

# Coggins Middle School Case Study



Welcome to the story of Coggins Middle School. This Case Study is an integral part of the NM DASH Learning Modules. It provides an example of how this fictitious school used the NM DASH Process Guide for Schools and engaged in the planning process. While Coggins is a middle school, the process is the same for elementary and high schools, therefore the Case Study can be used no matter what your context. However, while the primary focus of the Case Study is Coggins Middle School, we have also provided brief descriptions about Ramirez High School — the school into which Coggins Middle School feeds — to provide examples that address the different accountability measures related to high schools.

**NOTE:** The Case Study is organized by the components of the NM DASH Process Guide for Schools. Each component aligns with the corresponding module (e.g., Component 1 corresponds to Module 1, Component 2 corresponds to Module 2, and so on). Also note, the examples in this Case Study are purposefully *imperfect*. As part of the learning modules, you will be guided to reflect on the strengths of the school's process, and where they could improve. The Case Study is not a model but a learning tool.

## INTRODUCTION

Coggins Middle School is an urban middle school in Sample City, New Mexico. See Table 1 below for information about the school's demographics.

**Table 1: Coggins Middle School Demographics (2021–2022 school year)**

Grades Served	6–8
Administrators	2
Teachers (including Specialists)	35
Enrollment	708 students
Race/Ethnicity	68% Hispanic or Latino
	22% White or Caucasian
	6% Native American
	2.6% African American
	1.2% Asian
	.2% Pacific Islander
Students with Disabilities	161
English Language Learners	304
Low-Income Students	679
Homeless Students	57
Foster Children and Youth	2
Migrant Education	6

The school's website includes the following goal and vision statements:

*Coggins Middle School offers our students an exceptional, well-rounded education, both in intellect and character. Our goal is to help our students become educated, responsible, and honorable citizens, who are ready to go out and change the world.*

*We believe that students at this age deserve a program of study that is uniquely specialized to their developmental needs and we strive to provide an experience that will help students grow academically and socially. Aside from core curriculum coursework, additional offerings during the school day include: AVID, Spanish for Heritage Speakers, Visual Arts, Music and Band, PE/Health, and Entrepreneurship.*

Over the last four years, Coggins Middle School has been struggling to meet the goals set forth in its mission statement. In particular, an examination of Coggins Middle School's state accountability data reflects academic achievement at levels below state average for all students as well as all student subgroups, including members of racial and ethnic groups, low-income students, students with disabilities, and English language learners. Both English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics proficiency scores dropped significantly from 2017 to 2019 (ELA dropped from 22% proficient to 17% and Math from 14% to 9%). In addition, 9.4 percent of students were chronically absent, an increase of percent over the previous year. The suspension rate was 21.8 percent of students suspended at least once, an increase of 9.2 percent over the previous year (see Table 2, below).

**Table 2: School Climate Data (2019–2020 school year)**

	School	District	State
Chronic Absenteeism Rate	9.4%	7.1%	11.1%
Suspension Rate	21.8%	3.1%	3.5%
Expulsion Rate	.12%	.05%	.08%

Coggins Middle School feeds into Ramirez High School, a comprehensive high school with approximately 2,150 students. Graduation rates for Ramirez High School students who attended Coggins Middle School tend to be several percentage points lower than for students from other feeder middle schools. The 2019 graduation rate at Ramirez High School was 70 percent overall, vs. 67 percent for students who came from Coggins Middle School.

Coggins Middle School recently engaged in the New Mexico DASH Ideal State Planning process. Their journey is described below.

## COMPONENT 1: BUILD SCHOOL CORE TEAM

When Michael Martin was hired as the new principal at Coggins Middle School in the spring of 2019, he encountered a couple of difficult issues. The first issue was that his day was fully consumed by managerial tasks that had little or nothing to do with the instructional system. The second was that he began to question whether his own instructional expertise sufficed for leading instructional change across the full range of subject areas, grade levels, and student differences that were found in his school. In addition, the school's rating had been on the decline for the past four years. He was committed to turning this around.

Mr. Martin realized that forming a School Core Team (SCT), also a requirement for his 90-day Plan, would enable him to engage in improvement-focused collaboration that would allow him to grow in his role as an instructional leader. Ideally, this SCT would collaborate with him to guide the school's approach to increasing, monitoring, and sustaining student achievement and positive educational outcomes for all students.

To build his School Core Team, Mr. Martin sent inquiries to the middle school staff and district leaders at the end of the 2018–19 school year. In response, he received two initial replies. The first reply was from Dr. Pablo Jimenez, the associate superintendent at the district. Dr. Jimenez had recently attended a workshop on the NM DASH system. The second response came from Luis Lonetree, a 6th grade ELA teacher that he knew from college. Dr. Jimenez is a Certified Reviewer, as well as a district representative. In addition to these two individuals, Mr. Martin also asked Theresa Tester to be on the team. Mrs. Tester was his assistant principal, a former Math Department Chair, and a strong data analyst. Although not required, Mr. Martin used Worksheet 1.1: School Core Team Members and Roles available in the NM DASH Process Guide to list the initial members of his School Core Team, summarized in Table 3 below.

**Table 3 – Initial School Core Team for Coggins Middle School, 2021–2022**

<b>SCT Member Name</b>	<b>Title/Position</b> What position does this person have?	<b>Role(s)</b> What role(s) will this person play on the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school's current achievement data?
Pablo Jimenez	Assoc. Supt.	Certified District Reviewer/Reflection Monitor
Michael Martin	Principal	School Leader
Theresa Tester	Assistant Principal	Data Analyst, Math Representative
Luis Lonetree	6th Grade ELA Teacher	Teacher Leader, Content Expert

Mr. Martin's next steps were to convene the SCT for its first meeting. Knowing that the team needed more representation, during the first meeting the members reviewed formative, interim, and summative assessment data and the school's NM PED School Grading Report Cards from 2015–2018.

Using this information, the team decided they needed additional representation on the SCT. They decided to invite the department chairs from Social Studies and Science as content leaders and teacher leaders. They also asked the music teacher to join — a veteran teacher and highly esteemed community member. In addition, they asked the district's EL Coordinator and one of the special education teachers to be on the team as well. To emphasize the importance of the SCT, the initial group sent an email to each person invited. The letter described a vision of

improvement for Coggins Middle School and the role the SCT would play in driving improvement. Knowing that many staff did not respond to the initial invite, they hoped greater clarity would encourage more to respond. All accepted the invitation to join. Table 4 represents the final School Core Team.

**Table 4 – Final School Core Team for Coggins Middle School, 2021–2022**

<b>SCT Member Name</b>	<b>Title/Position</b> What position does this person have?	<b>Role(s)</b> What role(s) will this person play on the team? How will including this individual help the team address the school's current achievement data?
Pablo Jimenez	Assoc. Supt.	Certified District Reviewer/Reflection Monitor
Michael Martin	Principal	School Leader Facilitator
Theresa Tester	Assistant Principal	Content Representative: Math Data Analyst
Luis Lonetree	6th ELA Grade Teacher	Content Representative: ELA
Mavis Maples	7th Grade Science Teacher, Dept.Chair	Content Representative: Science
William Bragdon	8th Grade Social Studies Teacher, Dept. Chair	Content Representative: Social Studies
Martha Waters	Music Teacher	Content Representative: Music
Sally Alvarez	Special Education Teacher	Student Group Representative: Special Education
Autumn Moon	District EL Coordinator	Student Group Representative: English Learners

Once the final School Core Team was created, they met to set norms, clarify their roles, and create a schedule for meeting regularly. Once all this was established, they started to craft their Student Achievement Goals for their 90-day Plans.

### *Ramirez High School*

Elena Sanchez, the principal of Ramirez High School (RHS) followed a similar process for developing her School Core Team. Like Mr. Martin, she gathered formative, interim, and summative assessment data, as well as the school NM PED report card from the past few years. She reviewed these data with the assistant principal, Meghan Sullivan and one of the deans, Kenneth Lingston. As the assistant principal, Mrs. Sullivan was also an instructional coach. As part of his duties, Mr. Lingston was in charge of attendance and truancy. After reviewing the school's data, the team identified individuals that they believed would fully represent the diversity at RHS. Most individuals selected to be part of the SCT accepted the invitation. Replacements were found for those that declined. Table 5 below lists the final School Core Team assembled at RHS to drive school improvement.

