

## Colorado's Unified Improvement Plan for Schools for 2015-16

Organization Code: **0880**      District Name: **DENVER COUNTY 1**      School Code: **8085**      School Name: **STRIVE PREP - FEDERAL**      Official 2014 SPF: **3 Year**

### Section I: Summary Information about the School

**Directions:** This section provides an overview of the school's improvement plan. To complete this section, copy and paste the school's Priority Performance Challenges, Root Causes and Major Improvement Strategies from Section III and IV of the 2015-16 UIP once it has been completed. In the UIP online system, this section will populate automatically as the UIP is written.

#### Executive Summary

##### How are students performing? Where will school staff be focusing attention?

**Priority Performance Challenges:** *Specific statements about the school's performance challenges (not budgeting, staffing, curriculum, instruction, etc.), with at least one priority identified for each performance indicator (achievement, growth, growth gaps, PWR) where the school did not meet federal, state and/or local expectations.*

Performance Challenges:

Difficulty balancing between the rigor of Common Core curriculum and supporting struggling students who entered 6<sup>th</sup> grade already behind.

There was also a curricular shift from focusing on grammar to instead focusing on the process of writing. When implementing this new curriculum with fidelity, the result was positive. Yet, the challenge is ensuring all teachers are trained and can implement that curriculum.

The math curriculum used to be very procedural base, and shifted to being conceptual based. There was a learning curve for staff with this new curriculum, and we saw that many students lacked number sense.

Challenge in building nonfiction literacy skills into the science content and balancing literacy and science content instruction.

Priority Performance Areas:

1. Data-Driven & Individualized Instruction: Instructional strategies must be informed by regular analysis of student performance data.
2. Professional Development: More coaching is necessary to support all teachers and ensure implementation of top quality curriculum that is based off the Common Core Standards and aligned with all exams and assessments.
3. English Language Development: Students language acquisition must be addressed in order to see improvement in their academic achievement across all subjects, and particularly literacy.

##### Why is the school continuing to have these problems?

**Root Causes:** *Statements describing the deepest underlying cause, or causes, of the performance challenges, that, if dissolved, would result in elimination, or substantial reduction of the performance challenges.*

Teachers need continued specific coaching related to the reading and math curriculum at the elementary school level.

More instructional time and individualized instruction than allotted in the traditional school day are needed for targeted literacy and math interventions.

Language acquisition gaps among English Language Learners lead to academic struggles in all subject areas.

##### What action is the school taking to eliminate these challenges?

**Major Improvement Strategies:** *An overall approach that describes a series of related actions intended to result in improvements in performance.*

The following strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching:

1. Double instructional time in literacy and math and data-driven, individualized learning & support for students.
2. Data-driven, individualized instruction to support students with persisting gaps in achievement, with particular focus on English Language Learners.
3. Instructional coaches conduct bi-weekly observations in order to provide instructional feedback for professional development, hold bi-weekly data meetings to coach on instructional strategies, and review lesson plans.

Access School Performance Frameworks here: <http://www.cde.state.co.us/schoolview/performance>

School Code: 8085

School Name: STRIVE PREP - FEDERAL

**Pre-Populated Report for the School**

**Directions:** This section summarizes program accountability requirements unique to the school based upon federal and state accountability measures. Historically, this report has included information from the School Performance Framework; because of the state assessment transition and passage of HB15-1323, 2015 SPFs will not be created. In the table below, CDE has pre-populated the school's data in **blue** text. This data shows the school's performance in meeting minimum federal and state accountability program expectations.

**Accountability Status and Requirements for Improvement Plan**

|  |                  |  |
|--|------------------|--|
| <b>Summary of School Plan Timeline</b> | October 15, 2015 | The school has the option to submit the updated plan through Tracker for public posting on SchoolView.org.   |
|  | January 15, 2016 | The school has the option to submit the updated plan through Tracker for public posting on SchoolView.org.   |
|  | April 15, 2016   | The UIP is due to CDE for public posting on April 15, 2016 through Tracker or the UIP online system. Some program level reviews will occur at the same time. For required elements in the improvement plan, go to the Quality Criteria at: <a href="http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp">http://www.cde.state.co.us/uip/UIP_TrainingAndSupport_Resources.asp</a> . |

