific cycle of planning, action, evaluation and feedback based on the two overarching goals of this grant - highly effective instruction and the culture and climate of the school.

**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.

VGHS will use the required monthly charter school report on the last day of each month including the times and places that will be used for regularly scheduled parent meetings. Parent activities are held in the evenings at VGHS. For the FY 19 school year the third Tuesday of each month will be designated as the “Data Lives at VGHS” night. VGHS has a parent advisory committee and a Governing Board both groups hold monthly meetings. The agenda and minutes are posted on vghs.org and all stakeholders are encouraged to participate and to read the minutes. The school director will report the leading indicator data to all stakeholders and during the parent advisory monthly meeting the key strategies used by teachers will be discussed. All teachers will have a syllabus posted on the website for all stakeholders to review and comment on. The syllabus for each course will provide stakeholders with a easy to access roadmap for the course students and families will be able to submit questions and concerns directly to the teachers and the school director.

**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).

**VGHS FY 2017 PARCC Summative Report Analysis**

**Algebra 1** (9th grade)

**Overall Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** | **Level 5** |
| **Overall** | 31.6% (6) | 63.2% (12) | 5.3% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **Female** | 33.3% (4) | 66.7% (8) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Male** | 28.6% (2) | 57.1% (4) | 14.3% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **Hispanic** | 40% (4) | 50% (5) | 10% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **Native**  | 33.3% (2) | 66.7% (4) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **White** | 0 | 0 | 100% (2) | 0 | 0 |
| **Mixed Race** | 0 | 0 | 100% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **No FRL** | 66.7% (2) | 33.3% (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **FRL** | 25% (4) | 68.8% (11) | 6.3% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **With IEP** | 50% (2) | 50% (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **No IEP** | 26.7% (4) | 66.7% (10) | 6.7% (1) | 0 | 0 |

A single item had a correct response rate of 62%, yet this item was an outlier. Overall, students performed slightly better on the least difficult items but rather poorly across all items.

**Type I**

* Comprises 61% of the items on the exam
* 11% average correct response rate overall
* Correct response rates ranged from 0% to 62% on the 48 evidence statements for this type of task

**Type II Tasks**

* Comprises 17% of the items on the exam
* 4% average correct response rate overall
* No evidence statement exceeded a 2% correct response rate
* 3 of 6 evidence statements had students who answered correctly on this type of task

**Type III Tasks**

* Comprises 22% of the items on the exam
* 2% average correct response rate overall
* 1 of the 5 evidence statements had students who answered correctly on this type of task

**Geometry** (10th grade)

**Overall Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** | **Level 5** |
| **Overall** | 9.5% (2) | 71.4% (15) | 9.5% (2) | 9.5% (2) | 0 |
| **Female** | 16.7% (2) | 66.7% (8) | 8.3% (1) | 8.3% (1) | 0 |
| **Male** | 0 | 77.8% (7) | 11.1% (1) | 11.1% (1) | 0 |
| **Hispanic** | 12.5% (2) | 75% (12) | 0 | 12.5% (2) | 0 |
| **Native**  | 0 | 60% (3) | 40% (2) | 0 | 0 |
| **White** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **No FRL** | 0 | 0 | 100% (2) | 0 | 0 |
| **FRL** | 10.5% (2) | 78.9% (15) | 0 | 10.5% (2) | 0 |
| **With IEP** | 14.3% (1) | 71.4% (5) | 0 | 14.3% (1) | 0 |
| **No IEP** | 0 | 71.4% (5) | 14.3% (2) | 7.1% (1) | 0 |

While no single item on the exam had more than a 42% correct response rate, students performed significantly better on the least difficult items.