**Table 5 – Final School Core Team for Ramirez High School, 2021–2022**

<b>SCT Member Name</b>	<b>Title/Position</b> What position does this person have?	<b>Role(s)</b> What role(s) will this person play on the team?How will including this individual help the teamaddress the school's current achievement data?
Pablo Jimenez	Assoc. Supt.	Certified District Reviewer/Reflection Monitor District Representative
Elena Sanchez	Principal	School Leader Facilitator
Meghan Sullivan	Assistant Principal	School Leader Other: Instructional Coach
Kenneth Lingston	Dean	School Leader Content Representative: Social Studies EWS Representative: Attendance / Truancy
Siobhan Finney	Biology Teacher, Science Chair	Teacher Leader Content Representative: Science
Joaquin Alvarez	Math Chair	Teacher Leader Content Representative: Math Data Analyst
Liz Smith	Dual Certified English Teacher and Special Education Teacher, Lead Teacher in the Alternative Education Program at RHS	Content Representative: ELA Student Group Representative: Other: Behavior Support Specialist
Sarah Williamson	Parenting and Child Development Teacher	Content Representative: Career Technical Education
Phil Baxter	Dual Certified English Teacher and Bilingual Education Teacher	Subgroup Representative for English learners Other: TESOL Endorsed
Mark Morales	Guidance Counselor	EWS Representative: Course completion, Credits earned toward graduation, Safe and Supportive Learning Environment

## COMPONENT 2: SET STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT GOALS

Once Coggins Middle School had formed its Core Team, the team decided that their first task was to set goals regarding student achievement, with a focus on ELA and mathematics. While several of the team members had worked on previous NM DASH 90-day Plans and other types of school improvement plans, the other members were new to the process. The principal volunteered to lead the team through a mini-lesson on accessing the school's most recent state-level and benchmark-level data. He also asked if any of the team members that had more experience in writing plans would be willing to lead the group through a mini-lesson on creating "SMART" goals. Ms. Waters volunteered and the following week led the group through the activity to practice setting SMART goals, using a fictitious school's data.

The next week, the team worked with their own data to set their own goals. The conversation became tense when the team began to discuss what constituted an "ambitious" yet achievable goal. By the end of the afternoon, the team arrived at goals that they all could agree were "S.M.A.R.T" (Specific, Measurable, Ambitious & Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound), and the team entered the information from Worksheet 2.1a into the NM DASH Process Management Tool.

**Worksheet 2.1a**

Student Achievement Summative Goals and Benchmarks (Grades 3–8): Grade Level Proficiency or Cohort Proficiency			
<b>ELA</b>	<b>Most Recent*</b> <i>State Mandated Student Summative Assessment Results</i>	<b>2021–22</b> Summative Goals	<b>Benchmarks:</b> How will you know you are on track to meet the <b>ELA</b> goals? Identify interim assessment(s) by title:
Grade 6	17% prof	22% prof	MOY: 19.5% prof
Grade 7	16% prof	21% prof	MOY: 19% prof
Grade 8	18% prof	23% prof	MOY: 20% prof
Grade			
<b>ELA 2021–22 grade level/cohort proficiency Summative Goal Statement:</b> All students will increase 5% or more in ELA proficiency from the 2018–2019 school year to the 2021–2022 school year.			<b>ELA 2021–22 grade level/cohort proficiency Benchmark Goal Statement:</b> All students will demonstrate 21–23% proficiency in ELA.
<b>Math</b>	<b>Most Recent*</b> <i>Student Summative Assessment Results</i>	<b>2021–22</b> Summative Goals	<b>Benchmarks:</b> How will you know you are on track to meet the <b>Math</b> goals? Identify interim assessment(s) by title:
Grade 6	9% prof	12% prof	MOY 20/21: 10.5% prof
Grade 7	10% prof	13% prof	MOY 20/21: 11.5% prof
Grade 8	8% prof	11% prof	MOY 20/21: 9.5% prof
Grade			
<b>Math 2021–22 grade level/cohort proficiency Summative Goal Statement:</b> All students will increase 3% or more in Math proficiency from the 2018–2019 school year to the 2021–2022 school year.			<b>Math 2021–22 grade level/cohort proficiency Benchmark Goal Statement:</b> All students will demonstrate 11–13% proficiency in Math.

After the team had drafted the goals, they were shared with the school staff for feedback. Staff were asked if the goals met the criteria for SMART goals. Although there were some who disagreed, the vast majority of the staff agreed that each of the criteria should be marked “Y.” The one area that generated the most discussion, and where there was the greatest level of disagreement, was whether or not the goals were “ambitious” enough. In the end, the team decided that these goals were attainable and would get them on the right track toward more ambitious long-term growth. The principal suggested that after engaging in the rest of the planning process, including data analysis and Root Cause Analysis, that they return to the goals to see if they wanted to make any changes.

SMART Goal Criteria Checklist		Y/N
Specific	Is the goal clearly defined?	Y
Measurable	Are multiple concrete criteria identified for measuring progress toward attainment of the goal?	Y
Ambitious & Attainable	Does the goal stretch the school?	Y
Relevant	Does the goal relate to student learning and achievement? Is it data-based?	Y
Time-bound	Is the timeframe appropriate for accomplishment of the goal(s)?	Y

### *Ramirez High School*

During a cross-district leadership network meeting, the principal at Coggins Middle School shared the process that his Core Team used to arrive at SMART goals. The principal from Ramirez High School, Elena Sanchez, liked the process, and shared it with her Core Team. One adaptation the principal made was to provide her School Core Team with a collection of example SMART Goals at the high school level. During the process, one of the team members argued for much more ambitious goals; however, the team decided to balance “ambitious” with “attainable.” As a compromise, the team increased their initial graduation rate goal to make it slightly more ambitious (from a 4% increase to a 7% increase) and also agreed to set their benchmark goals to be much more ambitious.

Following are the goals that Ramirez High School set, after engaging in a process very similar to Coggins Middle School to set SMART goals. The team entered their goals into the NM DASH Process Management Tool. The goals were shared with the school, and although there were some who disagreed (most notably, the counseling team), the vast majority of the staff agreed that each of the criteria should be marked “Y.”

<b>Worksheet 2.2: Ramirez High School</b> <b>Student Achievement Goal and Benchmarks</b> <b>(Grades 9–12)</b>			
<b>1. Graduation Rate</b>	<b>2019–2020</b> Graduation Rate Results	<b>2021–2022</b> Graduation Rate Goal	<b>Benchmarks:</b> How will you know you are on track to meet the Graduation Rate goal? (EWS, Course Completion, Demonstration of Readiness, etc.)
Cohort 2022 4-year cohort Graduation Rate	70%	77%	EWS: 95% of entering 12th grade students will be on track for graduation based on Course Completion 92% of entering 12th grade students will be on track for graduation based on Common Assessment Data
<b>Summative Goal Statement to be entered in NM DASH Process Management Tool:</b> High School Graduation Rate – The 4-year graduation rate will increase by 7% for 2021–22 school year as compared to the 2019–2020 school year.			<b>Benchmark Goal Statement to be entered in NM DASH Process Management Tool:</b> MOY: 95% of 12th grade students will be on track for graduation based on Course Completion and 92% of 12th grade students will be on track for graduation based on Common Assessment Data

<b>SMART Goal Criteria Checklist</b>		<b>Y/N</b>
Specific	Is the goal clearly defined?	Y
Measurable	Are multiple concrete criteria identified for measuring progress toward attainment of the goal?	Y
Ambitious & Attainable	Does the goal stretch the school?	Y
Relevant	Does the goal relate to student learning and achievement? Is it data-based?	Y
Time-bound	Is the timeframe appropriate for accomplishment of the goal(s)?	Y



### COMPONENT 3: CONDUCT DATA ANALYSIS AND IDENTIFY THE PERFORMANCE CHALLENGE

Once the Coggins Middle School Core Team selected both ELA and Math Summative and Benchmark Goals, they were ready to review multiple data options around achievement data, student and adult behaviors, and instructional practices at the school. The team set the ELA and Math goals based on examination of the previous year student assessment results.

**SPECIAL NOTE:** The NM DASH Process Guide for Schools instructs schools to review student performance data, student/adult behaviors, and instructional practices to identify patterns, trends, and/or relationships, and list the following as possible data options to analyze:

- |                                       |  |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| ▪ ELD assessment(s)                   | ▪ ELEVATE                                |
| ▪ Formative student achievement       | ▪ School climate                         |
| ▪ Interim assessments                 | ▪ Student/staff/parent surveys           |
| ▪ Graduation Rate                     | ▪ Student work samples                   |
| ▪ Classroom Observation (Evaluative)  | ▪ State Mandated Summative assessment(s) |
| ▪ Lessons/Unit Plans                  | ▪ Classroom Walkthrough (non-evaluative) |
| ▪ Office discipline referral          | ▪ Grade distribution report              |
| ▪ Teacher Action Plans                | ▪ School NM VISTAS Report                |
| ▪ Attendance (ADA)                    | ▪ Course completion                      |
| ▪ College/Career Readiness Indicators |  |

The Process Guide also notes that School Core Teams should identify and prioritize the 4–6 critical data options for detailed data analysis. The School Core Team will then include all selected data options in the data analysis narrative.

Throughout the process of deep data analysis and reflection, the School Core Team identifies trends and/or patterns and/or relationships drawn from both student and teacher data, all with a clear link to student learning, graduation rates, and improving outcomes for the whole child.

In addition to the data worksheets from Component 2, Principal Martin initially assembled the following additional data sets for the team's review:

- Summative Assessment Data
- Interim Assessment Data

The School Core Team also requested and was provided with:

- Office Discipline Referral suspension data, disaggregated by student groups
- Attendance data, disaggregated by student groups

As the team began to look at the data, another School Core Team member asked about instructional monitoring data. The principal indicated that walkthroughs had not occurred at the regular intervals originally planned but was able to pull some data from his notes around the initiatives from last year that he had taken during his non-evaluative CWTs, which he hoped might provide some additional insight.