| Program                              | Identification Process   | Identification for School                | Directions for Completing Improvement Plan  |
|--------------------------------------|--|--|---|
| <b>State Accountability</b>          |  |  |   |
| READ Act                             | All schools that serve students in grades Kindergarten through 3 <sup>rd</sup> Grade.  | Not serving grades K-3                   | This schools is not currently serving grades K-3.   |
| Plan Type Assignment                 | Plan type is assigned based on the school's overall 2014 official School Performance Framework rating (determined by performance on achievement, growth, growth gaps, postsecondary and workforce readiness).  | Performance Plan                         | The school meets or exceeds state expectations for attainment on the 2014 SPF performance indicators and is required to adopt and implement a Performance Plan. The plan must be submitted to CDE by April 15, 2016 to be posted on SchoolView.org. Note that some programs may still require a review of the UIP in April. Through HB 14-1204, small, rural districts (less than 1200 students) may opt to submit their plans biennially (every other year). |
| <b>ESEA and Grant Accountability</b> |  |  |   |
| Title I Focus School                 | Title I school with a (1) low graduation rate (regardless of plan type), and/or (2) Turnaround or Priority Improvement plan type with either (or both) a) low-achieving disaggregated student groups (i.e., minority, ELL, IEP and FRL) or b) low disaggregated graduation rate. This is a three-year designation. | Not identified as a Title I Focus School | This school is not identified as a Focus School and does not need to meet those additional requirements.  |
| Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)      | Competitive grant (1003g) for schools identified as 5% of lowest performing Title I or Title I eligible schools, eligible to implement one of four reform models as defined by the USDE.   | Not awarded a TIG Grant                  | This school does not receive a current TIG award and does not need to meet those additional requirements.   |

School Code: 8085

School Name: STRIVE PREP - FEDERAL

|   |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Diagnostic Review and Planning Grant</p>       | <p>Title I competitive grant that includes a diagnostic review and/or improvement planning support.</p>   | <p>Not awarded a current Diagnostic Review and Planning Grant</p> | <p>This school has not received a current Diagnostic Review and Planning grant and does not need to meet those additional requirements.</p> |
| <p>School Improvement Support (SIS) Grant</p>     | <p>Title I competitive grant that supports implementation of major improvement strategies and action steps identified in the school's action plan.</p>  | <p>Not a current SIS Grantee</p>                                  | <p>This school has not received a current SIS grant and does not need to meet those additional requirements.</p>                            |
| <p>Colorado Graduation Pathways Program (CGP)</p> | <p>The program supports the development of sustainable, replicable models for dropout prevention and recovery that improve interim indicators (attendance, behavior and course completion), reduce the dropout rate and increase the graduation rate for all students participating in the program.</p> | <p>Not a CGP Funded School</p>                                    | <p>This school does not receive funding from the CGP Program and does not need to meet these additional program requirements.</p>           |

## Section II: Improvement Plan Information

### Additional Information about the School


| Comprehensive Review and Selected Grant History   |  |  |
|---|--|--|
| Related Grant Awards  | Has the school received a grant that supports the school's improvement efforts? When was the grant awarded?  | No   |
| External Evaluator  | Has the school partnered with an external evaluator to provide comprehensive evaluation? Indicate the year and the name of the provider/tool used. | No   |
| Improvement Plan Information  |  |  |
| The school is submitting this improvement plan to satisfy requirements for (check all that apply):  |  |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> State Accreditation <input type="checkbox"/> Title I Focus School <input type="checkbox"/> Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) <input type="checkbox"/> Diagnostic Review and Planning Grant<br><input type="checkbox"/> School Improvement Support Grant <input type="checkbox"/> READ Act Requirements <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |  |  |
| School Contact Information (Additional contacts may be added, if needed)  |  |  |
| 1   | Name and Title   | Whitney Bride, COO   |
|   | Email  | <a href="mailto:wbride@striveprep.org">wbride@striveprep.org</a>   |
|   | Phone  | 720.772.4300   |
|   | Mailing Address  | 2480 W. 26 <sup>th</sup> Ave, Suite 360B                           |
| 2   | Name and Title   | Libby Miller, Principal  |
|   | Email  | <a href="mailto:lmiller@striveprep.org">lmiller@striveprep.org</a> |
|   | Phone  | 303-573-2017   |
|   | Mailing Address  | 2626 W. Evans Ave., Denver CO 80219                                |

School Code: 8085

School Name: STRIVE PREP - FEDERAL

### Section III: Narrative on Data Analysis and Root Cause Identification

This section corresponds with the “Evaluate” portion of the continuous improvement cycle. The main outcome is to construct a narrative that describes the process and results of the analysis of the data for your school. The analysis should justify the performance targets and actions proposed in Section IV. Two worksheets have been provided to help organize your data analysis for your narrative. This analysis section includes: identifying where the school did not at least meet minimum state and federal accountability expectations; describing progress toward targets for the prior school year; describing what performance data were used in the analysis of trends; identifying trends and priority performance challenges (negative trends); describing how performance challenges were prioritized; identifying the root causes of performance challenges; describing how the root causes were identified and verified and what data were used; and describing stakeholder involvement in the analysis. Additional guidance on how to engage in the data analysis process is provided in Unified Improvement Planning Handbook.



