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Panel’s Recommendation:

The State Review Panel recommends Innovation Status for Martinez Elementary School, based on an analysis of compiled data and documentation, as well as a site visit conducted on March 30-31, 2017.

Evidence and Rationale:

**The State Review Panel recommends Innovation Status** for Martinez Elementary because the school has been rated **Effective** in the following areas: the leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results; the infrastructure is adequate to support school improvement; and there is readiness and apparent capacity of personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate action to improve student academic performance.

The school has demonstrated early indications of improvement to support increased achievement. School leaders have been proactive in addressing turnaround efforts by initiating a diagnostic review in 2015. As a result, the principal, teachers, and parents revisited the school’s mission and vision and identified a school focus on science, technology, engineering, and math as part of the school’s innovation plan proposal. The district has also been supportive of the school’s improvement efforts, including supporting the ongoing development of school leaders. Further, school leaders are creating structures to provide regular, weekly professional development and collaborative planning time for staff. Finally, although not fully developed, the school is beginning to collaborate with external partners to support school improvement.

Martinez has a strong leadership team that is committed to improving the school. This year, the principal sought permission from the district to provide professional development (PD) at the building, aligned with the specific needs of the school, rather than sending teachers out to district-provided PD. District leaders have committed to the improvement of the school by supporting the principal’s requests for more autonomy in making curricular decisions and staffing changes.

School leaders sought input from teachers and parents in the development of an Innovation plan that, if approved, will allow the school to implement a school health clinic and preschool program on site. Additionally, the school’s plan emphasizes science, technology, engineering, arts, and mathematics (STEAM) through Understanding by Design (UBD) project-based learning (PBL) as an instructional delivery model. District leaders are supportive of the school’s plan for Innovation.

**The State Review Panel does not recommend management by a private or public entity other than the district** because district leaders are committed to supporting school leadership to improve student learning. The Superintendent is new within the last two school years and has previous experience as a turnaround principal in another district. She is supportive of providing the principal more autonomy to implement change and is committed to holding her accountable for demonstrating improvement. District leaders have expressed a commitment to
ensuring the principal has the right personnel on campus to support Innovation plan initiatives, and has committed to making leadership changes if the school does not experience improvement.

Additionally, school staff is invested in the school's new mission and vision and is committed to implementing a school-wide PBL STEAM focus. School staff is committed to the school, based on its high level of trust with the current school and district leadership. Further, the current school leadership is working collaboratively with the Colorado Department of Education and has been awarded a Turnaround (TA) Network Grant, which will provide additional professional development for school leaders. The school's leaders are participating in the Relay Graduate School of Education (Relay) leadership development program beginning in 2017-18.

The State Review Panel does not recommend conversion to charter school status because, as stated above, the school has effective leadership and infrastructure. There is apparent trust between the school and district leadership. District leaders are committed to supporting the school’s Innovation plan proposal and are providing the school with further autonomy to differentiate professional development to meet the needs of the school. District leaders are also providing support to the school by conducting weekly walkthroughs with the principal and supporting the principal in making changes in staffing, as necessary. Further, school staff and parents are committed to the new mission, vision, and values of the school and are supportive of the school’s proposed Innovation plan. Finally, there is currently no community infrastructure or teacher momentum in place to initiate and develop a charter board to govern the school.

Finally, the State Review Panel does not recommend closure as an option for Martinez Elementary School because the school has demonstrated an Effective rating in three of six indicators. The school has effective school leadership, district-level support, and a staff committed to the school’s mission and vision moving forward. The leadership and staff are committed to implementing a PBL teaching structure to implement a focus on STEAM education. More importantly, Martinez is part of the community’s cultural identity. Parents have a deep level of trust in school leaders and teachers, and the school staff respects, and is committed to, supporting families. All stakeholders reported feeling safe at the school. The majority of Martinez parents walk their children to and from school each day and attend the same neighborhood churches; many have attended the school for generations. Any short term academic benefits gained from students attending other higher-performing schools would be negated by the impact closure would have on students and families within the community.
Purpose: The State Review Panel (SRP, or the Panel) was created by the Accountability Act of 2009 to provide a critical evaluation of the state’s lowest-performing schools and districts’ plans for dramatic action, and provide recommendations to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education. The Panel’s work is informed by a review of documents (e.g., Unified Improvement Plan) and, in some cases, by a site visit. The site visit component was added in 2013 to strengthen panelists’ understanding of the conditions in the schools and districts that are further along on the accountability clock. The expectation is that the site visit will inform their recommendations to the Commissioner and the State Board of Education about potential actions at the end of the accountability clock.

Prior to arriving on site, panelists conducted a document review aligned to the six key areas in the Accountability Act. The results of this review were shared with all members of the site visit team and helped inform the team’s work during the visit. On site at the school/district, the site visit team used evidence collected through classroom observations, focus groups, interviews, and document review to come to consensus on capacity levels in relation to the six key areas. This report presents the school/district’s capacity levels in relation to the six key areas and a summary of evidence for each.
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SRP Site Visit Summary (complete using ratings from the following pages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. The leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results.  
   Effective

2. The infrastructure is adequate to support school improvement.  
   Effective

3. There is readiness and apparent capacity of personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate action to improve student academic performance.  
   Effective

4. There is readiness and apparent capacity to engage productively with and benefit from the assistance provided by an external partner.  
   Developing

5. There is likelihood of positive returns on state investments of assistance and support to improve the performance within the current management structure and staffing.  
   Not Effective

6. There is necessity that the school remain in operation to serve students.  
   Yes
Capacity Level Rubric

The site visit team will use the following guidance to select a capacity level for each key question. Note that the quality standard for each capacity level is based on the extent to which the site visit team finds multiple types and multiple sources of evidence related to the adoption and/or implementation of a practice or system AND the extent to which the site visit team finds evidence of high levels of adoption and/or implementation of a practice or system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Level</th>
<th>Quality Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is not a practice or system that has been adopted and/or implemented at the school/district, or that the level of adoption/implementation does not improve the school/district’s effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is a practice or system that is developing at the school/district, but that it has not yet been implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school/district’s effectiveness, OR that the impact of the key action on the effectiveness of the school/district cannot yet be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is a practice or system that has been adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school/district’s effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is a practice or system that has been fully adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has had a demonstrably positive impact on the school/district’s effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**SRP Evaluation based on Site Visit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Claims &amp; Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results.</td>
<td>Capacity Level: [ ] Highly Effective [ X ] Effective [ ] Developing [ ] Not Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Considerations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1 Leadership acts as a change agent to drive dramatic achievement gains.</th>
<th>Leadership acts as a change agent and is beginning to drive achievement gains.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership communicates a relentless commitment to the school turnaround.</td>
<td>• District and school leaders, as well as teachers and parents, all described the principal’s commitment to school improvement and setting a new vision for the school. School leaders explained that a diagnostic review conducted in September 2015 has guided school improvement planning work since that time. School leaders, teachers, and school support staff all reported that school leaders asked for input from all stakeholder groups (teachers, parents, and support staff) to develop the mission and vision for the school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership makes data-driven changes to the academic program and organization to promote dramatic achievement gains.</td>
<td>• School leaders concentrate on a limited number of priorities. When asked to describe the school’s Major Improvement Strategies (MIS), district and school leaders, as well as teachers and support staff all described the school’s emphasis on “Best First Instruction” and “Culture and Climate”.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership conveys clear expectations for performance for all stakeholders, including leadership, teachers, students, and partners.</td>
<td>• School leaders distribute leadership responsibilities. School leaders and teachers stated that the teacher leadership team provides input on all school improvement efforts. For example, teacher leaders provided input into the school’s Unified Improvement Plan (UIP). The team meets on Mondays during early release time for 45 minutes weekly. Teachers explained that they applied to be a part of the leadership team, and all teachers interested and committed were selected to participate. Teachers described other leadership opportunities such as serving on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School leaders distribute leadership responsibilities to appropriate individuals or groups.</td>
<td>data on progress toward goals drives organizational and instructional decision making</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.2 Leadership establishes clear, targeted and measurable goals designed to promote student performance.

1.3 Leadership analyzes data to identify and address high priority challenges, and to adjust implementation of the action plan.
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1.4 Leadership establishes high expectations for student learning and behavior.