**Type I Tasks**

* Comprises 61% of the items on the exam
* 22% average correct response rate overall
* Correct response rates ranged from 8% to 42% on the 20 evidence statements for this type of task

**Type II Tasks**

* Comprises 17% of the items on the exam
* 6% average correct response rate overall
* Only 1 of 6 evidence statements had students who answered correctly on this type of task

**Type III Tasks**

* Comprises 22% of the items on the exam
* 3.7% average correct response rate overall
* 3 of the 6 evidence statements had students who answered correctly on this type of task

**Algebra 2** (11th grade)

**Overall Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** | **Level 5** |
| **Overall** | 70% (14) | 15% (3) | 15% (3) | 0 | 0 |
| **Female** | 70% (7) | 30% (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Male** | 70% (7) | 0 | 30% (3) | 0 | 0 |
| **Hispanic** | 66.7% (6) | 33.3% (3) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **Native**  | 80% (8) | 0 | 20% (2) | 0 | 0 |
| **White** | 0 | 0 | 100% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **No FRL** | 0 | 0 | 100% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **FRL** | 73.7% (14) | 15.8% (3) | 10.5% (2) | 0 | 0 |
| **With IEP** | 100% (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **No IEP** | 68.4% (13) | 15.8% (3) | 15.8% (3) | 0 | 0 |

**Type I Tasks**

* Comprises 61% of the items on the exam
* 15% average correct response rate overall
* Correct response rates ranged from 0 to 47% on the 38 evidence statements for this type of task

**Type II Tasks**

* Comprises 17% of the items on the exam
* 3.5% average correct response rate overall
* Correct response rates ranged from 0 to 17% on the evidence statements for this type of task

**Type III Tasks**

* Comprises 22% of the items on the exam
* 2.8% average correct response rate overall
* Correct response rates ranged from 0 to 10% on the evidence statements for this type of task

**ELA 1** (9th grade)

**Overall Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** | **Level 5** |
| **Overall** | 45% (9) | 30% (6) | 20% (4) | 5% (1) | 0 |
| **Female** | 54% (7) | 31% (4) | 8% (1) | 8% (1) | 0 |
| **Male** | 29% (2) | 29% (2) | 43% (3) | 0 | 0 |
| **Hispanic** | 55% (6) | 27% (3) | 9% (1) | 9% (1) | 0 |
| **Native**  | 33% (2) | 33% (2) | 33% (2) | 0 | 0 |
| **White** | 50% (1) | 0 | 50% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **2+ Races** | 0 | 100% (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **No FRL** | 33% (1) | 67% (2) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **FRL** | 47% (8) | 24% (4) | 24% (4) | 6% (1) | 0 |
| **With IEP** | 75% (3) | 0 | 25% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **No IEP** | 38% (6) | 38% (6) | 19% (3) | 6% (1) | 0 |

**Reading Evidence Statements Analysis**

 **Literature**

Lower correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(1-5%):**

* Analysis of how author uses source material
* Analysis of point of view or culture not from U.S.

Higher correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(20-33%)**:

* Cite text evidence
* Statement of theme
* How them is shaped by details
* How characters interact with each other
* How characters advance plot
* How characters advance theme
* Analysis of author’s text structure

**Informational Text**

Lower correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(0-17%)**:

* Statement of central idea
* How author unfolds analysis or ideas
* How author uses rhetoric to advance points
* Delineate arguments and claims
* Assess if evidence is relevant and sufficient
* Analysis of U.S. seminal documents (not an RH standard)

Higher correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(22-42%)**:

* Cite text evidence
* Analyze how central idea develops
* Analyze how author introduces and develops idea
* Analyze how author connects ideas
* Analyze how claims are developed by structure
* State author’s point of view
* State author’s purpose

**RL.4 and RI.4**

Determine meaning of words and phrases and analyze how they impact meaning and tone:

* **38%** literature
* **28%** informational text

**Language**

**40%** correct response rate for using context to determine the meanings of words.

**12%** correct response rate for interpreting figures of speech in context

**Reading in History**

* How key events or ideas develop: **38%**
* Analyze series of events: **43%**
* Analyze use of text structure: **18%**
* Analyze how well evidence supports claims: **19%**

**Reading in Science and Technical Subjects**

* Provide text evidence: **25%**
* State conclusion of text: **40%**
* Trace text’s explanation or process: **23%**
* Follow a multistep procedure: **41%**
* Analyze structure of relationships among concepts: **30%**
* Analyze author’s purpose: **17%**
* Assess if evidence supports claims: **63%** (easy item)
* Compare and contrast info gained from different sources: **5%**

**Writing**

**Written Expression** – development of ideas, organization, clarity of language = **10%** average points earned

**Knowledge of Writing** – use of language and conventions = **9%** average points earned

**Prose Constructed Response Items** – is aligned to the texts used in multiple choice items and assesses written expression and use of language and conventions in PCR rubric.