**Implications of Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS) on Data Analysis:** During the 2014-15 school year, Colorado transitioned from reading, writing and math TCAP assessments to CMAS PARCC English language arts and math assessments. These assessments measure related, but different content standards and are expected to have different proficiency levels. As a result, updating the data analysis this year (particularly the trend statements) may be more challenging. While the school’s data analysis is still expected to be updated, some modifications in typical practice may be needed. Refer to the UIP state assessment transition guidance document on the UIP website for options and considerations.

#### Data Narrative for School

**Directions:** In the narrative, describe the process and results of the data analysis for the school, including (1) a description of the school and the process for data analysis, (2) a review of current performance, (3) trend analysis, (4) priority performance challenges and (5) root cause analysis. A description of the expected narrative sections are included below. The narrative should not take more than five pages. Two worksheets (#1 *Progress Monitoring of Prior Year’s Performance Targets* and #2 *Data Analysis*) have been provided to organize the data referenced in the narrative.

|  |   |   |   |  |
|--|---|---|---|--|
| <p><b>Description of School Setting and Process for Data Analysis:</b> Provide a very brief description of the school to set the context for readers (e.g., demographics). Include the general process for developing the UIP and participants (e.g., School Accountability Committee).</p>  | <p><b>Review Current Performance:</b> Review recent state and local data. Document any areas where the school did not at least meet state/federal expectations. Consider the previous year’s progress toward the school’s targets. Identify the overall magnitude of the school’s performance challenges.</p> | <p><b>Trend Analysis:</b> Provide a description of the trend analysis that includes at least three years of data (state and local data), if available. Trend statements should be provided in the four performance indicator areas and by disaggregated groups. Trend statements should include the direction of the trend and a comparison (e.g., state expectations, state average) to indicate why the trend is notable.</p> | <p><b>Priority Performance Challenges:</b> Identify notable trends (or a combination of trends) that are the highest priority to address (priority performance challenges). No more than 3-5 are recommended. Provide a rationale for why these challenges have been selected and address the magnitude of the school’s overall performance challenges.</p> | <p><b>Root Cause Analysis:</b> Identify at least one root cause for every priority performance challenge. Root causes should address adult actions, be under the control of the school, and address the priority performance challenge(s). Provide evidence that the root cause was verified through the use of additional data. A description of the selection process for the corresponding major improvement strategy(s) is encouraged.</p> |
| <p><b>Narrative:</b><br/> <b>Description of School Setting &amp; Process for Data Analysis</b><br/>                 After eight years of operations with over 90% of students qualifying for free or reduced lunch and over 90% students of color, STRIVE Prep - Federal was most recently rated as ‘Meets Expectations’ on the last version of the School Performance Framework (SPF) in 2014.<br/>                 To create structured support for teachers, STRIVE Prep has developed a curriculum team consisting of a Chief Academic Officer, Senior Director of Math and Science, Senior Director of Humanities, and Director of Data Analysis. Additionally, content-area teacher specialists provide curriculum leadership throughout our network. Each specialist receives a stipend for their time working as a</p> |   |   |   |  |

School Code: 8085

School Name: STRIVE PREP - FEDERAL

curriculum resource for other teachers in their same content area and as curriculum leads in the network structure. With these positions in place, STRIVE Prep can provide targeted, immediate interventions for students who need additional help. With the support of these leaders and their focus on data-analysis, best instructional practices, and content knowledge, students are more quickly placed in intervention programs to suit individualized needs and learning styles.

STRIVE Prep assesses academic achievement throughout the school year and students are tested at the end of each nine-week period or, Interim Assessment Periods (IA). The day after IA tests are administered, teachers from across the network gather to discuss results. Designed as intermediate measures that evaluate mastery of Common Core Standards, these tests give the students, their educators, and their family immediate, clear feedback on where they have excelled in each tested subject area, and where more diligence is required. Teachers use this time to determine successful teaching methods and methods that need to be revised. In this way, teachers are better able to support student achievement and are instantly made aware of areas where students struggle and need additional assistance.

STRIVE Prep recognizes that great instruction is the key to student success and achievement and that supporting and developing our teachers is the greatest lever we have to ensuring students are on the path towards college readiness. As such, instructional coaching is a high priority in all STRIVE Prep schools. All STRIVE Prep teachers have a dedicated instructional coach, who is responsible for their growth and professional development.