- The school holds high expectations for academic learning.
- Educators set high expectations for learning and clearly convey these to students.
- Educators convey that students are responsible for raising their performance and encourage their participation in learning.
- The school provides a safe environment to support students’ learning and, in the case of a virtual school, ensures that students’ interactions between and among themselves and school staff are respectful and supportive.
- Leadership ensures that school’s physical environment is clean, orderly, and safe.

- Teachers stated that school leaders expect teachers to share school’s multi-tiered support system (MTSS) team, which teachers are asked to serve on and lead based on their experience and expertise in this area.
- Teachers shared that one teacher from each grade level/program actively works with other staff and parents in support of the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) and School Accountability Committee (SAC), as well as facilitating Parent Universities and Kindergarten Roundup activities. Additionally, school leaders and teachers explained a nomination process for selecting teachers to attend the Buck Institute Project-Based Learning (PBL) institute in California this summer, 2017. Teachers explained that school leaders selected five teachers to attend, while the staff nominated an additional four colleagues outside of their grade-level team whom they “respect and that would represent Martinez well.”
- School leaders and teachers are beginning to use data to improve the academic program. For example, district and school leaders and teachers reported that the school is progress-monitoring students on DIBELS every six days, while the district expectation is monitoring every six weeks. Teachers use the data from the assessments during data team meetings to make decisions about how to group students for instruction and intervention. DIBELS data confirmed that students are beginning to make gains in reading achievement. Further, district leaders shared and a review of data reports confirmed that although Martinez is not yet demonstrating significant improvement in math, the school is performing in top half of the district on district literacy assessments in English language arts (ELA).

Leadership establishes high expectations for student learning and behavior.

- Teachers stated that school leaders expect teachers to share
| Learning goals with students, such as the number of words read per minute (WPM) and students’ weekly progress toward attaining goals. Additionally, teachers shared that they are expected to reflect with students regarding their progress toward accomplishing academic goals.  
• Teachers described the school leader’s expectations for charting student progress aligned with learning goals. Teachers explained that they are expected to have students self-assess their understanding of learning goals by identifying their level of understanding such as “I can move on,” “I need more time,” or “I need help.”  
• Teachers shared that leaders provided time for teachers to develop “non-negotiables” for each grade level in writing. Teachers reported that they met with the grade-level teams above and below their own and identified essential skills for writing that students must have to be successful.  
• School support staff and teachers reported that they are implementing an inclusion model to support high expectations for all students. To support the least restrictive environment (LRE), school leaders implemented a push-in model of in-classroom support for English learners and students receiving special education services this year, in addition to providing pullout targeted support with school support staff.  
• District and school leaders stated, and a review of the school’s data confirmed, that the Martinez experiences significantly lower behavior incidents annually, as compared with other schools throughout the district. During classroom visits, the site review team observed that behavioral expectations were clear and understood by students in 100% of classrooms (n=8). In all classrooms visited, students followed the teacher’s directions, worked respectfully with each other, pushed in chairs, raised their hands, and completed assigned work as directed.  
• Finally, the school provides a safe environment to support students’ learning and ensures that student interactions between and among themselves and school staff are respectful and supportive. The site visit team observed students keeping their |
hands to themselves and standing in line quietly, while teachers monitored transitions in hallways. The site team observed a clean, orderly, inclusive environment. Teachers and students were heard saying “please” and “thank you” in classrooms. The site team also observed anti-bullying posters on the walls throughout the school hallways and signage displayed in English and Spanish. Additionally, the site visit team observed flags from around the world displayed in the front office.
### SRP Evaluation based on Site Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Claims &amp; Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2. The infrastructure is adequate to support school improvement.</strong></td>
<td>Capacity Level: [ ] Highly Effective [ X ] Effective [ ] Developing [ ] Not Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Considerations:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.1: The district leads intentional, strategic efforts to ensure the effectiveness of the academic program and the sustainability of the organization.</strong></td>
<td>The district leads intentional, strategic efforts to ensure the effectiveness of the academic program and the sustainability of the organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The district/superintendent ensures ongoing leadership development for emerging and current school leaders with a focus on building leadership capacity to lead turnaround efforts and sustain improvement.</td>
<td>- District and school leaders and teachers all reported that the new superintendent, hired in 2015, has been highly supportive of the school’s strategic improvement efforts. School leaders reported that due to the superintendent’s leadership and support, they have more autonomy to implement strategies to improve the academic program of the school. For example, during the 2015-16 academic year, the principal was allowed to utilize professional development (PD) days with teachers within the building to focus on school-specific needs, rather than requiring them to attend district training. This has continued during the 2016-17 academic year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The district/superintendent provides adequate oversight in schools’ work to deliver the curriculum, monitors instruction on a regular basis, and provides adequate support and feedback to principals to improve instruction.</td>
<td>- The district provides ongoing leadership development for emerging and current school leaders with a focus on building leadership capacity to lead turnaround efforts. District and school leaders explained that school leaders applied for, and were awarded, a Turnaround (TA) Network Grant by the Colorado Department of Education (CDE), which will provide additional PD for school leaders. Additionally, district leaders explained that the assistant principal (AP) is currently participating in the Relay Graduate School of Education (Relay) leadership development program and that the district’s Executive Director of Elementary Education, as well as the school’s principal, will participate in this program during the 2017-18 academic year as part of TA Network Grant. Additionally, the principal and AP each have monthly PD meetings with district leadership, primarily focused on district-wide initiatives, such as improving the teacher evaluation process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- The district provides adequate systems by which to capture and store data, report it to schools, and make it accessible for instructional staff to utilize.</td>
<td>- District and school leaders explained that the district provides a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  |  |
|  |  |

© 2017 SchoolWorks, LLC. All rights reserved.
2.3: School leadership ensures that the school has sound financial and operational systems and processes.

- School leadership ensures that the organizational structure supports essential school functions, and that roles and responsibilities of all individuals at the school are clear.
- School leadership has established effective means of communicating with school staff.
- School leadership ensures that the school meets all compliance requirements and deadlines set by the state, including the submission of school improvement plans, financial statements, school audit, calendar, and student attendance.
- School leadership effectively manages the school budget and cash flow, and there is a plan for long-term financial sustainability.
- The school leadership effectively manages operations (e.g., food services, transportation, school facilities).

School leadership develops and evaluates all staff and dismisses those who do not meet professional standards and expectations.

- Teachers reported that school leaders assign a mentor to all new teachers to the school, regardless of their years of teaching experience, to provide ongoing support during their first year at Martinez.
- Teachers explained that they were given time during data team meetings to create rubrics to evaluate learning targets and success criteria. In January, teachers conducted peer observations using these rubrics. Teachers explained that they then met to refine the rubrics based on those observations. They will use the revised rubrics to conduct another round of peer observations in April 2017.
- District and school leaders and teachers reported that the principal and AP conduct daily observations and weekly meetings with every teacher. The Executive Director of Elementary Education also conducts weekly walkthroughs with the principal to provide oversight and support for the school’s work to monitor instruction. District and school leaders shared that the principal conducted approximately 600 observations (10 minute walkthroughs) during the 2015-16 school year. They reported that, at the time of the State Review Panel visit (March 2017), they had already conducted about 530 for the 2016-17 school year.
- Teachers reported that they receive immediate feedback after each observation that includes areas of strength or “Positives” and “Think Abouts”, which are opportunities for improvement. Teachers reported that school leaders provide scripted observation

2.4: School leadership provides effective instructional leadership.

- School leaders ensure that the school implements a coherent, comprehensive, and aligned curriculum.
  - School leaders ensure that curriculum, instruction, and assessments are aligned with state standards, aligned with each other, & coordinated both within & across grade levels.
  - School leaders ensure that instructional materials are selected and/or developed in accordance with a schoolwide instructional framework and aligned with established curriculum standards.
  - School leaders ensure the curriculum is periodically reviewed and revisions are made accordingly.
- School leaders provide meaningful feedback on teachers’ instructional planning and practice.
  - Leaders regularly provide meaningful feedback on instructional planning.
  - Leaders regularly observe instruction and provide meaningful, timely feedback that helps teachers improve their practice.
- School leaders provide conditions that support a schoolwide data culture.
  - Teachers have easy access to varied, current, and accurate student and instructional data.
  - Teachers are provided time to collect, enter, analyze, & represent student data & use tools to help act on results.
  - School leaders ensure that all teachers receive full-time instructional coach (IC) who receives PD weekly with other district coaches at the school district level. With guidance from the district’s Executive Director of Elementary Education, school leaders have become more strategic in their collaboration with the IC. School leaders and teachers stated that having a full-time IC this year has also been highly valuable to the instructional development of teachers.
2.5: The school provides high quality instruction.