- Classroom Walkthrough Data (Non-Evaluative)
- Lesson/Unit Plans

The Coggins School Core Team worked together to review the data, noting specific data numbers where applicable, and writing summary statements for what each data set revealed. They captured and organized the results of their

work in a variety of tables, provided below, first focusing on ELA. (Note: These data tables are examples of how data might be organized and displayed. They are not required.

#### Data Reviewed by the Coggins School Core Team – ELA

<b>2018–19 Summative Data</b>	<b>ELA</b> Gr 6 – 17% prof Gr 7 – 16% prof Gr 8 – 18% prof
<b>What this data shows</b>	Our students are not making significant progress in ELA from 6th to 7th to 8th grade.
<b>2017–18 Summative Data</b>	<b>ELA</b> Gr 6 – 22% prof Gr 7 – 20% prof Gr 8 – 20% prof
<b>What this data shows</b>	Student scores dropped in all grades (2 to 5 percentage point decrease) in ELA from 2017–18 to 2018–19.

<b>Illuminate 7th Grade ELA 2018–19 Data:</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>
<b>Exceeded</b>	0%	0%	0%
<b>Met</b>	25%	28%	30%
<b>Approaching</b>	33%	27%	28%
<b>Partially Met</b>	30%	35%	37%
<b>Did Not Meet</b>	12%	10%	5%
<b>Illuminate 8th Grade ELA 2018–19 Data:</b>	<b>Q1</b>	<b>Q2</b>	<b>Q3</b>
<b>Exceeded</b>	0%	0%	0%
<b>Met</b>	15%	23%	27%
<b>Approaching</b>	29%	34%	35%
<b>Partially Met</b>	40%	35%	32%
<b>Did Not Meet</b>	10%	8%	6%

What this data shows: No students Exceeded expectations in ELA. The percentage of students moving into the Met category for ELA increased somewhat from Q1 to Q3 for 7th and significantly for 8th grade. The percentage of students for Did Not Meet decreased for both grades in ELA from Q1 to Q3. Summative data scores have been dropping since 2017-2018.

<b>2018–19 Summative Data: Proficient by Grade / Student Group</b>	<b>All Students</b>	<b>SWD</b>	<b>English learners</b>	<b>Low Income</b>	<b>Homeless</b>	<b>Foster</b>	<b>Migrant</b>
<b>Grade 6</b>	17%	15%	9%	23%	14%	Not Enough Students	Not Enough Students
<b>Grade 7</b>	16%	12%	11%	21%	10%	Not Enough Students	Not Enough Students
<b>Grade 8</b>	18%	20%	9%	24%	15%	Not Enough Students	Not Enough Students

What this data shows: In terms of proficiency, ELs are lagging behind their peer student in ELA academic performance.

Walkthrough Data:	What this data shows:
Action plan evident in teachers' lesson plans for addressing interim results	Notes indicated that out of every 5 ELA classes visited, only around 2 contained action plan steps for addressing areas of struggle as indicated by interim scores. The lesson plans with action plans happened most often the week following the interim assessment. He also had notes indicating that most action plans only addressed whole-class re-teaching, and only once did he see a teacher indicate plans to reassess students after the re-teaching.
Re-teaching (whole class or small group) observed	The principal had no notes indicating observations of re-teaching during the walkthroughs he conducted.

In further looking for trends, patterns, and relationships, the Coggins Middle School team decided to dig deeper into the suspension data and see if there is a relationship between those students most often suspended and their achievement data.

Attendance Data, 2018–19	Coggins:	District:
Chronic Absenteeism Rate	9.4% (67 students)	7.1%
Suspension Data – 2018–19	21.8% (154 students)	3.1%
Expulsion Rate	0.12% (1 student)	.05%
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Students with the highest absenteeism are males (67%), students with IEPs (45%), and/or EL students (42%).</li> <li>Of the 21.8% suspensions, 45% were students with two or more suspensions. (Of the total student population, 12% of students were suspended one or more times.)</li> <li>EL students were suspended at a higher rate than any student group (36.6%).</li> <li>3x more males than females were suspended.</li> <li>Only 1 student was expelled in 2018–19, making the N size too small to report data on that student.</li> </ul>		

What this data shows: Chronic absenteeism most impacts males, EL students, and students with IEPs. Coggins suspension rate is 7 times higher than the district rate, with EL and male students most likely to be suspended. Repeat suspensions are high, raising questions of how effective this is as a discipline strategy.

The School Core Team reviewed the data and organized it in preparation for data entry into the NM DASH Process Management Tool. The summary they prepared appears below.

## ELA

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND STUDENT/ADULT BEHAVIORS, AND/OR INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES (DATA OPTIONS)

- Summative Assessment Data
- Interim Assessment Data
- Lesson/Unit Plans
- Classroom Walkthrough data (non-evaluative)
- Office Discipline Referral data
- Attendance Data (ADA)

### SCHOOLWIDE DATA SHOWS... (IN DEPTH DATA ANALYSIS NARRATIVE)

- Student summative scores dropped in all grades (2% to 5% decrease) in ELA from 2017–18 to 2018–19. Our students are not making significant progress in ELA from 6th to 7th to 8th grade. Student summative scores dropped in all grades in ELA 2017–18 to 2018–19.
- Interim assessments (illuminate) show the majority of students in 7th and 8th grade are below Met expectations in ELA. No students Exceeded expectations in ELA. The percentage of students moving into the Met category for ELA increased somewhat from Q1 to Q3 for 7th and significantly for 8th grade. The percentage of students for Did Not Meet decreased for grades 7 and 8 in ELA from Q1 to Q3.
- All 7th grade ELA teachers received instruction on using Illuminate data to inform classroom instruction in 2018–19 but were not consistent in using interim results to design action plans to address gaps in learning or thorough in ensuring re-teaching efforts worked.
- Classroom Walkthrough data demonstrates that teacher talk is predominate in most classrooms compared to student talk and that scaffolding is not a widely used strategy among ELA instructors.
- Lesson plans do not reflect differentiated instruction strategies.
- Chronic absenteeism most impacts males, EL students, and students with IEPs. Coggins suspension rate is 7 times higher than the district rate, with EL and male students most likely to be suspended. Chronic absenteeism is also higher than the district rate, with males, EL students, and students with IEPs having the highest number of absences. Coggins suspension rate is way above the district rate, with EL and male students most likely to be suspended. Repeat suspensions are high, raising questions of how effective this is as a discipline strategy.
- EL males were the dominant group in suspensions, including repeat suspensions. Those students were also falling below their peers in ELA on the Summative data.

### THESE AREAS ARE CAUSE FOR CONCERN

- Decrease in scores from year to year in ELA.
- Lack of solid progress shown on interim assessments, despite PD for our ELA teachers.
- Student Summative scores dropped in all grades in ELA (2%–5% decrease) from 2017–18 to 2018–19.
- District PD is not having an impact on classroom instruction.
- ELA Interim data-based interventions do not appear to be having an impact on student performance.
- Suspension rate is 7 times higher than the district average, and disproportionately applied to EL male students.
- Students missing school miss instruction, contributing to the low student achievement scores.

After looking at the data, the School Core Team recognized the unexpected relationship between ELA student achievement scores and the Early Warning Systems data demonstrating steady growth in absenteeism and a very high suspension rate. The School Core Team realized they needed to add a representative to the team who had expertise to inform the attendance and suspension issues, such as the counselor. They decided to add Jennifer Gonzales, School Guidance Counselor, as a member to the School Core Team serving in the role of EWS Representative. Then, they turned their attention to math.

### Data Reviewed by the Coggins School Core Team – Math

2018–19 Summative Data	Math Gr 6 – 9% prof Gr 7 – 10% prof Gr 8 – 8% prof
What this data shows	Our students are not making significant progress in Math from 6th to 7th to 8th grade.
2017–18 Summative Data	Math Gr 6 – 14% prof Gr 7 – 16% prof Gr 8 – 15% prof
What this data shows	Student scores dropped in all grades (5 to 7 percentage point decrease) in Math from 2017–18 to 2018–19.

Illuminate 7th Grade MATH 2018–19 Data:	Q1	Q2	Q3
Exceeded	0%	0%	0%
Met	15%	18%	18%
Approaching	19%	24%	30%
Partially Met	40%	45%	47%
Did Not Meet	16%	13%	5%
Illuminate 8th Grade MATH 2018–19 Data:	Q1	Q2	Q3
Exceeded	0%	0%	0%
Met	17%	18%	18%
Approaching	33%	48%	30%
Partially Met	40%	45%	47%
Did Not Meet	10%	3%	6%

What this data shows: No students Exceeded expectations in Math. The percent of students meeting expectations in Math did not significantly move from Q1 to Q3 in either 7th or 8th grade. The percentage of students for Did Not Meet decreased for both grades in Math from Q1 to Q3.