Literary Analysis = **3%**

Research Simulation =**10%**

Narrative Writing = **11%**

**ELA 2** – 10th grade

**Overall Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** | **Level 5** |
| **Overall** | 65% (13) | 10% (2) | 15% (3) | 10% (2) | 0 |
| **Female** | 63.6% (7) | 9% (1) | 9% (1) | 18% (2) | 0 |
| **Male** | 66.7% (6) | 11% (1) | 22% (2) | 0 | 0 |
| **Hispanic** | 80% (12) | 6.7% (1) | 13% (2) | 0 | 0 |
| **Native**  | 20% (1) | 20% (1) | 20% (1) | 40% (2) | 0 |
| **No FRL** | 0 | 50% (1) | 50% (1) | 0 | 0 |
| **FRL** | 72% (13) | 5.6% (1) | 11% (2) | 11% (2) | 0 |
| **With IEP** | 71% (5) | 0 | 14% (1) | 14% (1) | 0 |
| **No IEP** | 61.5% (8) | 14% (2) | 15% (2) | 7.7% (1) | 0 |

**Evidence Statements Analysis**

 **Literature**

Lower correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(0-12%):**

* Objective summary of text
* How complex characters advance the plot
* How complex characters develop the theme
* Analysis of point of view or culture from outside the U.S.

Higher correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(23-50%)**:

* Cite evidence
* State the theme
* Analyze how theme emerges and is shaped by details
* How complex characters develop
* Author’s choices regarding structure

**Informational Text**

Lower correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(5-8%)**:

* How author unfolds an analysis or series of ideas
* How author’s claims are developed and refined by sentences, paragraphs, portions of text

Higher correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(19-37%)**:

* Use of rhetoric
* Delineate claims and argument
* Assess relevance of evidence
* Cite evidence
* Statement of central idea
* How central idea emerges and refined through details
* How connections are made between ideas
* State author’s point of view
* State author’s purpose

**RL.4 and RI.4**

Determine meaning of words and phrases and analyze how they impact meaning and tone:

* 25% literature
* 30% informational text

**Language**

**40%** correct response rate for meaning of figures of speech in context and using context to determine the meanings of words.

**35%** correct response rate for using general academic and domain-specific words and phrases (easiest items on test)

**Reading in History**

Lower correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(3-12%):**

* Compare and contrast topic in primary and secondary sources
* Compare points of view of two or more authors on same topic

Higher correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(19-35%)**:

* Cite evidence
* Accurate summary of development of ideas
* Analysis of events
* Analysis of text structure to advance explanation
* Assess evidence used to support a claim

**Reading in Science and Technical Subjects**

* Provide text evidence **10%**
* Provide objective summary **45%**
* Ability to follow complex multistep procedure **10%**

**Writing**

**Written Expression** – development of ideas, organization, clarity of language = **8** average points earned

**Knowledge of Writing** – use of language and conventions = **10** average points earned

**Prose Constructed Response Items** – is aligned to the texts used in multiple choice items and assesses written expression and use of language and conventions in PCR rubric.