- Classroom interactions and organization ensure a classroom climate conducive to learning.
- Classroom instruction is intentional, engaging, and challenging for all students.
- The school identifies and supports special education students, English language learners, and students who are struggling or at risk.

School leadership provides effective instructional leadership.

- School leaders and teachers described a shift from relying on textbook programs as the curriculum to now using the standards to drive instruction. For example, rather than teaching the Wonders reading curriculum cover to cover, teachers reported that they are using the anthology and leveled readers to align with UBD units and to provide students with more time in text. Additionally, teachers explained that they came in over the summer one week before school started, and used materials within Full Option Science System (FOSS) kits to develop Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts, and Math (STEAM) units.
- Teachers shared that they are beginning to also align resources from external partners to support effective instruction. For example, the Denver Zoo provided an assembly for the school, and the Greeley museum has provided resources to support STEAM
School leaders and teachers reported that teachers participate in bi-weekly data team meetings. During these meetings, teachers examine student work samples and evaluate levels of mastery toward standards. Although school leaders set the agenda for data team meetings. They reported that they “try to step back” and let the teachers run the meetings.

School leaders and teachers shared that teachers have embraced, and now expect, regular feedback from leaders. School leaders conducted an action research experiment with teachers by conducting observations of teachers in classrooms. School leaders provided feedback after observations to half of the teachers and no feedback to the other half. School leaders and teachers reported the impact of the experiment, helping teachers realize the importance of providing immediate feedback to students.

The school does not yet consistently provide high quality instruction.

The site review team observed that the learning environment and learning time are purposeful and reflective of effective planning and guidance in 100% of classrooms. For example, teachers prepared and made available a variety of materials for student use, such as designated writing journals and colored pencils. Teachers posted directions on Promethean boards and communicated options for additional work for students who finished early, such as illustrating a picture of their writing.

However, teachers only provided students with clear learning goals and focused direct instruction in 38% of observed classrooms. Even though teachers and leaders emphasized that posting learning targets and success criteria are a school-wide expectation, in most observed classrooms, there were either no targets communicated, or posted targets did not align with the lesson being taught. For example, one posted target emphasized writing facts about an animal, while the lesson focused on sorting living and nonliving things. Further, when asked, students in the majority of observed classes could not articulate what the learning target was. When asked, one student replied, “We don’t have a learning target.
The site review team observed instruction requiring all students to use and develop higher-order thinking skills in only 13% of classrooms. In most observed classes, students were completing tasks that required them to work independently with no opportunity for discussion. Teachers typically asked recall and identification questions, such as, “Do you have a capital letter?” and, “How many halves do you have?” Teachers did not ask students to justify their answers. Classroom activities generally included low-level application of skills, such as students completing worksheets, independent reading, or having “free writing time,” rather than provide students opportunities to analyze, discuss, synthesize, or solve open-ended problems.

Assessment strategies revealed students' thinking about learning goals in 38% of observed classrooms. Although teachers were observed checking for understanding, students were often not able to answer correctly or demonstrate understanding of taught concepts when prompted by the teacher. For example, in one observed class, students were not able to transfer vocabulary words into meaning. After teacher instruction on “living” and “non-living,” students were not able to use the terms correctly. In some classrooms, no assessment or checks for understanding were observed.

The site visit team observed timely, frequent, specific feedback to inform improvement efforts in only 25% of classrooms. In the majority of classrooms, no feedback was provided to students. In some classrooms, students were not provided rubrics or success criteria for writing assignments. Feedback given to students was generally procedural, such as the teacher asking an off-task student, “What are you supposed to be doing right now?” versus providing content-based feedback to students.

During classroom visits, the site visit team observed several missed opportunities for teachers to use visual aids in instruction to support English learners (ELs) in making meaning of academic vocabulary. For example, the majority of instruction was delivered verbally or in writing, without any visual reference or supports for
| students. Although in interviews teachers described a push-in model of support for ELs and students on IEPs, the site review team only observed one teacher in each visited classroom with the exception of one. In the one classroom observed with two adults present, the English Language Development (ELD) specialist worked one-on-one with ELs in the back of the room. |
SRP Evaluation based on Site Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Claims &amp; Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. There is readiness and apparent capacity of personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate action to improve student academic performance.</td>
<td>Capacity Level: [ ] Highly Effective [X] Effective [ ] Developing [ ] Not Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considerations:

3.1: Educators’ mindsets and beliefs reflect shared commitments to students’ learning.

- Educators convey shared vision and values about teaching and learning and reference these to guide their instructional decision making.
- Educators convey a shared commitment to the learning of all students in the school.
- Educators convey a belief that students’ learning is their collective responsibility, regardless of students’ personal or home situations.
- Educators convey that it is important not to give up on any students, even if it appears that they do not want to learn.
- Educators convey commitment to, and hold each other accountable for, collaboratively established improvement goals and tasks.

3.2: The school has established conditions that support educators’ learning culture.

- School leaders stated, and a document review confirmed, that the principal provides updates to staff weekly through a staff newsletter sent each Sunday morning via email. The newsletter provides an updated schedule for two-weeks; expectations for teachers, such as progress monitoring new READ plan students; and upcoming PD. One newsletter included upcoming PD related to implementing learning targets and a reminder to teachers to bring student work samples to the next data team meeting. The last section of each week’s newsletter is entitled, “Leave No Doubt.” School leaders reported that this section provides an opportunity for the principal to provide a human connection and inspiration for staff. For example, within the section, the principal wrote, “I challenge you to make a difference in the life of a child.”
- School leaders shared, and teachers and support staff confirmed, that school leaders create structures to solicit input from all stakeholder groups. The school schedule indicates that collaborative planning time is built into the schedule daily. Teachers described the collaborative relationships among school leaders, teachers, and support staff in support of educator learning. Several teacher groups described a high level of trust among colleagues. They said they confide in each other for advice. For example, when they are having difficulty with a particular student,
### 3.3: Educators collaborate regularly to learn about effective instruction and students’ progress.

- Educators meet frequently, during regularly scheduled, uninterrupted times (e.g., staff, department, grade level meeting times) to collaborate, establish improvement goals, and make data-informed instructional decisions.
- Educators’ collaborative meetings have a clear and persistent focus on improving student learning and achievement.
- Educators describe sharing knowledge and expertise among colleagues as essential collaborative activity for job success.
- Teachers are willing to talk about their own instructional practice, to actively pursue and accept feedback from colleagues, and to try new teaching strategies.
- The school has created a performance-driven classroom culture in which teachers effectively use data to make decisions about daily instruction and the organization of students.
- Teachers use results from interim or summative assessments to make adjustments to the organization of students in the classroom, pace of instruction, or content being taught.
- Teachers use results from interim or summative assessments to identify students in need of remediation or acceleration, and assign students to appropriate supports.
- Qualified staff deliver instruction and provide the necessary supports for ELL students or students with special needs.
- Leaders involve faculty and staff in planning and implementation of school policies.
- Leaders provide opportunities for faculty and staff to make or provide input on important decisions.

### 3.4: Staff members demonstrate the capacity to implement appropriate action to support student achievement and school improvement.

- Teachers reported that they have had opportunities to observe each other and provide feedback specific to the implementation of learning targets and success criteria in instruction. Teachers explained that after they developed a rubric to evaluate the quality of learning targets and success criteria, they were provided time to observe colleagues using the rubrics to evaluate how learning targets and success criteria were being implemented across the school. Teachers then analyzed the effectiveness of the rubrics and suggested changes for improvement.
- Teachers described the process as allowing them to generate ideas in whole group or in smaller groups on sticky notes. School leaders and teachers explained that consensus circles were used to gather input into the development of the school’s innovation plan.

### 3.5: The school engages the community and families in support of students’ learning and school improvement efforts.

- The school includes parents/guardians in cultivating a culture of high expectations for students’ learning and their consistent support of students’ efforts.
- The school invites family participation in school activities (e.g., volunteering in classrooms or on committees; attendance at performances, sports events, organizational meetings) and regularly solicits their input.
- The school offers workshops and other opportunities for parents/guardians to learn about home practices that support student learning.
- Educators communicate with parents/guardians about instructional programs and students’ progress.