2018-19 Summative Data: Proficient by Grade / Student Group	All Students	SWD	English learners	Low Income	Homeless	Foster	Migrant
Grade 6	9%	7%	8%	12%	8%	Not Enough Students	Not Enough Students
Grade 7	10%	7%	9%	10%	10%	Not Enough Students	Not Enough Students
Grade 8	8%	6%	9%	11%	8%	Not Enough Students	Not Enough Students

What this data shows: Statistically, there is little difference between Student Groups and All Students. Student proficiency is crucially low and trending downward since school year 2017–2018.

Walkthrough Data:	What this data shows:
Standards identified in lesson plan and broken into daily learning objectives	CWT notes indicated that few (9 of those reviewed) lesson plans identified the learning standard being addressed but did include identified topics (i.e., square root, slope, Pythagorean Theorem...) as well as resources and the assignment.
Evidence of daily, formative assessments	Most of the CWT notes indicated that the teachers often used the assignment, which could be finished outside of class, as the daily CFA. One note from a follow-up conversation indicated that the teacher also identified observation of student work while in class as a form of CFA. None of the notes mentioned addressing gaps brought out by CFAs in lesson plans or observations.
Evidence of questioning level/grade-level expectations	Principal had additional comments on 11 of his CTW notes about worksheets and/or math problems copied from the board and/or most observations identifying students working on calculation rather than computational thinking.

The School Core Team reviewed the data and organized it in preparation for data entry into the NM DASH Process Management Tool. The summary they prepared appears below.

## Math

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND STUDENT/ADULT BEHAVIORS, AND/OR INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES (DATA OPTIONS)

- Summative Assessment Data
- Interim Assessment Data
- Lesson/Unit Plans
- Classroom Walkthrough Data (non-evaluative)

### SCHOOLWIDE DATA SHOWS... (IN DEPTH DATA ANALYSIS NARRATIVE)

- Student summative scores dropped in all grades (5% to 7% decrease) in Math from 2017–18 to 2018–19. Our students are not making significant progress in Math from 6th to 7th to 8th grade. Student scores dropped in all grades in Math from 2017–18 to 2018–19.
- Interim assessments show the majority of students in 7th and 8th grade are below Met expectations in Math, and none of our students Exceeded expectations in Math. The percent of students meeting expectations in Math did not significantly move from Q1 to Q3 in either 7th or 8th grade. The percentage of students for Did Not Meet decreased for both grades in Math from Q1 to Q3.
- Lesson plans identified topics of focus but not the learning standard or individual objectives that would build towards a learning standard.
- Teachers are not using the most reliable sources for content or assessment: worksheets were often used for class practice and assignments rather than adopted textbooks, and most of the practice/assignments focused on calculation-type problems.
- Non-Evaluative Classroom Walkthroughs show varied consistency in lesson objectives among common math classes.
- Student assignments and classroom observations are being used to determine if students understood lessons and content, which could provide inaccurate results.

### THESE AREAS ARE CAUSE FOR CONCERN

- Decrease in scores from year to year in Math.
- Student Summative scores dropped in all grades in Math (5%–7% decrease) from 2017–18 to 2018–19.
- Teachers are not successfully implementing strategies in Math that lead to student achievement.

## Student Groups:

### STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND STUDENT/ADULT BEHAVIORS, AND/OR INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICES (DATA OPTIONS)

- Office Discipline Referral data
- Attendance Data (ADA)

### SCHOOLWIDE DATA SHOWS... (IN DEPTH DATA ANALYSIS NARRATIVE)

- Chronic absenteeism most impacts males, EL students, and students with IEPs. Coggins suspension rate is 7 times higher than the district rate, with EL and male students most likely to be suspended. Chronic absenteeism is also higher than the District rate, with males, EL students, and students with IEPs having the highest number of absences. Coggins suspension rate is way above the district rate, with EL and male students most likely to be suspended. Repeat suspensions are high, raising questions of how effective this is as a discipline strategy.

### THESE AREAS ARE CAUSE FOR CONCERN...

- Suspension rate is 7 times higher than the district average, and disproportionately applied to EL male students.
- Students missing school miss instruction, contributing to the low student achievement scores.

With the areas of concern identified, the School Core Team next discussed which was the most pressing, would have the greatest impact on student achievement, and could reasonably be addressed in their Annual and two 90-Day Plans. At first, they wondered if they needed to prioritize the student behavior issues through one of the Performance Challenges, since it was clear this was a pressing issue that needed to be addressed. However, since it

focused on such a specific student group, they decided that both Performance Challenges should focus on all students, and the student group needs could be addressed in their choice of Focus Area and Critical Actions. So, the School Core Team, after deep discussions, decided on the following Performance Challenges:

- THE Performance Challenge identified for ELA: Student Summative scores dropped in all grades in ELA (2%–5% decrease) from 2017–18 to 2018–19.
- THE Performance Challenge for Math: Student Summative scores dropped in all grades in Math (5%–7% decrease) from 2017–18 to 2018–19

#### *Ramirez High School*

In addition to the Graduation Rate data, the School Core Team at Ramirez High School looked at predictors of being on track for graduation for grades 9–11 (Early Warning Systems data.) For the incoming 9th graders, the Team studied data from the feeder middle schools regarding attendance, discipline, and course completion. They disaggregated the data based on all student groups, and flagged for special intervention those students at risk of not graduating in 4 years. The Ramirez team further examined their own school data for 10th and 11th graders, looking at attendance, course completion, course failures and credits earned, and overall GPA. The team also reviewed grade distribution reports that gave insight into failure rates by teacher/subject and also individual student group performance. The Team discussed the possibility of providing assistance such as tutoring, counseling, and family involvement for students at risk of not graduating on time. The CTE instructor and Guidance Counselor also discussed expanding the outreach for CTE programs to students and parents as a way to re-engage students who may be struggling with core courses. Ms. Sanchez wisely reminded the Team that in this step they were unpacking what the data shows, not problem solving, and the Team agreed to keep these options in mind for further consideration as they moved forward with their planning process.



## COMPONENT 4: CONDUCT ROOT CAUSE ANALYSIS AND SELECT FOCUS AREAS

After identifying THE Performance Challenge in ELA and THE Performance Challenge in Math, the School Core Team was ready to uncover possible reasons for the school's Performance Challenges that, if resolved, could result in elimination or substantial reduction of THE Performance Challenge. Once the deepest underlying causes for each Performance Challenge were identified, the School Core Team would be prepared to select the highest-leverage Focus Areas to implement for addressing the Root Cause and producing the greatest possible achievement increases for all students.

The School Core Team decided to first address THE Performance Challenge in ELA: Student Summative scores dropped in all grades in ELA (2%–5% decrease) from 2017–18 to 2018–19.

The Team began brainstorming possible causes, such as:

- Teachers lack strategies for scaffolding and differentiating instruction for students performing below grade level
- Teachers are not addressing gaps in reading comprehension
- Not enough or correct intervention to close learning gaps
- Teachers are not identifying students who need individualized or small group support
- School behavior challenges are affecting progression in ELA
- Students are not reading at grade level which impacts access to the content
- Poor student attendance, chronic absences, and high suspension rates
- Chronic absentee rate and suspension rate worst among high-need students
- No progress monitoring system for identifying students who are at risk of falling behind
- Curriculum lacks interventions and strategies to meet the needs of the student population, particularly students performing below grade level
- Teachers unclear on how to leverage Illuminate system for supporting intervention

The School Core Team decided that the deepest underlying issue impacting THE Performance Challenge as: Teachers lack strategies for scaffolding and differentiating instruction for students performing below grade level. The Team selected *Layer I (core) Instruction and Intervention* as the Focus Area, since so many of the issues seemed connected to instructional practices and addressing gaps in learning. The Team also noticed that many of their causes referenced behavior, which suggested that they select a second Focus Area to address School Culture. Given their Root Cause Analysis and the Root Cause statement, the School Core Team selected *Layer I (core) Instruction and Intervention and School Culture* as their two highest-leverage Focus Areas for addressing the ELA Performance Challenge.

The School Core Team elected to use a similar Root Cause Analysis process for addressing THE Performance Challenge in Math: Student Summative scores dropped in all grades in Math (5–7 percentage point decrease) from 2017–18 to 2018–19. Then the School Core Team elected to use the Fishbone Diagram process for their Root Cause Analysis and began exploring what they believed was at the core of the challenge by individually brainstorming possible causes and writing each cause on a separate sticky note. They were careful to avoid jumping ahead to

naming solutions and focused on causes within the school's control. The School Core Team continued generating causes and going around the group, until all ideas were exhausted. The team facilitator continually asked the team, "How do you know? What's your evidence of that cause?" After all ideas were recorded, the Team then sorted the stickies into major categories organized into groups with a similar theme or idea. Once the team agreed on a possible Root Cause, it asked itself "Would the problem and challenge have occurred if that cause had not been present?" If the answer is yes, it is not a Root Cause. "If the cause is corrected, will the problem and challenge reoccur?" If the answer is yes, it is not a Root Cause. The Fishbone Diagram was drawn on a large sheet of chart paper and used to capture the possible causes and categories.