Literary Analysis = **3**

Research Simulation = **3**

Narrative Writing = **18**

**ELA 3** (11th grade)

**Overall Performance Levels**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Level 1** | **Level 2** | **Level 3** | **Level 4** | **Level 5** |
| **Overall** | 10% (2) | 30% (6) | 35% (7) | 25% (5) | 0 |
| **Female** | 10% (1) | 30% (3) | 40% (4) | 25% (5) | 0 |
| **Male** | 10% (1) | 30% (3) | 30% (3) | 30% (3) | 0 |
| **Hispanic** | 11% (1) | 22% (2) | 56% (5) | 11% (1) | 0 |
| **Native**  | 10% (1) | 40% (4) | 20% (2) | 30% (3) | 0 |
| **No FRL** | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100% (1) | 0 |
| **FRL** | 11% (2) | 32% (6) | 37% (7) | 26% (3) | 0 |
| **With IEP** | 100% (1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| **No IEP** | 5% (1) | 32% (6) | 37% (7) | 26% (3) | 0 |

**Reading Evidence Statements Analysis**

 **Literature**

Lower correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(10-15%):**

* Provide objective summary of text
* Knowledge of 2 18th century text treat similar themes

Higher correct response rate for the following evidence statements **(28-32% one item at 75%)**:

* Providing text evidence
* Statement of two or more themes
* Analysis of impact of author’s choices
* How author’s choices about structure affect text
* Analysis of how themes interact and build (75% easier item)

**Informational Text**

Correct response rate for the evidence statements **(18-43%)**:

* Providing text evidence
* State two or more central ideas
* Analysis of how 2 ideas develop in text
* Provide objective summary
* Analysis of complex set of ideas
* Analysis of sequence of events
* How specific individuals interact and develop
* Analysis effectiveness of structure
* Determine author’s point of view with rhetoric use (43%)
* Analysis of style and content
* Evaluate multiple sources of information
* Themes of 17th-19th century foundational documents (not considered RH)

**RL.4 and RI.4**

Determine meaning of words and phrases and analyze how they impact meaning and tone:

* 23% literature
* 41% informational text – how author refines a key term 15%

**Language**

**8%** correct response rate for meaning of figures of speech in context and using context to determine the meanings of words.

**38%** correct response rate for ability to use context to determine meaning of word or phrase

**Reading in History**

* Provide text evidence: **35%**
* Evaluate various explanations of events: **25%**
* Evaluate explanations when actions or event are uncertain: **25%**
* How a complex primary source is structured: **42%**
* Evaluate author’s premise, claims, evidence: **12%**
* Integrate information from diverse sources: **20%**

**Reading in Science and Technical Subjects**

* Provide text evidence about important distinctions: **10%**
* Provide objective summary: **18%**
* Ability to follow complex multistep procedure: **10%**
* Analysis of specific results of experiments, measurements, technical tasks: **43%**
* Organization of categories or hierarchies: **17%**
* Analysis of author’s purpose: **50%**
* Integrate information from diverse sources: **18%**

**Writing**

**Written Expression** – development of ideas, organization, clarity of language **= 19%** average points earned

**Knowledge of Writing** – use of language and conventions = **22%** average points earned

**Prose Constructed Response Items** – is aligned to the texts used in multiple choice items and assesses written expression and use of language and conventions in PCR rubric.

Literary Analysis = **10%**

Research Simulation = **18%**

Narrative Writing = **28%**

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.

For the 2016-17 academic year, 9 instructional staff were employed and earned the following NMTEACH summative ratings.

* 1 SPED teacher was rated highly effective.
* 1 math and 1 ELA teacher were rated effective.
* 4 teachers were rated minimally effective.
* 2 teachers were rated ineffective.

VGHS currently employs eight instructional staff. The staff has been consistent with the RIF of one ELA teacher from the prior year. The results of observations one, by an external observer, and 2, by the school director, are showing growth on domains 2 and 3 for all staff, with only one-two teachers earning minimally effective ratings. No teachers have been rated ineffective on these measures.

**B. NM DASH Plans**

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

X 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.