---

they ask a colleague for classroom management strategies to try. They are explained that they share lesson plans and instructional strategies with each other.

- School leaders and teachers reported that a PD focus this year has been on the implementation of consensus circles to promote teacher voice and collaboration. School leaders shared that the district provided training to all principals and district leaders. The principal also observed the superintendent model the use of consensus circles. The principal then provided training to the Martinez staff and included the consensus circles during staff meetings for decision-making. Teachers described the process as allowing them to generate ideas in whole group or in smaller groups on sticky notes. School leaders and teachers explained that consensus circles were used to gather input into the development of the school’s innovation plan.

**Educators collaborate regularly to learn about effective instruction and students’ progress.**

- Teachers reported that they have had opportunities to observe each other and provide feedback specific to the implementation of learning targets and success criteria in instruction. Teachers explained that after they developed a rubric to evaluate the quality of learning targets and success criteria, they were provided time to observe colleagues using the rubrics to evaluate how learning targets and success criteria were being implemented across the school. Teachers then analyzed the effectiveness of the rubrics and suggested changes for improvement.
- Additionally, teachers reported that during data team meetings, they calibrate around student work expectations by bringing proficient and non-proficient student work samples. Teachers grade each other’s papers to create a common understanding of writing expectations for students. Teachers also reported that they bring samples of student work and each share out where they believe each piece of work falls on a rubric. Teachers reported that this practice has helped them raise their expectations of student work.
• Teachers further shared that they often turn to colleagues for assistance with lesson planning during the collaborative planning times scheduled during the school day, or after school and on the weekends. Teachers shared that they meet at each other’s homes in the evenings or on weekends to plan or discuss instructional strategies.

• The student support team shared that they collaboratively conducted action research and analyzed data resulting in a proposal to school leaders to implement a co-teaching model. The support team explained that co-teaching is currently being piloted and will complement current intervention structures such as push-in and pull-out support for students.

The school engages the community and families in support of students’ learning and school improvement efforts.

• Parents described daily communication with teachers. They explained that teachers at Martinez are very caring and know all of the students by name. Parents further explained that most parents walk their children to and from school every day. Teachers and parents reported that they often discuss student behavior and progress during these times as needed.

• The school supports family participation and communication. The site visit team observed parents eating breakfast in the cafeteria prior to the start of the school day. Teachers reported that translation services are available for teachers to communicate effectively with families whenever needed. The school provides interpreters through the office staff or through community members. Additionally, the site review team reviewed that the school’s student family handbook, which is published in English and Spanish and the school website, has a translating function that translates content into multiple languages.

• School leaders and parents reported that the principal holds coffee and donut meetings with parents once per month in the mornings to discuss parent questions and concerns and to share information about school initiatives. Additionally, the principal communicates with parents about the school’s programs during SAC meetings.
During focus group interviews, school leaders, teachers, and parents reported that parents reviewed the innovation plan and provided feedback during these meetings. Parents reported that they are very excited about the direction the school is headed. Parents specifically commented about their support for the school’s plans to open a health clinic and preschool.

- School leaders, teachers, and parents also described the school’s Parent University, which was implemented during the 2016-17 school year to provide opportunities for parents to learn about home practices that support student learning. They explained that teachers demonstrate instructional strategies with parents or parents learn about specific ways they can support their child at home. According to teachers, one recent Parent University topic was, “How to help your student to be a successful leader.”

- During focus group interviews, teachers described parents as committed to supporting student learning. They reported that if there is ever a problem with student behavior, parents address the concern immediately. Teachers and school leaders reported that school leaders expect 100% attendance at parent-teacher conferences. They explained that, if parents cannot make conferences, teachers immediately follow-up with them to arrange for a make-up meeting. Teachers explained that conferences are strategically scheduled with families of multiple children first to accommodate parents’ schedules.
### SRP Evaluation based on Site Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Claims &amp; Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. There is readiness and apparent capacity to engage productively with and benefit from the assistance provided by an external partner.</td>
<td>Capacity Level: [ ] Highly Effective [ ] Effective [X] Developing [ ] Not Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Considerations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1: The school collaborates effectively with existing external partners.</th>
<th>The school collaborates effectively with existing external partners, but is not yet leveraging partnerships to support student learning.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The school seeks expertise from external partners, as appropriate (i.e., for professional development, direct support for students).</td>
<td>• School leaders and teachers explained, and a review of the contract with the organization confirmed, that the JDO Foundation is providing PD for 4th and 5th grade teachers involved in a technology grant. The foundation provides training for teachers through Google Classroom and requires teachers to collaborate with teachers in England and Ireland to build lessons, based on aligned standards and curriculum. Although the JDO Foundation grant aligns with the school’s plan to implement a Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Math (STEAM) emphasis, the grant is only in its first year of implementation and is only impacting five classrooms currently.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The school ensures that roles and responsibilities of existing partners are clear.</td>
<td>• School leaders, teachers, and support staff also described the school’s partnership with Redeemer Lutheran Church. School leaders, teachers, and support staff all commented on the resources provided to the school, including the church’s support for the school’s annual “Back to School Night”, carnival celebration, and free piano and guitar lessons for students. However, no focus groups described how the church directly supports the school’s efforts to improve academic performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• There are designated school personnel to coordinate and manage partnerships.</td>
<td>• School leaders and teachers reported that through support from a partnership with the Colorado Education Initiative (CEI), a group of teachers conducted a site visit to Loveland School District earlier this year to learn how to examine student work through the Literacy Design Collaborative (LDC). According to teachers, grade-level teams are now using the LDC protocol to examine expectations for grade-level work as they continue to develop Understanding by Design (UBD) units of instruction. School leaders and teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2: The school leverages existing partnerships to support of student learning.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The school maximizes existing partners’ efforts in support of improvement efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• All externally provided professional development is aligned to improvement efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.3: Leadership is responsive to feedback.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership seeks feedback on improvement plans.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership seeks feedback from key stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership integrates feedback into future improvement efforts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
reported that additional teachers and leaders plan to visit the Loveland school next year. Although school leaders and teachers all stated that they are excited about the implementation of LDC, this initiative is in the first year of implementation, and not all teachers and leaders have yet been fully trained.

- Although the school currently partners with Head Start to provide on-site preschool, teachers and school leaders reported that slots are too limited to service all of the students who need access to early childhood education.

**Leadership is responsive to feedback.**

- District and school leaders indicated that strong partnerships exist between district and school leaders and CDE, which are supporting the school’s improvement efforts. For example, the school applied for, and received, a Diagnostic Review (DR) and Improvement Planning Grant in September 2015, which included feedback that has since driven the development of the school’s Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) and Innovation Plan.

- The DR processes indicated that the school should focus on improving “Best First Instruction”. The DR report suggested that school leaders and teachers “Learn more about the power of effective formative assessment practices and how they can be embedded into daily instruction.” The school is now focusing on training teachers through LDC on implementing all three components of UBD, learning targets, success criteria, and formative assessments.

- The DR also indicated that the school should improve its “Climate and Culture.” One suggestion within the DR report suggested that the school should revisit the school’s mission and accompanying description to ensure that it communicates the purpose and direction of the school. School leaders re-visited the mission and vision with school staff and parents during the 2016-2017 school year, as indicated in the UIP and in teacher and leader focus group interviews.
State Review Panel School Document Review Feedback Form 2016-17

SRP Evaluation based on Site Visit

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Claims &amp; Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. There is likelihood of positive returns on state investments of assistance and support to improve the performance within the current management structure and staffing.</td>
<td>Capacity Level: [ ] Highly Effective [ ] Effective [ ] Developing [ X ] Not Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considerations:

5.1: Leadership monitors the return on investment of specific improvement initiatives, and uses that data to inform decision-making.

- Leadership identifies turnaround strategies and implements programs/initiatives designed to improve student performance.
- Leadership assesses the cost and impact (effect on student achievement and number of students served) of each program/initiative to determine its academic return on investment.
- Leadership makes decisions regarding continuation or discontinuation of programs/initiatives based on this analysis.
- Leadership establishes systems and structures to support regular and ongoing monitoring.

5.2: Leadership has demonstrated an ability to produce positive returns on state investment and uses resources effectively.