When engaging in the Fishbone process for THE Math Performance Challenge, the Core Team suggested a number of possible causes, such as:

- Insufficient district follow-up for supporting teachers in fully implementing skills gained in the professional development
- Inconsistent planning and delivery of rigorous standards-based instruction
- Inconsistent use of common standards-based adopted text, curriculum guide, and assessments
- Inconsistent classroom walkthroughs with teacher feedback on implementation of math strategies
- Insufficient class time to address gaps in learning and new content
- Questioning focus on calculations instead of mathematical thinking
- Lessons not differentiated for varying achievement levels
- Student Talk to Teacher Talk Ratio heavily weighted to Teacher Talk
- Teachers are not using their textbooks
- No common teacher collaboration time for planning standards-based lessons due to master schedule conflicts
- The socioeconomic status of the school's neighborhood
- 6th grade teachers did not attend district Algebra training
- Teachers do not unpack common core learning standards into daily learning objectives
- Teachers do regularly use CFAs aligned to objectives to ensure student learning

In order to arrive at the deepest underlying cause for THE Math Performance Challenge, the Team decided to pick the category with the most stickies generated by the team, which was "Standards." The Team noted their Fishbone results and identified their Math Root Cause as: Inconsistent use of common standards-based adopted text, curriculum guide, and assessments.

In order to select the corresponding 1 to 2 highest-leverage Focus Areas most aligned with their Root Cause, the Team used the Guiding Questions to reflect on their evidence related to each of the seven provided Focus Areas. The team identified *Standards Alignment* as the immediate Focus Area to address.

For a second Focus Area, the team decided, that since at least 80 percent of students are not attaining math proficiency and the school has failed to ensure or support teachers in the implementation of rigorous standards-based instruction, the School Core Team selected *Layer I (core) Instruction and Intervention* as an additional high-leverage Focus Areas for addressing THE Math Performance Challenge.

#### *Ramirez High School*

While the Core Team at Ramirez High School had gathered multiple sources of Early Warning data, had engaged in some analysis, and was even starting to identify solutions, they had not yet stepped back and identified and prioritized THE Performance Challenge or challenges that needed to be addressed based on the analysis of data. Principal Sanchez reminded the Team that data-driven selection of Performance Challenges is crucial for addressing the most significant challenges and necessary before engaging in an analysis of the causes at the root of the challenge. Without engaging in deeply analyzing and understanding why a problem exists and what causes the problem, the Team ran the risk of addressing the incorrect Root Cause of the problem.

Based on previous discussions, the Team quickly agreed that their greatest Performance Challenges impacting graduation rate were that 1) 30% of students are chronically absent, including many that are enrolled but never attend, and 2) 30% of students that are not passing two or more core courses as early as 10th grade. The Team used the Fishbone diagram drawn on chart paper to capture and categorize possible causes for each of the challenges. Some of the articulated causes for Performance Challenge 1 included:

- students struggle transitioning from middle to high school,
- limited student knowledge on the academic and economic impact of attending and completing high school,
- lack of support for social-emotional learning, low expectations for students,
- lack of relevant job training to prepare graduates,
- poor student-teacher relationships, and
- poor academic performance that leads to student disengagement.

Some of the articulated causes for Performance Challenge 2 included:

- inadequate academic intervention for struggling students,
- teachers unprepared to differentiate curriculum and instruction to meet student needs,
- curriculum lacks interventions for meeting needs of student population, especially students performing below grade level, and
- students do not have access to required courses and the school does not offer summer school.

The School Core Team selected the same two Focus Areas to meet each of their goals: Tier I (core) Instruction and Tier I Interventions.

## COMPONENT 5: CREATE DESIRED OUTCOMES, DEVELOP PROGRESS INDICATORS, AND DEFINE CRITICAL ACTIONS (BUILD A 90-DAY PLAN)

The Coggins Middle School Core Team is satisfied with the outcome of all their hard work of setting goals, conducting data and Root Cause Analyses, and identifying THE Performance Challenge for both ELA and Math. They now have three Focus Areas and have completed their Annual Plan (see Table 56 below).

**Table 6 - Coggins Middle School Focus Areas**

Goal	Layer 1 (core) Instruction and Intervention	Standards Alignment	School Culture
ELA	X		X
Math	X	X	

It's been hard work to get to this point. Once Dr. Jimenez, the District Reviewer/Reflection Monitor reviewed, approved, and returned the plan, the School Core Team came together again. The Coggins Core Team is a bit battle weary, but Mr. Martin rallies them one more time so they can focus on building their Fall 90-day Plan, which will guide their improvement efforts once school starts. He knows that without this step, they won't have any structure to guide them as they address THE Performance Challenge for both Math and ELA. At the next team meeting, Mr. Martin recaps where they are with their planning:

For ELA:

- THE Performance Challenge: Student Summative scores dropped in all grades in ELA (2–5% decrease) from 2017–2018 to 2018–2019
- Root Cause summary statement: Lack of strategies for scaffolding and differentiating instruction for students performing below grade level
- Focus Area: Layer 1 (core) Instruction and Intervention and School Culture

For Math:

- THE Performance Challenge: Student Summative scores dropped in all grades in Math (5%–7% decrease) from 2017–18 to 2018–19.
- Root Cause summary statement: Inconsistent use of common standards-based adopted text, curriculum guide, and assessments
- Focus Areas: Standards Alignment and Layer 1 (core) Instruction and Intervention

Principal Martin tells the team that this information is foundational to developing their 90-day Plan. He then leads a discussion to identify their 90-day Desired Outcomes. He knows the Desired Outcomes need to directly address the THE Performance Challenges and related Root Cause(s), and that there needs to be a Desired Outcome for each selected Focus Area. So, he asks the team what changes in adult behavior they want to see at the end of the 90 days that will address, or at least begin to address, THE Performance Challenge in Math and THE Performance Challenge in ELA. After a lengthy discussion, the team developed the following Desired Outcomes for each Focus Area are summarized in Table 7 below.

**Table 7: Summary of ELA and Math Focus Areas and Desired Outcomes**

<b>Focus Area #1 for ELA</b>	<b>LAYER 1 (core) INSTRUCTION AND INTERVENTION</b>
<b>Desired Outcome</b> for ELA Focus Area # 1	At the end of 90 days, all teachers will incorporate and implement scaffolding and differentiated instructional strategies on a daily basis as measured by non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.
<b>Focus Area #2 for ELA</b>	<b>SCHOOL CULTURE</b>
<b>Desired Outcome</b> for ELA Focus Area #2	At the end of 90 days, all teachers will be proficient in their use and delivery of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model as evidenced by non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.
<b>Focus Area #1 for Math</b>	<b>STANDARDS ALIGNMENT</b>
<b>Desired Outcome</b> for Math Focus Area # 1	At the end of 90 days, all teachers will write and deliver standards-aligned daily lesson plans that include a measurable objective that is posted and administer a formative assessment for each objective.
<b>Focus Area #2 for Math</b>	<b>LAYER 1 (core) INSTRUCTION AND INTERVENTION</b>
<b>Desired Outcome</b> for Math Focus Area #2	At the end of 90 days, all teachers will utilize increasingly intensive evidence-based academic and behavioral supports that address student needs as evidenced by student data as identified for Layer 1 in the Multi-Layered System of Support.

Once the team had agreement on the Desired Outcomes, they developed the Progress Indicators that describe the data elements to be collected and reviewed to monitor progress at 30, 60, and 90 days. For both Desired Outcomes they reviewed the DASH Process Guide and discovered that the Progress Indicators, in addition to the 30ish-day intervals, require that they develop metrics and demonstrate sequential growth. They learned that Progress Indicators cite evidence to determine progress toward achieving the Desired Outcome. Since Desired Outcomes are always about changes in adult behavior, they realized that progress monitoring is about monitoring adult behaviors and not about monitoring student achievement. The School Core Team collectively determined that non-evaluative walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews would be the best methods of determining progress of adult changes toward the Desired Outcome. They also realized that it works best for School Core Team Monitoring when Progress Indicators dates are aligned closely with School Core Team Check-in dates. That way, the School Core Team has timely data to review at the 30, 60, and 90-day Check-in.

The last step that rounds out the development of a 90-day Plan is to define Critical Actions. Specifically, the Coggins School Core Team had to be able to answer: Who needs to do what? By when? And what will they need in order to achieve the Desired Outcomes? After some deliberation, the team determined the following Critical Actions for both ELA and Math and captured the results of their work in Worksheet 5.1: 90-day Plan.