STRIVE Prep also conducts comprehensive site reviews at each school annually. Through three priority areas of focus (Data-Driven Instruction, School Culture, and Operations), the site reviews are designed to identify strengths, weaknesses, and recommendations for improvement in each area of focus. The site review is conducted by the Chief Academic Officer, Chief Executive Officer, and a team of leaders from around the network and will help individual campuses increase overall academic performance while reinforcing STRIVE Prep culture and values.

The general process for developing the UIP was managed by STRIVE Prep's Chief Operating Officer, with assistance from the network's Managing Director of Elementary and Middle Schools.

### **Current Performance**

While STRIVE Prep – Federal matched the District average for proficiency in ELA and Math, we did not meet our internal targets to exceed District averages by 10%.

The biggest contributing factor to our shortfall is lag time in implementing strategies to better meet Common Core standards: Strategies to address the curriculum shift with the transition to Common Core standards were not implemented in time to be effective during the 2015 assessment window. We are hopeful that consistent implementation of Common Core aligned instruction in 2015-16 will produce improved results.

### **Trend Analysis**

Students have historically entered middle school at STRIVE Prep struggling with Literacy and Math. While our goal is to help students reach grade-level mastery by 8<sup>th</sup> grade, students often enter our high schools with lingering proficiency gaps.

In 2014-15 STRIVE Prep – Federal students matched District averages for both ELA and Math proficiency.

### **Priority Performance Challenges**

We have identified three main priority performance challenges as our highest priorities to address. These challenges have been selected because they have greatly affected student's overall

performance, regardless of grade or subject. Thus, these challenges are not content or grade specific, but are challenges that reflect areas of focus throughout the STRIVE Preparatory Schools network.

4. Data-Driven & Individualized Instruction: Instructional strategies must be informed by regular analysis of student performance data.
5. Professional Development: More coaching is necessary to support all teachers and ensure implementation of top quality curriculum that is based off the Common Core Standards and aligned with all exams and assessments.
6. English Language Development: Students language acquisition must be addressed in order to see improvement in their academic achievement across all subjects, and particularly literacy.

**Root Cause Analysis**

Both state tests and interim assessment measures across all grade levels demonstrate performance gaps for English Language Learners and students who qualify for Special Education services. Assessment data demonstrates that even beyond these two disaggregated groups, students enter each grade-level at STRIVE Prep at varying academic ability levels and with a range of specific support needs. In order to the academic growth of each student, teachers must review individualized data and tailor instruction and supports for each student accordingly. This level of personalization requires training and ongoing coaching for teachers who may not have sufficient experience with data analysis.

The three priority performance challenges identified are supported by reading and math data that reflects a need for highly targeted attention in order for students to make greater gains in their grade-level mastery.

**Worksheet #1: Progress Monitoring of Prior Year’s Performance Targets**

**Directions:** This chart supports analysis of progress made towards performance targets set for the 2014-15 school year (last year’s plan). While this worksheet should be included in your UIP, *the main intent is to record your school’s reflections to help build your data narrative.*

| Performance Indicators        | Targets for 2014-15 school year<br>(Targets set in last year’s plan)  | Performance in 2014-15? Was the target met? How close was the school to meeting the target? |            |                             | Brief reflection on why previous targets were met or not met.   |
|-------------------------------|---|---|------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Academic Achievement (Status) | Students exceed district average proficiency on PARCC exams by at least 10%. 65% of students in grades 8 and above meet or exceed college-ready benchmarks on ACT ASPIRE exams. | Federal   |            | DPS                         | While STRIVE Prep – Federal matched the District average for proficiency in ELA and Math, we did not meet our internal targets to exceed District averages by 10%.<br><br>The biggest contributing factor to our shortfall is lag time in implementing strategies to better meet Common Core standards: Strategies to |
|                               |   | ELA Proficient  | ELA % Rank | District ELA % met or above |   |
|                               |   | 37%   | 63%        | 35%                         |   |



| Performance Indicators              | Targets for 2014-15 school year<br>(Targets set in last year's plan)                    | Performance in 2014-15? Was the target met? How close was the school to meeting the target? |             |                              | Brief reflection on why previous targets were met or not met.  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|------------------------------|--|
|                                     |   | Math Proficient   | Math % Rank | District Math % met or above |  |
|                                     |   | 28%   | 66%         | 28%                          | address the curriculum shift with the transition to Common Core standards were not implemented in time to be effective during the 2015 assessment window. We are hopeful that consistent implementation of Common Core aligned instruction in 2015-16 will produce improved results. |
| Academic Growth                     | 65% of students at each school meet or exceed expected growth on ACT ASPIRE /TerraNova. | N/A   |             |                              |  |
| Academic Growth Gaps                | Increase median growth percentile to at least 65  | N/A   |             |                              |  |
| Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness | N/A   | N/A   |             |                              |  |