- Programs and initiatives are designed to support turnaround efforts and have demonstrated results.
- Leadership seeks resources aligned to its improvement efforts and programs/initiatives with high academic return on investment.
- Any additional resources received (i.e., specialized grant funding) are aligned, strategic, and showing evidence of results.
- Leadership treats resources flexibly, and implements focused improvement efforts with a focus on early wins.

5.3: Students demonstrate academic progress over time.

- Students demonstrate progress on internal measures linked with the school's promotion or exit standards.
- The performance of student subgroups on state assessments demonstrates that the school is making progress toward eliminating achievement gaps.
- Students meet proficiency and grade-level targets across subjects and grade levels on norm-referenced benchmark assessments and state assessments.
- Matched cohorts of students who score proficient or advanced (or equivalent) on state assessments maintain or improve performance levels across continuous enrollment years.
- The percentage of all students performing at proficient or

Leadership does not strategically monitor the return on investment of specific improvement initiatives.

- District and school leaders stated that they received a Pathways Grant, which led the school to identify Innovation as a pathway to improve student performance. School leaders developed an Innovation Plan with input from teachers, support staff, and parents designed to improve student performance. During focus group interviews, school leaders and teachers explained that the Innovation Plan will enable the school to implement PBL to focus on STEAM. However, when asked, they could not cite research supporting this decision or articulate why they had chosen STEAM as a focus, except that the principal has an interest in science and had given teachers information about science, technology, engineering and math (STEM) education. Teachers explained that they decided that they also wanted to incorporate the arts.

- A review of the school’s proposed Innovation Plan and interviews with district and school leaders revealed that the school is requesting waivers from district policies, which the school believes will support improvement efforts. These waivers include allowing the school to implement differentiated personnel and pay, human resources management, staff hiring processes, and provide flexibility within the district’s collective bargaining agreement, such as the redefinition of workday and non-contact hours.

- However, when asked, school leaders and teachers could not articulate a strategy for evaluating the cost and impact of school initiatives, the effect on student achievement, or academic return on investment. Further, when asked, neither school leaders nor teachers could describe the school’s strategy for adopting or abandoning new
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students do not demonstrate sufficient academic progress over time.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A review of district benchmark assessment results indicated increases in the percentage of students meeting and exceeding standards for ELA in all grade levels, with the most significant gains in 3rd-5th grades. However, there is no indication that the observed results on district benchmarks are significant enough to impact increased student performance on state assessments over time. There is no evidence that growth on district developed benchmark assessments will correlate with achievement or growth on state administered PARCC assessments, since the school is currently in year five of priority improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A review of DIBELS assessment data indicated that all grade levels are increasing the percentage of students at benchmark from beginning of the year (BOY) to middle of the year (MOY) and decreasing the number of students scoring well below benchmark (WBB), with the exception of 3rd grade, which increased students scoring WBB by one student. Martinez is experiencing more growth on DIBELS as compared with national trends, according to the national quintile report reviewed by the site visit team. National quintile results show 20% of students making above average growth, while 41% of Martinez students are making above average growth. However, there remain over half of Martinez students making less than above average growth on DIBELS, and the school is currently performing below the district, according to the School Performance Framework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A review of the school’s PARCC data indicated that although 5th grade growth scores for ELA resulted in above average growth for female students, Hispanic students, non-ELs, and students who are and are not economically disadvantaged, 3rd-4th grade PARCC growth is typically below the 50th median growth percentile (MGP) with the exception of 53.5 MGP for Black students. These results indicate that the school is not making sufficient enough growth to move the school out of priority improvement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### State Review Panel Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. There is necessity that the school remain in operation to serve students.</th>
<th>Claims &amp; Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[X] Yes [ ] No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Considerations:**

#### 6.1: The school is mission-driven and its mission and vision meet a unique need.

- All stakeholders share an understanding of, and commitment to, the mission and vision.
- School programs reflect the mission and vision.
- The mission and vision guide decisions about teaching and learning.
- The mission and vision meet the needs of an identified student population.


- When asked during focus group interviews, all stakeholders articulated the school’s mission and vision to educate the whole child. Parents, teachers, and leaders all described the school’s work revisiting the mission and vision and the school’s new mission statement and beliefs, “Love, Live, Learn.”
- The school’s mission and belief statements emphasize building a safe, trusting environment for students in which students, faculty, and parents all work together, “bringing a unique cultural perspective.” Further, the school’s mission emphasizes the school’s commitment to innovation, UBD, and PBL as teaching strategies for personalized student learning.
- As indicated in the school’s written vision and accompanying belief statements, Martinez parents, teachers, and students all work together to create a solid foundation of learning for the future. Teacher and parent focus groups described a strong sense of community within the Martinez school and surrounding neighborhood with an emphasis on their care and commitment to the school.
- The site review team overheard morning announcements, which included student leaders reciting along with the students and staff the “Panther Pledge” and “I am Somebody” affirmation. The team also observed hallway posters with inspirational quotes and student artwork displayed throughout the hallways and classrooms.

#### 6.2 There are no other viable options for enrolled students that will likely lead to better outcomes.

- There are limited other school options available (e.g., online, charter, district).
- The school serves an isolated and/or remote community.
- Closure would have a significant negative impact on the community.
- Comparison schools do not promote better student outcomes.

There are no other viable options for enrolled students that will likely lead to better outcomes.

- School leaders, teachers, support staff, and parents all described
Martinez as the center of the community. Parents explained that parents “watch out for all of the students” and consider the school a family.

- Although a review of district performance frameworks indicates that other schools within the district are experiencing higher levels of academic performance, parents, teachers, and support staff all explained that the majority of Martinez students walk to school and live in the surrounding neighborhood. Martinez families all attend the same neighborhood churches and many parents and grandparents attended Martinez as children.

- Although Martinez is entering year five of priority improvement, the school has demonstrated a commitment to improvement. School leaders and teachers explained that the school was proactive in seeking out the Pathways grant to support identification of innovation as a turnaround strategy and for the development of the school’s innovation plan. All stakeholders provided input into the development of the innovation plan.

- Many Martinez students experience challenges that impact their academic success. Many students are English learners or living in poverty. Teachers also explained that many students do not have access to early childhood education. The school’s innovation plan proposal includes the addition of an on-site, school-based health care center and preschool to help address some of these identified challenges for students and families.
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### SRP Summary (complete using ratings from the following worksheets)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Capacity Level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The infrastructure is adequate to support school improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>There is readiness and apparent capacity of personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate action to improve student academic performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>There is readiness and apparent capacity to engage productively with, and benefit from, the assistance provided by an external partner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>There is likelihood of positive returns on state investments of assistance and support to improve the performance within the current management structure and staffing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>There is necessity that the school remain in operation to serve students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Based on your professional judgment, will the plan result in dramatic enough change to pull the school/district off the accountability clock if it is implemented as written?**

- [ ] Yes  [X] No  [ ] Not sure, more information is needed. Specify the additional information required.

**Based on your professional judgment, what is your overall level of concern regarding this school/district’s ability to significantly improve results?**

- Level of Concern:  [X] High  [ ] Moderate  [ ] Low  [ ] Cannot determine. Specify the additional information required.
Overall Comments:

Martinez Elementary is a Title I Focus School, currently serving students in kindergarten through fifth grade. The school is entering Year 5 Priority Improvement. Martinez serves a unique population of students, primarily from Latino heritage. Approximately 97% of Martinez students receive free or reduced lunch.

School leadership revisited the school’s vision, mission, and beliefs with stakeholders during the 2016-2017 school year. The school’s vision: “Martinez Dedicated-Children Educated-A Better Future Created; Martinez parents, students, and teachers all work together to create a solid foundation of learning for the future,” and mission: “Love, Live, Learn” are communicated in the Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) and on the school’s website.

Although the school has demonstrated growth in English language proficiency on the World-Class Instructional Design and Assessment (WIDA) and the Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State (ACCESS) assessment, the school has not made significant improvement on state-administered English language arts and math assessments to cause the school to come “off the accountability clock.” According to the School Performance framework (SPF) the school’s performance falls below district and state expectations in all content areas (English language arts, math, and science). As a result, the school received a Diagnostic Review Grant from the Colorado Department of Education in 2015 and a Pathways Grant in 2016, which are driving school improvement planning efforts. Specifically, feedback from the review indicated that the school should focus on providing “Best First Instruction” and “Culture and Climate” of staff. These recommendations have been incorporated into the Major Improvement Strategies of the UIP. To further address the low performance, the school is currently writing an Innovation Plan focused on providing a STEAM focus and is preparing to present the plan to the State Board of Education in April 2017.