FOCUS AREA: Layer 1 (core) Instruction and Intervention					
DESIRED OUTCOME: ELA					
At the end of the 90 days, all teachers will incorporate scaffolding and differentiated instructional strategies on a daily basis.					
PROGRESS INDICATORS: ELA					
Date		Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome			
10/10/20		At the end of 30 days, all teachers will incorporate scaffolding and differentiated instructional strategies at least twice a week as evidenced through daily walkthroughs.			
11/10/20		At the end of 60 days, all teachers will incorporate scaffolding and differentiated instructional strategies at least three to four times a week as evidenced through daily walkthroughs.			
12/20/20		At the end of 90 days, all teachers will incorporate scaffolding and differentiated instructional strategies on a daily basis as evidenced through daily walkthroughs.			
CRITICAL ACTIONS: ELA					
Date Range		Critical Actions	Resources Needed/Funding Source	Person(s) Responsible	Person(s)Involved
Start	End				
9/17	9/17	Workshop on scaffolding and differentiated instructional strategies	Substitutes, materials	District staff TBD	All certified staff
9/23	12/20	Non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs	Walkthrough schedule	Mr. Martin	All certified staff

FOCUS AREA: School Culture					
DESIRED OUTCOME: ELA					
At the end of 90 days, all teachers will be proficient in their use and delivery of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model as evidenced by non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.					
PROGRESS INDICATORS: ELA					
Date		Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome			
10/10/20		At the end of 30 days, 100% of teachers will have completed sessions 1 through 4 of the online professional development series “Principles and Practices of SIOP.”			
11/10/20		At the end of 60 days, 50% of teachers will be explicit in teaching language and implement SIOP scaffolding techniques in the delivery of their classroom lesson plans as evidenced through non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs.			
12/20/20		At the end of 90 days, 100% of teachers will be explicit in their teaching of language and implement SIOP scaffolding techniques in the delivery of their classroom lesson plans as evidenced through non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs.			
CRITICAL ACTIONS: ELA					
Date Range		Critical Actions	Resources Needed/Funding Source	Person(s) Responsible	Person(s)Involved
Start	End				
8/20	8/20	Workshop overview of SIOP Online Professional Development Modules	Purchase license agreements, Certified staff usernames and passwords, Computer lab	Assistant Principal, District EI Coordinator	All. Certified Staff
8/27	10/15	Friday afternoon virtual PD for SIOP Online Training sessions 1-4	Computer lab, certified staff rotation schedule by grade	Assistant Principal	All certified staff
9/23	12/20	Non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs	Walkthrough schedule	Mr. Martin	All certified staff
11/17	11/17	SIOP Implementation Review, Discussion and Summary completed by each PLC	SIOP Implementation stem questions and evaluation form	Mr. Martin and PLC Leads	All certified staff
12/10	12/10	TESOL workshop on the challenges that second language learners face and concrete strategies to address the challenges	Coggins TESOL teachers and reding interventionist, Ms. Moon, District EI Coordinator, and NMPED representative for Culturally and Linguistically Responsive Teaching	Mr. Martin, District EI Coordinator and Assistant Principal	All certified staff

FOCUS AREA: Standards Alignment					
DESIRED OUTCOME: Math					
At the end of 90 days, all teachers will write and deliver standards-aligned daily lesson plans that include a measurable objective that is posted and administer a formative assessment for each objective.					
PROGRESS INDICATORS: Math					
Date		Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome			
10/10/20		At the end of 30 days, all teachers will write and post grade-level daily learning objectives, deliver the lesson plan and 50% of teachers will use aligned exit tickets at least once a week as evidenced through lesson plans and daily walkthroughs.			
11/10/20		At the end of 60 days, 100% of teachers will write and post grade-level daily learning objectives, deliver the lesson plan and 75% of teachers will use aligned exit tickets at least three times a week as evidenced through lesson plans and daily walkthroughs.			
12/20/20		At the end of 90 days, 100% of teachers will write and post grade-level daily learning objectives, deliver the lesson plan and 100% of teachers will use aligned exit tickets every day as evidenced through lesson plans and daily walkthroughs.			
CRITICAL ACTIONS: Math					
Date Range		Critical Actions	Resources Needed/Funding Source	Person(s) Responsible	Person(s)Involved
Start	End				
9/11	9/11	Updated training for all teachers schoolwide on unpacking standards into daily learning objectives that are measurable and manageable.	Substitutes, materials	Assistant Principal	All certified staff
9/15	12/20	Non-evaluative daily walkthroughs	Walkthrough schedule	Principal	All certified staff
10/8	10/8	Friday Professional Learning Workshop on developing effective exit tickets aligned to daily learning objectives.	Principal Martin and District Teaching and Learning Coordinator to present workshop. Prepare workshop materials.	Principal Martin	All certified staff



FOCUS AREA: Layer 1 (core) Instruction and Intervention					
DESIRED OUTCOME: Math					
At the end of 90 days, all teachers will utilize increasingly intensive evidence-based academic and behavioral supports that address student needs as evidenced by student data and identified for Layer 1 in the Multi-Layered System of Support.					
PROGRESS INDICATORS: Math					
Date		Evidence to Determine Progress Toward Achieving Desired Outcome			
10/10/20		At the end of 30 days, 35% of teachers will deliver high quality instruction, academic and behavioral supports (or acceleration, when appropriate) (universal screening, core instruction, whole class reinforcements and supports, reteaching, and differentiation) as evidenced by non-evaluative walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.			
11/10/20		At the end of 60 days, 70% of teachers will deliver high quality instruction, academic and behavioral supports (or acceleration, when appropriate) (universal screening, core instruction, whole class reinforcements and supports, reteaching, and differentiation) as evidenced by non-evaluative walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.			
12/20/20		At the end of 90 days, 100% of teachers will deliver high quality instruction, academic and behavioral supports (or acceleration, when appropriate) (universal screening, core instruction, whole class reinforcements and supports, reteaching, and differentiation) as evidenced by non-evaluative walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.			
CRITICAL ACTIONS: Math					
Date Range		Critical Actions	Resources Needed/FundingSource	Person(s) Responsible	Person(s)Involved
Start	End				
8/11	8/12	MLSS Training for all teachers schoolwide	NMPED Presenter, Copies of MLSS Manual, Implementation Guide, Self-Assessment, Supplemental Manual, and other guiding documents	Principal and Assistant Principal	All certified staff
9/6	12/13	PLC MLSS weekly collaboration time and feedback loop	Academic Data, Non-Academic and EWS data, Perception data	PLC Leads, Certified Staff, Principal and Assistant Principal, Guidance Counselor	All Certified Staff
9/15	12/20	Non-evaluative daily walkthroughs	Walkthrough schedule	Principal	All certified staff
10/14	10/22	Administer Interim Assessment, compile data and release results to staff before 10/27 PLC meetings	Schedule Computer Labs 10/14,15, and 18. Testing schedule and IT to ready computers	Assistant Principal	All certified staff
11/12	11/12	Full Staff MLSS Implementation Review Meeting	Compiled results of staff MLSS implementation survey, aggregate non-evaluative classroom walkthrough data, School Core Team 30-day Progress Monitoring Results	Principal, Assistant Principal	All certified staff

## COMPONENT 6: IMPLEMENT PLAN AND MONITOR PROGRESS

### SPECIAL NOTE:

Progress Indicators cite evidence to determine progress toward achieving the Desired Outcome. Since Desired Outcomes are always about changes in adult behavior, the 30- and 60-day monitoring considers the changes in adult behaviors and does not yet monitor student achievement.

Everyone on the School Core Team believes that monitoring a plan is more likely to lead to the successful implementation of the plan. And so, at the 30- and 60-day check-ins, the School Core Team engaged in progress monitoring guided by the Progress Indicators. They documented the results in the NM DASH Process Management Tool using Worksheet 6.1: 30, 60, and 90-day Check-in for Progress Monitoring. Now the team is coming together to engage in a third and final progress monitoring discussion before the end of the 90-day period.

Ahead of the meeting, an agenda was circulated by Ms. Maples on behalf of Mr. Martin. Other members of the team reviewed it, but they were relatively indifferent about seeing the 90-day Progress Indicator data. The members knew that the principal had been running around like crazy trying to finish up a bunch of classroom walkthroughs. If they were truly curious about the data, they could have reviewed it ahead of the meeting in the electronic Box folder, but nobody did.

The 90-day progress monitoring meeting was scheduled from 3:30 to 5:00 pm in the school library. After a few opening remarks by Mr. Martin thanking the team for their commitment to the 90-day Plan, he turned the facilitation over to Ms. Maples who was leading the meeting as part of her requirements for an administrative internship. She projected Worksheet 6.1 on the screen. She reviewed ELA Focus Area #1: Layer 1 (core) Instruction and Intervention and ELA Focus Area #2: School Culture. She explained that the purpose of using Worksheet 6.1 is to provide the School Core Team an opportunity to reflect on progress toward accomplishing 90-day Plan Desired Outcomes, Critical Actions, and Progress Indicators.

First, she led the team through a discussion of questions associated with reflection on each of the ELA Focus Areas. She had the Team talk through these guiding questions found in the DASH Process Guide:

- If the school has not met the Desired Outcome Progress Indicators, how will the School Core Team reset? How would the plan be modified?
- If the school has exceeded Desired Outcome Progress Indicators, how will the School Core Team expand the scope of Critical Actions for the next check-in date?