Whole school PD embeds collaborative protocols and application of learning. These sessions occur each week for 1.5 hours. Every other month, whole group PD takes place for 3 hours. As a charter school, teachers receive a greater amount of PD after the school year ends for students and prior to the start of school. At VGHS, teachers collaborate to write curriculum and create school structures for 3 days at the end of the school year and 8-10 days prior to the start of school. PD sessions have clear agendas and are guided by text-based, discussion, and critique protocols (e.g., Consultancy Protocol)

Grade-level and department collaboration time occurs weekly for 1.5 hours. These small group meetings have clear agendas and use standard protocols. The Professional Teaching-Learning Cycle meetings involve a protocol to unpack standards, align tasks, and create lesson plans, for the first meeting, and follow a Learning from Student Work protocol for the second session.

The principal works with the instructional coach to plan PD agendas. The instructional coach attends all PD and collaborative sessions.

**III. Evidence-based Interventions**

1. **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).

The root cause analysis process first used the Fishbone Analysis protocol and was conducted by the entire staff and co-facilitated by the instructional coach and an external consultant. The staff began by considering the considering the data analyzed for the comprehensive needs assessment. Further data were provided by teachers, including low work completion rates and low rates of participation in class. The greatest challenge presented to the school was articulated from this analysis – VGHS students are generally not engaged in school.

The Fishbone Analysis protocol was then used to explore the possible causes of this issue. After a brainstorming session to independently identify hypothesized causes on sticky notes, staff collaborated as a whole to categorize the causes. The categories resulting included poor peer relationships, mental/emotional health, poor physical health, mindset, issues at home, and academic history. The ultimate effect of the causes was student lack of academic motivation. While the staff determined that a lot of these causes are out of the control of the school, they concluded that they could address the root causes of fixed mindset and academic history by continuing to work toward curriculum that is seen as relevant and worthwhile and instructional strategies that are high quality and culturally responsive to better match the demographics of this minority-majority school. The school is also in the position to address the recurrent issues of poor peer relationships reported by students. These conclusions were reached through the use of the 5 Whys process. The resultant theory of action is that if students view what they are learning as relevant to their lives, they will be more highly engaged in learning, which will be evident in changes in attendance and graduation rates and in measures of student achievement.

**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.

As a transformation model CSI school, the interventions recommended include the following. These interventions are outlined by the U.S. Department of Education (<https://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/nastid2.pdf>) and the UVA/PLE program.

Leadership

• Replace principal

• Implement new evaluation system

• Developed with staff

• Uses student growth as a significant factor

•Identify and reward staff who are increasing student outcomes; support and then remove those who are

not

• Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff

Instruction

• Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs

• Provide job-embedded professional development designed to build capacity and support staff

• Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction

• Provide increased learning time for staff and students

Community

• Provide ongoing mechanism for community and family engagement

• Partner to provide social‐emotional and community‐ oriented services and supports

Governing Board

• Provide sufficient operating flexibility to implement reform

• Ensure ongoing technical assistance

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

Leadership

•Identify and reward staff who are increasing student outcomes; support and then remove those who are

not

• Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff

Instruction

• Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs

• Provide job-embedded professional development designed to build capacity and support staff

• Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction

Community

• Provide ongoing mechanism for community and family engagement

• Partner to provide social‐emotional and community‐ oriented services and supports

Identify the school’s chosen intervention(s).

Based on the goals outlined in the 90-day plan, the interventions to support high quality instruction and culture and climate are appropriate for VGHS.

1- Strong leadership

2- Strategies to recruit and retain staff

3- Provide job-embedded professional development designed to build capacity and support staff

4- Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction

5- Provide ongoing mechanism for community and family engagement

6- Partner to provide social‐emotional and community‐ oriented services and supports

**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.

The leadership, retaining staff, embedded PD and partnering to provide social-emotional supports all require high quality professional development opportunities. Yoon et al. ( examined nine well-designed experimental or quasi-experimental investigations. Their analysis found that “14 hours or less of professional development on a given topic showed no significant effects on student learning. The efforts that showed positive and significant effects on student achievement ranged from 14 to 100 hours, with an average of 49 hours.”