**Worksheet #2: Data Analysis**

**Directions:** *This chart supports planning teams in recording and organizing observations about school-level data in preparation for writing the required data narrative.* Planning teams should describe positive and negative trends for all of the four performance indicators using at least three years of data, when available, and then prioritize the performance challenges (based on notable trends) that the school will focus its efforts on improving. The root cause analysis and improvement planning efforts in the remainder of the plan should be aimed at addressing the identified priority performance challenge(s). A limited number of priority performance challenges is recommended (no more than 3-5); a performance challenge may apply to multiple performance indicators. At a minimum, priority performance challenges must be identified in any of the four performance indicator areas where minimum state and federal expectations were not met for accountability purposes. In most cases, this should just be an update to the plan from 2014 since the SPF has not changed for 2015. Finally, provide a brief description of the root cause analysis for any priority performance challenges. Root causes may apply to multiple priority performance challenges. You may add rows, as needed.

| Performance Indicators              | Description of Notable Trends<br>(3 years of past state and local data)  | Priority Performance Challenges  | Root Causes  |
|-------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Academic Achievement<br>(Status)    | Students have historically entered middle school at STRIVE Prep struggling with Literacy and Math. While our goal is to help students reach grade-level mastery by 8 <sup>th</sup> grade, students often enter our high schools with lingering proficiency gaps. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data-Driven &amp; Individualized Instruction</li> <li>• Professional Development</li> <li>• English Language Development</li> </ul> | <p>Teachers need continued specific coaching related to the reading and math curriculum at the elementary school level.</p> <p>More instructional time and individualized instruction than allotted in the traditional school day are needed for targeted literacy and math interventions.</p> <p>Language acquisition gaps among English Language Learners lead to academic struggles in all subject areas.</p> |
| Academic Growth                     |  |  |  |
| Academic Growth Gaps                |  |  |  |
| Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness |  |  |  |


## Section IV: Action Plan(s)

This section addresses the “Plan” portion of the continuous improvement cycle. First, identify annual performance targets and the interim measures. This will be documented in the required *School Target Setting Form* on the next page. Then move into action planning, which should be captured in the *Action Planning Form*.

### School Target Setting Form

**Directions:** Complete the worksheet below. Schools are expected to set their own annual targets for the performance indicators (i.e. academic achievement, academic growth, academic growth gaps, and postsecondary and workforce readiness). At a minimum, schools should set targets for each of the performance indicators where state expectations were not met; targets should also be connected to prioritized performance challenges identified in the data narrative (section III). Consider last year’s targets (see Worksheet #1) and whether adjustments need to be made. For each annual performance target, identify interim measures that will be used to monitor progress toward the annual targets at least quarterly during the school year.

**Implications of Colorado Measures of Academic Success (CMAS) on Target Setting:** During the 2014-15 school year, Colorado transitioned from reading, writing and math TCAP assessments to CMAS PARCC English language arts and math assessments. These assessments measure related, but different content standards and are expected to have different proficiency levels. As a result, setting targets based on the percent of students scoring proficient and advanced on TCAP is not appropriate. Furthermore, CDE does not yet know if student growth percentiles and median student growth percentiles will be available for accountability, planning or reporting use. It is known that adequate growth percentiles will not be available this school year for 2014-15 results. Target setting is still expected to occur in the UIP process during this transition period. However, some modifications in typical practice may be needed. Refer to the UIP state assessment transition guidance document on the UIP website for options and considerations.