### SPECIAL NOTE:

Monitoring the plan at the 90-day mark is a little different. At this Check-in, the School Core Team meets in person to reflect on progress toward accomplishing 90-day Plan Desired Outcomes, Critical Actions, and Progress Indicators. Again, using Worksheet 6.1: 30- 60-, and 90-day Check-in for Progress Monitoring, the School Core Team reflects on available student achievement data, student/adult behaviors data, and instructional practices data (i.e., walkthroughs, PLCs, formative and/or interim assessment analysis.) At the 90-day Check-in the School Core Team considers evidence of progress toward 90-day Plan goals and actions, focuses on student achievement data, as well as the Progress Indicators to meet the Desired Outcome. The School Core Team does this by using the current student achievement data and Progress Indicator data. As they do at the 30- and 60-day check-ins, the School Core Team also identifies any necessary 90-day Plan adjustments and required district support at the 90-day check-in and documents results in the NM DASH Process management Tool.

- Are the Desired Outcomes having a positive impact on student achievement? What is the evidence to substantiate the progress?
- Were the wrong Critical Actions identified? Are there other Critical Actions that should have been completed first? Should some Critical Actions be carried over, adjusted, or replaced with new Critical Actions?
- Did Critical Actions, if implemented with fidelity, lead to Desired Outcomes? If not, why not? Were Desired Outcomes too broad or unrealistic for a 90-day period?
- What unanticipated barriers and/or unexpected challenges did the School Core Team encounter?
- Has the School Core Team identified the best Progress Indicators? Are they rigorous enough? Do they truly measure progress toward accomplishing Critical Actions and Desired Outcomes?

Ms. Maples took notes on Worksheet 6.1 and projected the notes on the screen for all to see. It became clear to all that Mr. Martin had done a lot of work this semester visiting classrooms to gather data for each of the check-ins. It was also clear that Ms. Maples had been really helpful compiling the data ahead of the meeting.

After they had reflected on the Progress Monitoring for each ELA Focus Area, Ms. Maples facilitated the School Core Team's discussion to make needed adjustments to the plan. To do so, she again turned to the DASH Process Guide and used the guiding questions:

- To what extent do Progress Indicators document progress toward the Desired Outcomes and Critical Actions?
- Given the school's current student achievement data, what adjustments should be made to the current 90-day Plan?
- Reflecting on Progress Indicators and student academic growth data, which Critical Actions had the greatest positive impact(s) on the quality of teaching and learning in the school?
- What major lessons were learned, or barriers uncovered, in implementation that need to be addressed moving forward?
- What additional supports or resources are needed?
- Has the 90-day Plan been communicated to key stakeholders?
- Have adjustments been communicated to school site staff?

When they were done, Ms. Maples had successfully facilitated the School Core Team through the process. The results of the School Core Team's work for the ELA Goal can be seen in Worksheet below.

**Worksheet 6.1: 30- 60-, and 90-day Check-ins for Progress Monitoring**

Progress Reflections – ELA Focus Area: Layer 1 Instruction and Intervention	Adjustments/Supports Needed:
Progress is as expected - continuation of Progress Indicators and Critical Actions; no adjustments necessary.	

Progress Reflections – ELA Focus Area: Layer 1 Instruction and Intervention	Adjustments/Supports Needed:
Progress exceeds expectations – expansion of the scope of Progress Indicators and Critical Actions as needed.	
<p>Progress is less than expected - modifications to the Critical Actions are necessary (reset).</p> <p>Mr. Martin and Ms. Tester continue to see teacher growth in the use of scaffolding and differentiated instruction evidenced by non-evaluative classroom walkthrough data and on lesson plans, but not in every classroom and on a daily basis. PLC Leads indicate that some teachers have self-identified as continuing to struggle with differentiation. BOY interim assessment data results showed growth on par with projected goals.</p>	<p>The School Core Team recommends a follow-up workshop during one of the Professional Learning Fridays in February. The workshop will be created and delivered by Ms. Alvarez, Mr. Lonetree and Ms. Maples. The focus of the workshop will be on the development of and use differentiation strategies.</p> <p>Mr. Martin and Ms. Tester will have a “Courageous Conversation” with teachers who are struggling with differentiation and provide them with an opportunity to observe Ms. Alvarez, Mr. Lonetree, or Ms. Maples as a guest in their classroom. A substitute will be provided if needed. Ms. Alvarez, Mr. Lonetree, or Ms. Maples will offer to provide additional peer mentoring support to the teachers who agree to the suggestion.</p> <p>The administration will continue to watch for and take note of the strategy delivery in every classroom during non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and in the review of lesson plans.</p>

Progress Reflections – ELA Focus Area: School Culture	Adjustments/Supports Needed:
Progress is as expected - continuation of Progress Indicators and Critical Actions; no adjustments necessary.	
Progress exceeds expectations – expansion of the scope of Progress Indicators and Critical Actions as needed.	
<p>Progress is less than expected - modifications to the Critical Actions are necessary (reset).</p> <p>The SIOP training and delivery has gone well. Non-evaluative classroom walkthrough data and lesson plans reviews show that 90% of teachers implement SIOP scaffolding techniques in the delivery of instruction. In addition, over 90% of teachers are explicit in teaching language. BOY interim assessment data demonstrates academic growth among all student on par with goals. Disaggregated interim assessment data demonstrates achievement growth among the EI student group.</p>	<p>The School Core Team recommends a grade level peer review and discussion of classroom SIOP strategies and how they are being delivered at the January 19<sup>th</sup> PLC. PLC Leads will facilitate the discussion at each grade level and provide peer mentoring support to teachers on their team seeking support.</p> <p>The administration will purchase a copy of <u><i>Strategies for Success with English Learners</i></u> from ASCD for each certified staff to be used in a Community of Practice setting among each PLC in the spring semester.</p> <p>The administration will continue to watch for and take note of the strategy delivery in every classroom during non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and in the review of lesson plans.</p>

Following the 90-day Check-in reflection for ELA, Ms. Maples led The School Core Team through the same questioning process for Math. Equipped with student performance data, student and adult behavior data, and instructional practices data, Ms. Maple captured the following in Worksheet 6.1

<b>Progress Reflections – Math Focus Area: Standards Alignment</b>	<b>Adjustments/Supports Needed:</b>
Progress is as expected - continuation of Progress Indicators and Critical Actions; no adjustments necessary.  By the end of the 90-day plan, all teachers were writing standards-aligned daily lesson plans that include a measurable objective, posted in the classroom, and administering a formative assessment for each objective.	Even though no adjustments are necessary, the School Core Team recognizes the value of administrative non-evaluative walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews to support the momentum gained this semester in the delivery of standards-based lesson plans and formative assessments.
Progress exceeds expectations – expansion of the scope of Progress Indicators and Critical Actions as needed.	
Progress is less than expected - modifications to the Critical Actions are necessary (reset).	

<b>Progress Reflections – Math Focus Area:</b>	<b>Adjustments/Supports Needed:</b>
Progress is as expected - continuation of Progress Indicators and Critical Actions; no adjustments necessary.	
Progress exceeds expectations – expansion of the scope of Progress Indicators and Critical Actions as needed.  Before the end of 90-days, all teachers had grasped the strategy to use increasingly intensive evidence-based academic and behavioral supports that address student needs as evidenced by student data and identified for Layer 1 in the Multi-Layered System of Support.	Following the successful November MLSS implementation review meeting the School Core Team recommended that staff-wide deeper professional learning on the full MLSS to include Layers 2 and 3. The School Core Team recommends this training for February or March.
Progress is less than expected - modifications to the Critical Actions are necessary (reset).	

The next day, the School Core Team convened again to complete optional Worksheet 6.2: 90-day Plan Reflect, Revisit, and Reset. Mr. Martin opened the meeting, “If this school is to start producing better outcomes for students, and to put them on a path to success at Ramirez High School and beyond, then WE need to do it together. As we begin work on the 90-day Reflection meeting today, I am asking each of you to be honest and forthcoming with your ideas. Let’s think about a plan for the next 90 days that is specific about the adult behaviors that we want to change in the school, and creates the type of focus and urgency that our students deserve.” The School Core Team members around the table nodded and agreed with his remarks.

Ms. Maples began to facilitate the conversation, the engagement and commitment was notably enthusiastic. After a review of the Progress Monitoring Indicators for each Focus Area, the team wrestled with the five questions on Worksheet 6.2: 90-day Plan Reflect, Revisit, and Reset:

- What progress is the school making towards academic goals?
- What is the data saying the Desired Outcomes should be?
- Is your analysis of Root Causes deep enough? Remember to leverage the 5 Whys or a fishbone.
- What is the most valuable feedback your school has received from district leadership about planning, implementation, and monitoring?
- What does the School Core Team articulate as the school's most compelling need?