Yoon, K.S., Duncan, T., Lee, S.W.Y., Scarloss, B., Shapley, K.L. (2007). Reviewing the evidence on how teacher professional development affects student achievement. Issues and Answers Report, REL 2007-No. 033. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Regional Educational Laboratory Southwest. Available at http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs

PD with the following characteristics has shown to have the greatest impacts on leading indicators of student progress:

“• focus on deepening teachers’ content knowledge and instructional practices

• function as a coherent part of a school’s improvement efforts—aligned with curriculum, assessments, and standards—so that teachers can implement the knowledge and practices they learn in their classrooms;

• occur in collaborative and collegial learning environments in which teachers participate in professional learning and together grapple with issues related to new content and instructional practices

• provide authentic activities rooted in teachers’ inquiry and reflection about practice within the context of the curriculum and students they teach

• link to analysis of teaching and student learning, including the formative use of assessment data; and

• are supported by coaching, modeling, observations, and feedback.” (Learning Policy Institute. 2016. Evidence-Based Interventions: A Guide for States)

Building capacity in the staff, in the case of VGHS, requires work on enhancing the quality of the curriculum and instruction in the school. This focus combines many of the principles of high school redesign. (Learning Policy Institute. 2016. Evidence-Based Interventions: A Guide for States) Specific to VGHS the high school redesign focus areas would be creating a strong academic curriculum, using authentic and responsive instruction, and continuing to build a professional community of teachers. These specific areas have shown positive impact on student leading indicators.

Darling-Hammond et al (2006/2007). See also Lee, V.E., Croninger, R.G., & Smith, J.B. Course-taking, equity, and mathematics learning: Testing the constrained curriculum hypothesis in U.S. secondary schools. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 19(2), 99-121.

Oakes, J. (2005). Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality (2nd ed.) Yale University Press.

Darling-Hammond et al (2006/2007). See also Friedlaender et al (2014). See also Mitchell, K., Shkolnik, J. Song, M., Uekawa, K., Murphy, R., Garet, M., & Means, B. (2005). Rigor, relevance, results: The quality of teacher assignments and student work in new and conventional high schools. Evaluation of the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation’s high school grants. Washington, DC. American Institutes of Research.

Bransford, J.D., Brown, A.L., & Cocking, R.R. (1999). How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School. National Academy Press

Newmann, F.M., Marks, H.M., & Gamora, A. (1996). Authentic pedagogy and student performance. American Journal of Education, 104(4): 280-312.

Bryk, A., Camburn, E., & Louis, K. (1999). Professional community in Chicago elementary schools: Facilitating factors and organizational consequences. Educational Administration Quarterly 35:751-81.

Kraft, M.A. & Papay, J.P. (2014). Do supportive professional environments promote teacher development? Explaining heterogeneity in returns to teaching experience. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 36(4): 476-500. See also Bryk et al (1999)

**D. Theory of Action**

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

If students are engaged in relevant curriculum through high quality instructional strategies and given that their social and emotional needs are addressed in the school setting, student attendance rates, graduation rates, office referral rates, and academic achievement rates will be positively impacted.

**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).

1- Strong leadership

According to the Center on School Turnaround, the school leader holds the vision and urgency to make changes that will impact student performance. The current school leader has been working on improvement for the past 3 years, and growth is apparent. At the end of the 2015-16 school year, the decision was made to completely RIF all instructional staff as a solid turnaround strategy. The leader also hired an instructional coach, an exemplary Level III teacher with a doctorate and leadership experience as a national consultant, to provide the support she needs as a charter school leader, which comes with added workload without district office support. The intervention supported in this grant would be to provide additional support and accountability for the leadership team to achieve the transformation needed at the school.

2- Strategies to recruit and retain staff

Two minimally effective teachers will not be returning to VGHS in the 2018-19 school year. The school employs a rigorous hiring process that requires two interviews and a model lesson delivered to actual students. These students assist in making hiring decisions. The State of NM and the nation are experiencing a teacher shortage. Finding pipelines of highly trained teachers is needed.