School leadership is beginning to plan for implementing change to drive improvement efforts. Three Major Improvement Strategies (MIS) are identified within the UIP: Best First Instruction, Culture, and Title I Supports. Although student academic and growth performance on state-administered PARCC assessments in English language arts and math have been flat for several years, performance on the WIDA ACCESS assessment for English language learners (ELLs) has been high.

According to the school’s UIP, the school has several curriculum resources in place to support student learning. The school uses a “walk to read” structure in kindergarten and first grade, while students in grades 2–5 stay with their homeroom teachers for all core subject areas. Some students are in a pullout program for reading core replacement. Students in grades 2–5 are grouped according to their academic needs in reading for an additional targeted instructional block provided during the school day. In addition to classroom teachers, four ELD teachers, five interventionists, and additional support staff help assist in meeting student needs.
Areas that should be explored more deeply through an on-site visit:

1) What are the goals of the school? What are the school’s priorities?
2) How do leaders ensure a safe and supportive school environment that supports learning?
3) What responsibilities do students have in the learning process?
4) How do leaders gauge the culture and climate of staff-peer relationships, staff-student relationships, and how do teachers perceive their learners?
5) What supports does the district provide to assist with school improvement efforts?
6) What types of professional development are provided for teachers/staff/school leaders?
7) How does school leadership manage the school budget?
8) How does the school leadership effectively manage operations?
9) Describe the evaluation process at the school.
10) How is data collected during observations, and used?
11) What do Martinez action plans look like as outlined in the UIP?
12) How are transitions from preschool to kindergarten supported by school staff?
13) Describe the WIDA writing non-negotiables structure.
14) Describe a recent staff meeting (how often, who leads, what is discussed?).
15) Describe the data teams.
16) How is staff involved in the implementation of school policies?
17) How do leaders provide opportunities for faculty and staff to make or provide input on important decisions?
18) How are parents encouraged to participate?
19) How do leaders involve staff in the planning and implementation of improvement strategies?
20) How do teachers provide opportunities for students and parents to be part of the learning process?
21) How do parents support their child’s learning? How do the external partners support the goals of the school?
22) How does the school monitor the effectiveness of improvement strategies?
23) How does the school share data with stakeholders?
24) How does the school know if external partners are helping to meet student needs or school priorities?
25) How does the school ensure that investments are maximized to improve student learning? (How do they monitor ROI?)
26) How does the school monitor student achievement internally and externally?
27) Why do students/families choose to attend Martinez?
28) How are stakeholders involved in developing and reviewing the MVB?
29) How does Martinez compare with other options for students?
Capacity Level Rubric

The site visit team will use the following guidance to select a capacity level for each key question. Note that the quality standard for each capacity level is based on the extent to which the site visit team finds multiple types and multiple sources of evidence related to the adoption and/or implementation of a practice or system AND the extent to which the site visit team finds evidence of high levels of adoption and/or implementation of a practice or system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Level</th>
<th>Quality Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Effective</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is not a practice or system that has been adopted and/or implemented at the school/district, or that the level of adoption/implementation does not improve the school/district’s effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is a practice or system that is developing at the school/district, but that it has not yet been implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school/district’s effectiveness, OR that the impact of the key action on the effectiveness of the school/district cannot yet be determined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is a practice or system that has been adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has begun to improve the school/district’s effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highly Effective</td>
<td>Evidence indicates that the key question is a practice or system that has been fully adopted at the school, and is implemented at a level that has had a demonstrably positive impact on the school/district’s effectiveness.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SRP Evaluation Based on Unified Improvement Plan and Other Available Documents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Look-Fors</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Leadership acts as a change agent to drive dramatic achievement gains.</td>
<td>• Evidence of leadership driving impactful change. (Major Imp. Strategies &amp; Action Plan)</td>
<td>• School leaders are beginning to act as a change agent to drive achievement gains. School leaders distribute leadership responsibilities to individuals and groups. The UIP identifies instructional coaches, parents, teachers, and administrators as accountable for many action steps within the plan such as data analysis, decision-making, and parent involvement activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership communicates a relentless commitment to the school turnaround.</td>
<td>• The degree to which leadership has been continuous over time or change(s) in leadership utilized to activate change. (see HR data)</td>
<td>• School leadership is beginning to establish clear, measurable goals designed to promote student performance. For example, leadership concentrates on a limited number of priorities. Three Major Improvement Strategies are identified within the UIP (Best First Instruction, Culture, and Title I Supports); however, there are many targets contained within the UIP Target Setting Form in the areas of academic achievement, growth, and disaggregated growth. For example, the school has identified targets for academic achievement in reading for every grade level, and has identified several targets for math including sub-group targets for growth. Further, specific interim measures are missing for all identified targets within the UIP. For example, the plan states that the school will move students up a level on the annual state-mandated language assessment, WIDA ACCESS, but does not indicate how the school will monitor attainment of this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership makes data-driven changes to the academic program and organization to promote dramatic achievement gains.</td>
<td>• Leadership communicates clear and focused goals that are understood by all staff.</td>
<td>• School leadership is beginning to establish clear, measurable goals designed to promote student performance. For example, leadership concentrates on a limited number of priorities. Three Major Improvement Strategies are identified within the UIP (Best First Instruction, Culture, and Title I Supports); however, there are many targets contained within the UIP Target Setting Form in the areas of academic achievement, growth, and disaggregated growth. For example, the school has identified targets for academic achievement in reading for every grade level, and has identified several targets for math including sub-group targets for growth. Further, specific interim measures are missing for all identified targets within the UIP. For example, the plan states that the school will move students up a level on the annual state-mandated language assessment, WIDA ACCESS, but does not indicate how the school will monitor attainment of this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership conveys clear expectations for performance for all stakeholders, including leadership, teachers, students, and partners.</td>
<td>• High, but realistic goals are set.</td>
<td>• School leadership is beginning to establish clear, measurable goals designed to promote student performance. For example, leadership concentrates on a limited number of priorities. Three Major Improvement Strategies are identified within the UIP (Best First Instruction, Culture, and Title I Supports); however, there are many targets contained within the UIP Target Setting Form in the areas of academic achievement, growth, and disaggregated growth. For example, the school has identified targets for academic achievement in reading for every grade level, and has identified several targets for math including sub-group targets for growth. Further, specific interim measures are missing for all identified targets within the UIP. For example, the plan states that the school will move students up a level on the annual state-mandated language assessment, WIDA ACCESS, but does not indicate how the school will monitor attainment of this goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School leaders distribute leadership responsibilities to appropriate individuals or groups.</td>
<td>• Leadership communicates clear and focused goals that are understood by all staff.</td>
<td>• School leadership is beginning to establish clear, measurable goals designed to promote student performance. For example, leadership concentrates on a limited number of priorities. Three Major Improvement Strategies are identified within the UIP (Best First Instruction, Culture, and Title I Supports); however, there are many targets contained within the UIP Target Setting Form in the areas of academic achievement, growth, and disaggregated growth. For example, the school has identified targets for academic achievement in reading for every grade level, and has identified several targets for math including sub-group targets for growth. Further, specific interim measures are missing for all identified targets within the UIP. For example, the plan states that the school will move students up a level on the annual state-mandated language assessment, WIDA ACCESS, but does not indicate how the school will monitor attainment of this goal.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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| 1.4 Leadership establishes high expectations for student learning and behavior. | sharing and using data are present. (see Action Plan) | results indicate that 100% of teachers perceive that they are held to high standards of instructional delivery, data from the diagnostic review indicated the school’s need to focus on addressing “School Culture and Climate” and “Best First Instruction” as Major Improvement Strategies for the 2016-2017 school year.