Ms. Maple captured the Team's consensus in each Focus area Worksheet below:

**Worksheets 6.2: 90-day Plan Reflect, Revisit, and Reset Coggins Middle School**

FOCUS AREA: LAYER 1 (core) INSTRUCTION AND INTERVENTION			
DESIRED OUTCOME: At the end of 90 days, all teachers will incorporate and implement scaffolding and differentiated instructional strategies on a daily basis as measured by non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.			
Evidence of Meeting Progress Indicators:			
Date: 10/10	At the end of 30 days, 40% of teachers were observed incorporating scaffolding and differentiated instruction strategies on a daily basis at least twice a week as evidenced by classroom walkthroughs. (Goal 100%/twice a week)		
Date: 11/10	At the end of 60 days, 65% of teachers were observed incorporating scaffolding and differentiated instruction strategies on a daily basis at least three to four times a week as evidenced by classroom walkthroughs. (Goal 100%/three to four times a week)		
Date: 12/20	At the end of 90 days, 80% of teachers were observed incorporating scaffolding and differentiated instruction strategies on a daily basis as evidenced by classroom walkthroughs. (Goal 100%/daily)		
CRITICAL ACTIONS THAT MADE BIGGEST IMPACT	LESSONS LEARNED	POTENTIAL NEXT SEMESTER DESIRED OUTCOME (building off last semester's plan)	
Reflecting on Progress Indicators and measurable evidence of student academic growth, briefly summarize actions that made the biggest difference in quality of teaching and learning at the school.  The Team agreed that the Workshop on scaffolding and differentiated instructional strategies was the major support. The Team was pleased to see that interim assessment data showed progress on par with established goals. The non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs provided useful and meaningful data.	Briefly summarize major lessons learned in implementation or barriers uncovered to address moving forward.  The School Core Team did not establish a clear road map for success by limiting the number of Critical Actions to accomplish the Desired Outcome.	Based on analysis of Student Achievement Data and Progress Indicators of the Current Desired Outcomes, what is the next Desired Outcome?  The School Core Team believes that this Desired Outcome is important and has the data to show that it is making a positive difference. The School Core Team intends to continue this desired outcome and provide additional supports for teachers to scaffold and differentiate instruction.	

FOCUS AREA: SCHOOL CULTURE			
DESIRED OUTCOME: At the end of 90 days, all teachers will be proficient in their use and delivery of the Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP) model as evidenced by non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.			
Evidence of Meeting Progress Indicators:			
Date:10/10	At the end of 30 days, 100% of teachers have completed sessions 1 through 4 of the online professional development series "Principles and Practices of SIOP" evidenced by completion certificates.		
Date:11/10	At the end of 60 days, 35% of teachers were explicit in teaching language and implementing SIOP scaffolding techniques in the delivery of their classroom lesson plans as evidenced by non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs. (Goal: 50%)		
Date:12/20	At the end of 90 days, 90% of teachers were explicit in teaching language and implementing SIOP scaffolding techniques in the delivery of their classroom lesson plans as evidenced by non-evaluative classroom walkthroughs. (Goal: 100%)		
CRITICAL ACTIONS THAT MADE BIGGEST IMPACT	LESSONS LEARNED	POTENTIAL NEXT SEMESTER DESIRED OUTCOME (building off last semester's plan)	
<p>Reflecting on Progress Indicators and measurable evidence of student academic growth, briefly summarize actions that made the biggest difference in quality of teaching and learning at the school.</p> <p>The online SIOP Module training was well received by teachers and a useful professional learning activity. Disaggregated interim assessment data indicates proficiency growth among ELs. The School Core Team will continue to monitor student attendance rates and Office Discipline Referral data to see if this strategy is positively impacting ADA and suspensions.</p>	<p>Briefly summarize major lessons learned in implementation or barriers uncovered to address moving forward.</p> <p>Online Professional learning Strategies can work when the content is well done and there is support for teachers to engage in the learning. Googins appreciates the support of the District and Ms. Moon in this effort.</p>	<p>Based on analysis of Student Achievement Data and Progress Indicators of the Current Desired Outcomes, what is the next Desired Outcome?</p> <p>The School Core Team intends to continue these progress indicators and believes that the SIOP has utility for classroom instruction and for our student learners.</p>	

FOCUS AREA: STANDARDS ALIGNMENT		
DESIRED OUTCOME: At the end of 90 days, all teachers will write and deliver standards-aligned daily lesson plans that include a measurable objective that is posted and administer a formative assessment for each objective.		
Evidence of Meeting Progress Indicators:		
Date: 10/10	At the end of 30 days, 60% of teachers wrote and posted grade-level daily learning objectives, delivered the lesson plan and 40% of teachers used aligned exit tickets at least once a week as evidenced through lesson plans and daily walkthroughs. (Goal 100%/50%/once a week)	
Date:11/10	At the end of 60 days, 80% of teachers wrote and posted grade-level daily learning objectives, delivered the lesson plan and 75% of teachers used aligned exit tickets at least once a week as evidenced through lesson plans and daily walkthroughs. (Goal 100%/75%/three times a week)	
Date:12/20	At the end of 90 days, 100% of teachers wrote and posted grade-level daily learning objectives, delivered the lesson plan and 100% of teachers used aligned exit tickets at least once a week as evidenced through lesson plans and daily walkthroughs. (Goal 100%/100%/daily)	
CRITICAL ACTIONS THAT MADE BIGGEST IMPACT	LESSONS LEARNED	POTENTIAL NEXT SEMESTER DESIRED OUTCOME (building off last semester's plan)
<p>Reflecting on Progress Indicators and measurable evidence of student academic growth, briefly summarize actions that made the biggest difference in quality of teaching and learning at the school.</p> <p>Setting high expectations for teachers with ambitious goals carried over to classroom performance by students. Teachers appreciated having a clear structure for how to approach standards-alignment while allowing instructors professional discretion on how to deliver the objective.</p>	<p>Briefly summarize major lessons learned in implementation or barriers uncovered to address moving forward.</p> <p>The professional learning opportunities were well done and presented to staff in a useful way. The staff appreciated the leadership of the Principal and Assistant Principal in bringing relevance to Standards-Aligned Daily lesson plans, measurable objectives and exit tickets.</p>	<p>Based on analysis of Student Achievement Data and Progress Indicators of the Current Desired Outcomes, what is the next Desired Outcome?</p> <p>The School Core Team will remove this Desired Outcome from the next 90-day Plan, however, the administration will still monitor via lesson plans and walkthroughs to signify the importance of sustaining the strategy now that the staff has embraced it.</p>



FOCUS AREA: LAYER 1 (core) INSTRUCTION AND INTERVENTION		
DESIRED OUTCOME: At the end of 90 days, all teachers will utilize increasingly intensive evidence-based academic and behavioral supports that address student needs as evidenced by student data and identified for Layer 1 in the Multi-Layered System of Support.		
Evidence of Meeting Progress Indicators:		
Date: 10/10	At the end of 30 days, 40% of teachers were delivering high quality instruction, academic and behavioral supports (or acceleration, when appropriate) (universal screening, core instruction, whole class reinforcements and supports, reteaching, and differentiation) as evidenced by non-evaluative walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews. (Goal: 35%)	
Date: 11/10	At the end of 60 days, 90% of teachers were delivering high quality instruction, academic and behavioral supports (or acceleration, when appropriate) (universal screening, core instruction, whole class reinforcements and supports, reteaching, and differentiation) as evidenced by non-evaluative walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.	
Date: 12/20	At the end of 90 days, 100% of teachers were delivering high quality instruction, academic and behavioral supports (or acceleration, when appropriate) (universal screening, core instruction, whole class reinforcements and supports, reteaching, and differentiation) as evidenced by non-evaluative walkthroughs and lesson plan reviews.	
CRITICAL ACTIONS THAT MADE BIGGEST IMPACT	LESSONS LEARNED	POTENTIAL NEXT SEMESTER DESIRED OUTCOME (building off last semester's plan)
<p>Reflecting on Progress Indicators and measurable evidence of student academic growth, briefly summarize actions that made the biggest difference in quality of teaching and learning at the school.</p> <p>The MLSS training and follow-up through PLCs was instrumental in implementing Layer 1 of the MLSS. As student achievement data begins to climb, teachers are building facility and capacity in how they approach instruction.</p>	<p>Briefly summarize major lessons learned in implementation or barriers uncovered to address moving forward.</p> <p>Building teacher ownership in the implementation of MLSS through PLCs was the major factor in the success of this strategy.</p>	<p>Based on analysis of Student Achievement Data and Progress Indicators of the Current Desired Outcomes, what is the next Desired Outcome?</p> <p>The School Core Team recommends the acceleration of this strategy by providing additional professional learning for Layers 2 and 3 of the MLSS at the school. The Team also recommends the continuance of the MLSS Community of Practice through PLCs.</p>

The School Core Team generally regards the time spent monitoring the Plan as useful and appreciates being a part of the process. They wish they had more time to pursue some of the guiding questions in the Process Guide but know that formal planning for the next 90 days is just around the corner. As the meeting concludes, each School Core Team member shares reflections on the process. One teacher says, “It has been a long couple of days, but I am kind of excited to see what happens next.”

Mr. Martin closes out the meeting, “I’ll tell you what happens next. Each of you around the table is a leader of this school. Together, we are going to figure out how to spend our precious time together focused on those things that are going to make the biggest difference for kids. Having me run around doing walkthroughs without a plan for sharing the feedback of what I am seeing in classrooms with teachers is not going to get us where we need to be. Thank you all for your time. Rest up. We have a lot of work to do to prepare for the second half of the year — and I need your help.”

Ms. Maples is happy to see the meeting come to an end. She is an aspiring principal and appreciated the opportunity to “facilitate” the meetings the past two days. The next day, she logs into the NM DASH system and updates the school’s plan using information captured in Worksheets 6.1 and 6.2.