The teachers at VGHS are highly committed to their students. Their major sources of perceived “burnout” are from all the requirements placed on teachers in the current environment. VGHS is hoping to use other funding sources to support a staff position to provide data analysis work for teachers and students to personalize learning. Additionally, this grant funding would be used to reimburse teachers for additional time to develop solid curriculum maps and pacing guides.

3- Provide job-embedded professional development designed to build capacity and support staff

The staff currently receives extended learning time, high quality PD, and embedded PD through coaching. This grant would support out-of-school PD experiences with organizations, such as Uncommon Schools.

4- Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction

The data analyst would work closely with the instructional coach and leadership team to better collect, collate, and analyze data from multiple sources.

5- Provide ongoing mechanism for community and family engagement

6- Partner to provide social‐emotional and community‐ oriented services and supports

We would partner with Windmill Education to provide PD for teachers to better support students socially and emotionally. Windmill Education supports work around the following areas: Social Awareness; Self-Management; Sense of Belonging; and Self-Efficacy. Much of the work involves setting up strong structures that involves support / materials for teachers and a consideration of how to build those four areas within daily practice. An additional element is using a tool called Panorama to gather data and evaluate progress. These data are used with students, teachers, and families.

Additionally, VGHS would continue to partner with PEAR and the Harvard Medical School for use of their resiliency survey and webinars that help teachers and social workers use the student data to create real interventions.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

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.

Click or tap here to enter text.

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

Click or tap here to enter text.

**B. Budget Forms**

X 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:
	1. 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.
	2. 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.
	3. 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.
	4. 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.
	5. 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:
	1. Partner with principal to establish a comprehensive school 90-day plan that is aligned with the LEA’s strategic plan
	2. Partner with principal on critical decisions like staffing, scheduling, budgeting, targeted professional development, and other operational issues
	3. 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
	4. Proactively engage all stakeholders to acknowledge current reality and present a bold vision for the future of the school
	5. 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:
	1. Rigorous aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year
	2. Deep item analysis of interim assessments 3-4 times per year with one-on-one teacher-leader (principal, assistant principal, instructional coach) analysis meetings
	3. 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
	4. Structured weekly collaboration time for ongoing data analysis by PLCs
	5. Student and staff culture of learning
	6. 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:
	1. Rigorous aligned interim assessments 3-4 times per year
	2. Timely dissemination of interim assessment data to teachers
	3. Deep item analysis of interim assessments 3-4 times per year with one-on-one teacher-leader(principal, assistant principal, instructional coach) analysis meetings
	4. Teacher action plans addressing root cause analysis of interim assessment data developed by all teachers prior to one-on-one teacher-leader analysis meetings
	5. Structured weekly collaboration time for ongoing data analysis by PLCs/grade level meeting/collaboration time
	6. Student and staff culture of learning
	7. Short-cycle observation walkthroughs and one-on-one teacher-leader feedback meetings
2. Align school policies and structures to provide ongoing school-site support for all teachers to support implementation of the evidence-based intervention
 |
|  |  |
| President, Board of Education Signature | Date |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Superintendent Signature | Date |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| School Leadership Signature | Date |

**Appendix B: Certification and Approval**

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

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

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

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

**Certification and Approval**

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

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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| Board President Printed Name | Date |