- Per the Weld County School District website, Greeley-Evans School District 6 has 11 elementary schools scattered across neighborhoods in Greeley and Evans. The schools range in size from approximately 400 to 700 students. Per the school website, Martinez Elementary School is a kindergarten through 5th grade school with approximately 583 students, 33 teachers, and an average class size of 23 students. |
### 2. The infrastructure is adequate to support school improvement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Look-Fors</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2.1: The district leads intentional, strategic efforts to ensure the effectiveness of the academic program and the sustainability of the organization. | - The district/superintendent ensures ongoing leadership development for emerging and current school leaders with a focus on building leadership capacity to lead turnaround efforts and sustain improvement.  
- The district/superintendent provides adequate oversight in schools’ work to deliver the curriculum, monitors instruction on a regular basis, and provides adequate support and feedback to principals to improve instruction.  
- The district provides adequate systems by which to capture and store data, report it to school leaders, and make it accessible for instructional staff to utilize. | - Evidence of district involvement. (see Data Narrative, Action Plan)  
- Evidence of district support and feedback to principals to improve instruction.  
- Evidence of district systems by which to capture and store data, report it to principals, and make it accessible for instructional staff to utilize. |
| 2.2: School leadership has a strong focus on recruiting and retaining talent; creates and implements systems to select, develop, and retain effective teachers and staff who can drive dramatic student gains; evaluates all staff; and dismisses those who do not meet professional standards and expectations. | - Leadership has created and/or implemented an organizational and staffing structure that will drive dramatic student gains.  
- Leadership recruits and hires teachers with commitment to, and competence in, the school’s philosophy, design, and instructional framework (e.g., trained and experienced with curriculum, certified/licensed to teach, qualified in subject area).  
- Trained mentors provide beginning teachers with sustained, job-embedded induction.  
- Leadership ensures the evaluation of all staff, and dismisses those who do not meet standards and expectations.  
- Leadership provides teachers with active, intense, and sustained professional development (PD), including guidance on data analysis and instructional practice, aligned to school improvement efforts.  
  - PD is informed by ongoing analysis of student performance, instructional data, and educators’ learning needs.  
  - PD requires teachers to demonstrate their learned competency in a tangible and assessable way.  
  - PD engages teachers in active learning (e.g., leading instruction, discussing with colleagues, observing others, developing assessments), & provides follow-up sessions and ongoing support for teachers’ continued learning.  
- The quality of professional development delivery is | - Indication of strategic staff changes, particularly at the supervisory level, to support dramatic improvement efforts. (see HR data)  
- Evidence of professional development activities aligned to priorities. (see Data Narrative, Action Plan, TELL data)  
- Evidence of professional development delivery is appropriate for instructional staff to utilize. |
2.3: School leadership ensures that the school has sound financial and operational systems and processes

- School leadership ensures that the organizational structure supports essential school functions, & roles and responsibilities of all at the school are clear.
- School leadership has established effective means of communicating with school staff.
- School leadership ensures that the school meets all compliance requirements and deadlines set by the state, including the submission of school improvement plans, financial statements, school audit, calendar, and student attendance.
- School leadership effectively manages the school budget and cash flow, and there is a plan for long-term financial sustainability.
- The school leadership effectively manages operations (e.g., food services, transportation, school facilities).

- Evidence of school communication with staff. (see Data Narrative, Target Setting, Action Plan, TELL data)
- Record of compliance.

2.4: School leadership provides effective instructional leadership.

- School leaders ensure that the school implements a coherent, comprehensive, and aligned curriculum.
  - School leaders ensure that curriculum, instruction, and assessments are aligned with state standards, each other, & coordinated within/across grade levels.
  - School leaders ensure that instructional materials are selected and/or developed in accordance with a school-wide instructional framework and aligned with established curriculum standards.
  - School leaders ensure the curriculum is periodically reviewed and revisions are made accordingly.
- School leaders provide meaningful feedback on teachers’ instructional planning and practice.
  - Leaders regularly provide meaningful feedback on instructional planning.
  - Leaders regularly observe instruction and provide meaningful, timely feedback that helps teachers improve their practice.
- School leaders provide conditions that support a school-wide data culture.
  - Teachers have easy access to varied, current, and accurate student and instructional data.
  - Teachers are provided time to collect, enter, analyze, represent student data & use tools to act on results.
- School leaders ensure that all teachers receive professional development in data use (e.g., how to access, read, and interpret a range of data reports;

- Instructional needs and associated curricula and assessments are identified as a mechanism to address performance needs. (see Action Plan)
- Organizational routines are established that include ongoing data analysis to improve student learning. (Evidence of interim measures and how they will be used to monitor results.) (see Data Narrative, Target Setting, Action Plan, TELL data)

Tuesday to support teachers in the use of data. Further, TELL Survey data indicates that 100% of teachers perceive that they receive informal feedback regarding their teaching on an ongoing basis, and 83% perceive that the evaluation process is fair.

- School leadership includes stakeholders in the school improvement process. According to the UIP, school staff has researched an instructional model to support school improvement efforts and is currently submitting an Innovation Plan to implement a Science, Technology, Engineering, Arts and Mathematics (STEAM) focus program at the school.
<p>| 2.5: The school provides high quality instruction. | n/a | • Not possible to assess from Document Review alone. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Look-Fors</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Educators’ mindsets and beliefs reflect shared commitments to students’ learning.</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>- School leadership is beginning to establish conditions that support a culture of educator learning. The 2016-2017 UIP identifies a root cause of low student achievement and growth due to school culture and climate. Specifically, the UIP states that staff report a “lack of trust” among colleagues and that staff report they do not believe all teachers have a strong belief that all students can learn at high levels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3.2 The school has established conditions that support educators’ learning culture. | • Communications among all stakeholder groups are constructive, supportive and respectful.  
• Communications between leadership and staff are fluid, frequent, and open.  
• School leaders model and convey well-defined beliefs about teaching and learning, and convey value for innovation, learning from mistakes, and risk-taking.  
• School leaders ensure that staff and team meeting discussions are structured and facilitated to support the staff’s reflective dialogue around data and instruction (e.g., attend to explicit group norms, use protocols).  
• School leaders provide guidance to teacher teams (e.g., help to establish meeting routines; model and promote use of discussion protocols; ensure systematic monitoring of student progress; create focus on linking results to instruction) and ensures that teachers utilize tools and time well.  
• School leaders participate in formal and informal professional learning, including their own leadership development about how to improve curriculum and instruction in a leadership context (i.e., elementary or secondary; high- or low-poverty; large/small schools). | • Evidence of development for leaders. (see Action Plan)  
• Structures for collaborative activities are present. (see Action Plan, TELL data)  
• Roles are dedicated to supporting teams of teachers. (see Action Plan, TELL data)  
• Communication structures are referenced. (see Data Narrative, Action Plan, TELL data) |
| 3.3 Educators collaborate regularly to learn about effective instruction and students’ progress. | • Educators meet frequently, during regularly scheduled, uninterrupted times (e.g., staff, department, grade level meeting times) to collaborate, establish improvement goals, and make data-informed instructional decisions.  
• Educators’ collaborative meetings have a clear and persistent focus on improving student learning and achievement. | • Collaborative meeting times and their purposes are referenced. (see Data Narrative, Action Plan, TELL data) }
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- Educators describe sharing knowledge and expertise among colleagues as essential collaborative activity for job success.
- Teachers are willing to talk about their own instructional practice, to actively pursue and accept feedback from colleagues, and to try new teaching strategies.
- The school has created a performance-driven classroom culture in which teachers effectively use data to make decisions about daily instruction and the organization of students.

**3.4: Staff members demonstrate the capacity to implement appropriate action to support student achievement and school improvement.**

- Teachers use results from interim or summative assessments to make adjustments to the organization of students in the classroom, pace of instruction, or content being taught.
- Teachers use results from interim or summative assessments to identify students in need of remediation or acceleration, and assign students to appropriate supports.
- Qualified staff deliver instruction and provide the necessary supports for ELL students or students with special needs.
- Leaders involve faculty and staff in planning and implementation of school policies.
- Leaders provide opportunities for faculty and staff to make or provide input on important decisions.

- Evidence of internal and external stakeholder involvement in development and implementation of UIP – for example PLC’s, building leadership teams. (see Data Narrative, TELL data)
- Structures for remediation, RTI, tutoring, or other data-driven supports are present. (see Action Plan)

**3.5: The school engages the community and families in support of students’ learning efforts.**

- The school includes parents/guardians in cultivating a culture of high expectations for students’ learning and their consistent support of students’ efforts.
- The school invites family participation in school activities (e.g., volunteering in classrooms or on committees; attendance at performances, sports events, organizational meetings) and regularly solicits their input.
- The school offers workshops and other opportunities for parents/guardians to learn about home practices that support student learning.
- Educators communicate with parents/guardians about instructional programs and students’ progress.