### School Target Setting Form

| Performance Indicators        | Measures/ Metrics  | Priority Performance Challenges | Annual Performance Targets  |   | Interim Measures for 2015-16  | Major Improvement Strategy  |  |
|-------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|
|                               |  |                                 | 2015-16   | 2016-17   |   |   |  |
| Academic Achievement (Status) | CMAS/PARCC, CoAlt, K-3 literacy measure (READ Act), local measures | ELA                             | <p>Difficulty balancing between the rigor of Common Core curriculum and supporting struggling students who entered 6<sup>th</sup> grade already behind.</p> <p>There was also a curricular shift from focusing on grammar to instead focusing on the process of writing. When implementing this new curriculum with fidelity, the result was positive. Yet, the challenge is ensuring all teachers are trained and can implement that curriculum.</p> | <p>Students in each school exceed district average proficiency on each PARCC exam by at least 10%.</p> <p>Student PARCC proficiency rates in grades 8 and above at each school meet or exceed state averages.</p> <p>65% of students in grades 8 and above at each school and in each subject meet or exceed college-ready benchmarks on ACT ASPIRE.</p> <p>Median ACT score meets or exceeds 21 at each high school.</p> | <p>Students in each school exceed district average proficiency on each PARCC exam by at least 10%.</p> <p>Student PARCC proficiency rates in grades 8 and above at each school meet or exceed state averages.</p> <p>65% of students in grades 8 and above at each school and in each subject meet or exceed college-ready benchmarks on ACT ASPIRE.</p> <p>Median ACT score meets or exceeds 21 at each high school.</p> | <p>Internal benchmarks every six weeks ("RAP" tests)</p> <p>ACT Aspire</p> <p>STAR Reading Assessments at least three times a year</p> <p>PARCC</p> <p>CMAS</p> | <p>All strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Double instructional time in literacy and math and data-driven, individualized learning &amp; support for students.</li> <li>2. Data-driven, individualized instruction to support students with persisting gaps in achievement, with particular focus on English Language Learners.</li> <li>3. Instructional coaches conduct bi-weekly observations in order to provide instructional feedback for professional development, hold bi-weekly data meetings to coach on instructional strategies, and review lesson plans.</li> </ol> |
|                               |  | READ                            |   | See status goal above. (Same for each subject).   | See status goal above. (Same for each subject).   | <p>Internal benchmarks every six weeks ("RAP" tests)</p> <p>ACT Aspire</p> <p>STAR Reading Assessments at least three times a year</p> <p>PARCC</p> <p>CMAS</p> | <p>All strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching.</p>   |

School Code: 8085

School Name: STRIVE PREP - FEDERAL

|                 |  |     |   |  |  |  |   |
|-----------------|--|-----|---|--|--|--|---|
|                 |  |     |   |  |  |  | See 3 strategies listed above.  |
|                 |  | M   | The math curriculum used to be very procedural base, and shifted to being conceptual based. There was a learning curve for staff with this new curriculum, and we saw that many students lacked number sense. | See status goal above. (Same for each subject).  | See status goal above. (Same for each subject).  | Internal benchmarks every six weeks ("RAP" tests)<br>ACT Aspire<br>STAR Reading Assessments at least three times a year<br>PARCC<br>CMAS | All strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching.<br><br>See 3 strategies listed above. |
|                 |  | S   | Challenge was in building nonfiction literacy skills into the science content and balancing literacy and science content instruction.   | See status goal above. (Same for each subject).  | See status goal above. (Same for each subject).  | Internal benchmarks every six weeks ("RAP" tests)<br>ACT Aspire<br>STAR Reading Assessments at least three times a year<br>PARCC<br>CMAS | All strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching.<br><br>See 3 strategies listed above. |
| Academic Growth | Median Growth Percentile, TCAP, CMAS/PARCC, ACCESS, local measures | ELA |   | Each school's median growth percentile exceeds 65 in each tested subject, on the Colorado Growth Model. 65% of students at each school meet or exceed expected growth on ACT ASPIRE / TerraNova. | Each school's median growth percentile exceeds 65 in each tested subject, on the Colorado Growth Model. 65% of students at each school meet or exceed expected growth on ACT ASPIRE / TerraNova. | Internal benchmarks every six weeks ("RAP" tests)<br>ACT Aspire<br>STAR Reading Assessments at least three times a year<br>PARCC<br>CMAS | All strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching.<br><br>See 3 strategies listed above. |
|                 |  | M   |   | See growth goal above (same for each subject).   | See growth goal above (same for each subject).   | Internal benchmarks every six weeks ("RAP" tests)<br>ACT Aspire<br>STAR Reading Assessments at least three times a year<br>PARCC<br>CMAS | All strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching.<br><br>See 3 strategies listed above. |