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

**Appendix C: Scoring Guide**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **CSI RFA Title I Sec. 1003[a] Scoring Guide** | **Points** | **Percent** |
| **I. LEA Organizational Culture** | **30** | **30%** |
| A. LEA Overview | 10 |  |
| 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** | **40** | **40%** |
| A. Root Cause and Focus Areas | 10 |  |
| B. Choice of Evidence-Based Interventions | 20 |  |
| C. Sources of Evidence | 5 |  |
| D. Theory of Action | 5 |  |
| **IV. Budget** | **15** | **15%** |
| A. Budget Narrative | 10 |  |
| B. Budget (Excel Files) | 5 |  |
| **Total** | **100** | **100%** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **I. LEA Organizational Culture:** **A: LEA Overview**  | **Points: 10 max**  |
| **Insufficient (0 points)** | **Approaching (5 points)** | **Meets Expectations (10 points)** |
| * 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.
 | * 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.
 | * 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)** |
| * 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.
* Does **not** provide a schedule for administering common interim assessments in ELA and Math
 | * 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 CCSS at each grade level’s scope and sequence.
* 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
 | * 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 CCSS at each grade level’s scope and sequence.
* 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)** |
| * 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)
 | * 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 course-corrections as applicable)
 | * 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)
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **II. School Level Context:** **A. School Overview** | **Points: 5 max** |
| **Insufficient (0 points)** | **Approaching (3 points)** | **Meets Expectations (5 points)** |
| * 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.
 | * 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.
 | * 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)** |
| * Did **not** submit a NM DASH Offline Planning Workbook or 90-Day Complete Detail Printout.
* Did **not** submit a NM DASH Feedback Tool.
 | * Submitted a **partial/incomplete** NM DASH Offline Planning Workbook or 90-Day Complete Detail Printout.
* Submitted a **partial/incomplete** NM DASH Feedback Tool.
 | * 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)** |
| * 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 other instructional leaders to support **or** hold teachers accountable for meeting effectiveness.
 | * 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.
* 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.
 | * 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~~.~~
* 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.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **III. Evidence-Based Interventions****A. Root Cause and Focus Areas** | **Points: 10 max** |
| **Insufficient (0 points)** | **Approaching (5 points)** | **Meets Expectations (10 points)** |
| * 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).
 | * 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).
 | * 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).
 |
| **III. Evidence-Based Interventions****B. Choice of Evidence-Based Interventions** | **Points: 20 max** |
| **Insufficient (0 points)** | **Approaching 10 points)** | **Meets Expectations (20 points)** |
| * 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).
 | * 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).
 | * **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).
 |
| **III. Evidence-Based Interventions****C. Sources of Evidence** | **Points: 5 max** |
| **Insufficient (0 points)** | **Approaching (3 points)** | **Meets Expectations (5points)** |
| * 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.
 | * Identifies **unvetted or obsure** 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.
 | * Identifies **well vetted and reputable** 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.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **III. Evidence-Based Interventions****D. Theory of Action** | **Points: 10 max** |
| **Insufficient (0 points)** | **Approaching (5 points)** | **Meets Expectations (10 points)** |
| * Does **not** detail a Theory of Action that will support implementation of the evidence-based intervention.
 | * **Somewhat/partially** details a Theory of Action that **may** support implementation of the evidence-based intervention.
 | * **Clearly and convincingly** details a Theory of Action that will support implementation of the evidence-based intervention.
 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **IV. Budget:****A. Budget Narrative** | **Points: 10max** |
| **Insufficient (0 points)** | **Approaching (5 points)** | **Meets Expectations (10 points)** |
| * 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 chosen evidence-based intervention.
 | * 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.
* 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.
 | * 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).
* **Cleary 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.
* 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.
 |
| **IV. Budget:****B. Budget Forms (Excel File)** | **Points: 5 max** |
| **Insufficient (0 points)** | **Approaching (3 points)** | **Meets Expectations (5 points)** |
| * Did **not** submit a Budget Summary Chart for the project period (six months of planning and two-years of implementation).
 | * Submitted a **partial/incomplete** Budget Summary Chart for **less than** the entire project period (six months of planning and two-years of implementation).
 | * Submitted a **complete and detailed** Budget Summary Chart for the **entire** project period (six months of planning and two-years of implementation).
 |

1. Non-Regulatory Guidance: Using Evidence to Strengthen Education Investments <https://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/essa/guidanceuseseinvestment.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. The NM Leadership Innovation Program is akin to the Principals Pursuing Excellence Program. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. ESSA § 1003(b) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. Continuing awards are dependent upon continued appropriation from congress. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. Continuing awards are dependent upon continued appropriation from congress. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. Funding will be determined based on school size on a sliding scale. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
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. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Templates will be provided by PED. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. 2 CFR Part 200 §200.338 Remedies for Noncompliance [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. §200.207 Special Conditions [↑](#footnote-ref-10)