- Strategies for community and family involvement are incorporated throughout the plan.
- Parent Involvement Plan is present (for Title I Schools only) and details strategies for involving families to advance student learning.
4. **There is readiness and apparent capacity to engage productively with and benefit from the assistance provided by an external partner.**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Look-Fors</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4.1: The school collaborates effectively with existing external partners.** | • The school seeks expertise from external partners, as appropriate (i.e., for professional development, direct support for students).  
• The school ensures that roles and responsibilities of existing partners are clear.  
• There are designated school personnel to coordinate and manage partnerships.  
| • Articulation of roles/responsibilities with external entities (e.g., district level staff, BOCES staff, vendors, CDE) is evident. *(see Action Plan)* | • The school seeks expertise from external partners. The UIP indicates that the school participated in a Diagnostic External Review conducted by Focused Leadership Solutions in September 2015. The feedback from the review has been used to conduct improvement planning. For example, the identified MIS within the UIP (“Best First Instruction” and “Culture and Climate”) were developed as a result of the review.  
• According to the school’s UIP, in June 2016, the school received a Pathways Grant, which the school is currently using to write an Innovation Plan. This plan will be submitted for state approval in April 2017.  
• The school is not yet leveraging existing partnerships to maximize improvement efforts. The 2017 Winter Colorado Department of Education (CDE) UIP reviewer feedback notes indicated that the most critical performance areas, including root causes and major improvement strategies, were all evident within the school’s plan. However, per the Colorado Department of Education Summary Reviewer Feedback, the action plan for implementing the major improvement strategies to bring about dramatic improvement and progress monitoring of the action plan were not sufficient. Specifically, the CDE review states that, “The Action Plan does not present a well-designed plan for implementing major improvement strategies that will bring about dramatic improvement.” |
| **4.2: The school leverages existing partnerships to support of student learning.** | • The school maximizes existing partners’ efforts in support of improvement efforts.  
• All externally provided professional development is aligned to improvement efforts.  
| • Activities of external entities align with major improvement strategies and performance needs of the school/district (not just a list of services the entity provides). *(see Action Plan)* | |
| **4.3: Leadership is responsive to feedback.** | • Leadership seeks feedback on improvement plans.  
• Leadership seeks feedback from key stakeholders  
• Leadership integrates feedback into future improvement efforts.  
| • Feedback from CDE on UIP is integrated into subsequent UIPs (i.e. feedback is not repeated for multiple years) *(see CDE feedback, previous UIPs, updated UIPs, TELL data)* | |
5. There is likelihood of positive returns on state investments of assistance and support to improve the performance within the current management structure and staffing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Look-For's</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.1: Leadership monitors the return on investment of specific improvement initiatives, and uses that data to inform decision-making.</td>
<td>• Leadership identifies turnaround strategies and implements programs/initiatives designed to improve student performance. • Leadership assesses the cost and impact (effect on student achievement and number of students served) of each program/initiative to determine its academic return on investment. • Leadership makes decisions regarding continuation or discontinuation of programs/initiatives based on this analysis. • Leadership establishes systems and structures to support regular and ongoing monitoring.</td>
<td>• Additional resources provided through specialized grant funding are aligned, strategic and show evidence of positive results. (for districts/schools that have received additional funds.) (see Action Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.2: Leadership has demonstrated an ability to produce positive returns on state investment and uses resources effectively.</td>
<td>• Programs and initiatives are designed to support turnaround efforts and have demonstrated results. • Leadership seeks resources aligned to its improvement efforts and programs/initiatives with high academic return on investment. • Any additional resources received (i.e., specialized grant funding) are aligned, strategic, and showing evidence of results. • Leadership treats resources flexibly, and implements focused improvement efforts with a focus on early wins.</td>
<td>• Evidence of the results of previous initiatives. (see Data Narrative, Target Setting, data dashboard, TELL data)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3: Students demonstrate academic progress over time.</td>
<td>• Students demonstrate progress on internal measures linked with the school’s promotion or exit standards. • The performance of student subgroups on state assessments demonstrates that the school is making progress toward eliminating achievement gaps. • Students meet proficiency and grade-level targets across subjects and grade levels on norm-referenced benchmark assessments and state assessments. • Matched cohorts of students who score proficient or advanced (or equivalent) on state assessments maintain or improve performance levels across continuous enrollment years. • The percentage of all students performing at proficient or advanced (or equivalent) on state assessments increases over time.</td>
<td>• Achievement and growth data trend up. (see Data Narrative, Target Setting, data dashboard) • Results of interim assessments show progress. (see Data Narrative, Target Setting)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

School leadership has identified turnaround strategies and is working to implement initiatives to improve student performance. The UIP indicates that school leadership is currently drafting an Innovation Plan to be submitted for State Board of Education approval in April 2017.

The school leadership does not yet make decisions regarding continuation or discontinuation of programs/initiatives based on this analysis. For example, the UIP does not include established systems and structures to support regular and ongoing monitoring of actions. Further, the UIP does not include evidence of students demonstrating increased achievement overtime on internal assessment measures. Although the UIP identifies interim measures such as DIBELS, Math Modules, and reading common assessments, it does not provide any evidence that the school is monitoring or adjusting instruction based on the assessment results.

The school is entering Year 5 Priority Improvement. Although the school meets expectations for academic growth in English language proficiency, and is approaching state expectations for English Learners (ELIs) in both English language arts (ELA) and math, the school ranks in the 12th percentile for both ELA and math achievement overall as indicated on the School Performance Framework (SPF). Further, according to the school’s SPF analysis of academic achievement and growth, school leaders state in the UIP narrative that Martinez students “are not growing at a rate we know will get us out of priority improvement.”

Leadership has not yet demonstrated an ability to produce positive returns on state investment. The 2016 School Performance Framework (SPF) indicates that the school is approaching state expectations for demonstrating academic
| Students demonstrate academic growth as measured by value-added or state growth percentile measures. Students demonstrate progress toward attaining expected knowledge and skills as measured by interim assessments. | growth with all identified student groups in ELA. Further, the trend analysis section of the UIP provides information about analysis of trends; however, the UIP does not clearly identify the trends, nor include a description of how the data team uses data trend information to drive or change instruction. |
6. There is necessity that the school remain in operation to serve students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Look-Fors</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.1: The school is mission-driven and its mission and vision meet a unique need. | - All stakeholders share an understanding of, and commitment to, the mission and vision.  
- School programs reflect the mission and vision.  
- The mission and vision guide decisions about teaching and learning.  
- The mission and vision meet the needs of an identified student population. | - Population of students served is clearly identified. (see Data Narrative)  
- Mission/Vision are evident in plan or publicly available information. (see website, Data Narrative) |

| 6.2 There are no other viable options for enrolled students that will likely lead to better outcomes. | - There are limited other school options available (e.g., online, charter, district).  
- The school serves an isolated and/or remote community.  
- Closure would have a significant negative impact on the community.  
- Comparison schools do not promote better student outcomes. | - Number of other available district, online, or charter options and their performance. (see data dashboard, websites)  
- Performance of neighboring districts (see data dashboard, websites)  
- Performance of comparison schools. (see data dashboard, websites) |

- School leadership is beginning to include all stakeholders in a shared understanding of, and commitment to, the mission and vision of the school. According to the UIP data narrative, the school leadership and staff revisited the mission and vision of the school in May 2016. The school staff is continuing to define each part of the school’s mission, vision, and beliefs (MVB) and how each statement is reflected in the daily work at the school. The MVB are posted on the school’s website and in the online student-parent handbook. The school’s vision is “Martinez Dedicated – Children Educated-A Better Future Created”; the mission is “Love, Live, Learn.” However, although the UIP action steps include implementing a process for decision-making, conflict-resolution, and consensus training for staff, these action steps do not include expectations for alignment with the school’s MVB.  
- There are other viable options for Martinez students. Greeley School District offers other public elementary school options for students. The district’s website lists ten elementary schools in addition to Martinez, five additional K-8 schools (including one focused on STEM education), and additional charter school options within the district. Several surrounding schools are currently performing better than Martinez Elementary School according to SPFs posted on CDE’s Schoolview website. Schools currently accredited with a “Performance” plan type include: Dos Rios, Jackson, Meeker, Monfort and Shawsheen. Additionally, Heiman, Madison, Maplewood Elementary Schools are accredited with an “Improvement” plan.