|                                     |  |     |     |   |   |  |   |
|-------------------------------------|--|-----|-----|---|---|--|---|
|                                     |  | ELP |     | See growth goal above (same for each subject).  | See growth goal above (same for each subject).  | Internal benchmarks every six weeks ("RAP" tests)<br>ACT Aspire<br>STAR Reading Assessments at least three times a year<br>PARCC<br>CMAS | All strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching.<br><br>See 3 strategies listed above. |
| Academic Growth Gaps                | Median Growth Percentile, local measures | ELA |     | MGPs for historically underserved student groups exceed school averages for all students on each measure. | MGPs for historically underserved student groups exceed school averages for all students on each measure. | Internal benchmarks every six weeks ("RAP" tests)<br>ACT Aspire<br>STAR Reading Assessments at least three times a year<br>PARCC<br>CMAS | All strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching.<br><br>See 3 strategies listed above. |
|                                     |  | M   |     | MGPs for historically underserved student groups exceed school averages for all students on each measure. | MGPs for historically underserved student groups exceed school averages for all students on each measure. | Internal benchmarks every six weeks ("RAP" tests)<br>ACT Aspire<br>STAR Reading Assessments at least three times a year<br>PARCC<br>CMAS | All strategies work together as a system to support each challenge through additional and individualized data-driven instructional time, professional development and ongoing coaching.<br><br>See 3 strategies listed above. |
| Postsecondary & Workforce Readiness | Graduation Rate                          |     | N/A | N/A   | N/A   | N/A  | N/A   |
|                                     | Disag. Grad Rate                         |     | N/A | N/A   | N/A   | N/A  | N/A   |
|                                     | Dropout Rate                             |     | N/A | N/A   | N/A   | N/A  | N/A   |
|                                     | Mean CO ACT                              |     | N/A | N/A   | N/A   | N/A  | N/A   |
|                                     | Other PWR Measures                       |     | N/A | N/A   | N/A   | N/A  | N/A   |

### Action Planning Form for 2015-16 and 2016-17

**Directions:** Identify the major improvement strategy(s) for 2015-16 and 2016-17 that will address the root cause(s) determined in Section III. For each major improvement strategy, identify the root cause(s) that the major improvement strategy will help to dissolve. Then, indicate which accountability provision or grant opportunity it will address. In the chart below, provide details about key action steps necessary to implement the major improvement strategy. Details should include the action steps that will be taken to implement the major improvement strategy, a general timeline, resources that will be used to implement the actions, and implementation benchmarks. Additional rows for action steps may be added. While the template provides space for three major improvement strategies, additional major improvement strategies may also be added. To keep the work manageable, however, it is recommended that schools focus on no more than 3 to 5 major improvement strategies.

**Major Improvement Strategy #1:** Double instructional time in literacy and math and data-driven, individualized learning & support for students.

**Root Cause(s) Addressed:** More instructional time and individualized instruction than allotted in the traditional school day are needed for targeted literacy and math interventions.

**Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy** (check all that apply):

- State Accreditation   
  Title I Focus School   
  Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)   
  Diagnostic Review Grant   
  School Improvement Support Grant  
 READ Act Requirements   
  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

| Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy   | Timeline |         | Key Personnel*   | Resources<br>(Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)  | Implementation Benchmarks   | Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun) |
|---|----------|---------|--|---|---|--|
|   | 2015-16  | 2016-17 |  |   |   |  |
| Hire 1 additional reading and math teacher per grade-level to provide double dose instruction.  | X        | X       | Reading & Math Teachers  | 6 additional teachers @ \$40,000 avg annual salary: \$240,000 supported by PPOR & Title I funds                         | Student achievement data on interim assessments, intervention program monitoring, and state assessments demonstrates consistent growth. | In progress  |
| Implement Individualized Instructional Time (IIT) block for all students Mon-Thurs using computer-based, individualized intervention programs including:<br>Newsela, IXL, Lexia, Read Naturally, Do the Math, Able Net, Wilson, Aimsweb, STAR | X        | X       | .25 FTE Math Teacher<br>.25 FTE Reading Teacher providing additional push-in support | 250 Student computers: \$130,000 - PPOR<br>Licenses: \$24,000 – Title I, III, & PPOR<br>.5 FTE: \$20,000 – Title I, III | Student achievement data on interim assessments, intervention program monitoring, and state assessments demonstrates consistent growth. | In progress  |
| Increase parent communication and involvement on student supports   | X        | X       | All Staff, Systems non-  | Title II, Illuminate & Live School: Parent information  | Positive results via family engagement survey   | In progress.   |

School Code: 8085

School Name: STRIVE PREP - FEDERAL

|  |   |   |  |  |   |             |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|-------------|
|  |   |   | salary                                 | and notification systems (\$2,778)         |   |             |
| Additional teachers allow more regular engagement with a smaller group of families to build deeper relationships | X | X | Teachers<br>Family Engagement<br>Staff | \$10,000 – Title I, PPOR, Foundation Grant | Positive results via family engagement survey<br><br>Annual enrollment demand | In progress |
|  |   |   |  |  |   |             |

\* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants.



**Major Improvement Strategy #2:** Data-driven, individualized instruction to support students with persisting gaps in achievement, with particular focus on English Language Learners.

**Root Cause(s) Addressed:** Language acquisition gaps among English Language Learners lead to academic struggles in all subject areas.

**Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy** (check all that apply):

- State Accreditation   
  Title I Focus School   
  Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)   
  Diagnostic Review Grant   
  School Improvement Support Grant  
 READ Act Requirements   
  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

| Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy   | Timeline |         | Key Personnel*               | Resources<br>(Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local) | Implementation Benchmarks   | Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun) |
|---|----------|---------|------------------------------|--|---|--|
|   | 2015-16  | 2016-17 |                              |  |   |  |
| Provide dedicated ELD instruction block for all English Language Learners   | X        | X       | ELD instructors              | .25 FTE dedicated to ELD instruction<br>\$30,000 – Title III   | Student achievement data on interim assessments, intervention programs, and annual WIDA administration.                                 | In progress  |
| ELD Specialist coaches ELD instructors using data analysis from ongoing progress monitoring                       | X        | X       | ELD coach                    | .3 FTE dedicated to ELD coaching<br>\$22,000 – Title III       | Student achievement data on interim assessments, intervention programs, and annual WIDA administration.                                 | In progress  |
| Progress monitor achievement on intervention programs and interim assessments to inform instructional strategies. | X        | X       | Data Intervention Specialist | \$65,000 – Title II & III; PPOR                                | Student achievement data on interim assessments, intervention program monitoring, and state assessments demonstrates consistent growth. | In progress  |
|   |          |         |                              |  |   |  |
|   |          |         |                              |  |   |  |

\* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants.

**Major Improvement Strategy #3:** Instructional coaches conduct bi-weekly observations in order to provide instructional feedback for professional development, hold bi-weekly data meetings to coach on instructional strategies, and review lesson plans.

**Root Cause(s) Addressed:** Teachers need continued specific coaching related to the reading and math curriculum at the elementary school level.

**Accountability Provisions or Grant Opportunities Addressed by this Major Improvement Strategy** (check all that apply):

- State Accreditation   
  Title I Focus School   
  Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG)   
  Diagnostic Review Grant   
  School Improvement Support Grant  
 READ Act Requirements   
  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

| Description of Action Steps to Implement the Major Improvement Strategy  | Timeline              |                       | Key Personnel*                            | Resources<br>(Amount and Source: federal, state, and/or local)                  | Implementation Benchmarks  | Status of Action Step* (e.g., completed, in progress, not begun) |
|--|-----------------------|-----------------------|---|---|--|--|
|  | 2015-16               | 2016-17               |   |   |  |  |
| Two-week Summer Institute  | Completed summer 2015 | Completed Summer 2015 | Instructional Staff & Outside Consultants | Salaries associated with staff time included in PPOR                            | Implementation of strategies evident through observations, evaluation rubric, and effectiveness rates through surveys.   | Completed  |
| Content-Specific Professional Development  | X                     | X                     | Central Curriculum Team staff             | Salaries associated with staff training time included in Central Office budget. | Student achievement data on interim assessments, intervention program monitoring, and state assessments demonstrates consistent growth. Staff evaluation scores. | In progress  |
| All teachers receive bi-weekly observations and debriefs and data analysis meetings from an instructional coach.<br>Instructional coaches are expected to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Observe their teachers bi-weekly (minimum) for at least 20 minutes, film the observation and upload the video in gdrive, and record the observation in the campus</li> </ul> | X                     | X                     | Instructional Coaches                     | 2.0 FTEs dedicated to Instructional Coaching<br>\$140,000 – Title II & PPOR     | Student achievement data on interim assessments, intervention program monitoring, and state assessments demonstrates consistent growth. Staff evaluation scores. | In progress  |

School Code: 8085

School Name: STRIVE PREP - FEDERAL

|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>observation tracker.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hold a scheduled (locked-in), 30 minute (minimum) coaching meeting with their teacher(s) at least once every 2 weeks.</li> <li>• Hold a scheduled (locked-in) 25 minute (minimum) data meeting meeting with their teacher(s) at least once every 2 weeks.</li> <li>• Review all lesson plans for the week to check for completeness, and email feedback to the teacher every week. Coach gives one piece of high leverage lesson plan feedback that can be applied across multiple plans.</li> </ul> |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |

\* Note: These two columns are not required to meet state or federal accountability requirements, though completion is encouraged. "Status of Action Step" may be required for certain grants.

## Section V: Appendices

Some schools will need to provide additional forms to document accountability or grant requirements:

- Additional Requirements for Turnaround Status Under State Accountability (Required)
- Tiered Intervention Grantee (TIG) (Required)
- Title I Schoolwide Program. *Important Notice: The schoolwide addendum is one of several ways to document how a school is meeting the Title I schoolwide requirements. While schools operating a Title I schoolwide program must have a plan, use of the UIP addendum is optional. The Federal Programs Unit and the Improvement Planning Unit will be offering training in fall 2015 on schoolwide requirements and the possible pathways to meet those requirements.*