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Panel’s Recommendation:

The State Review Panel recommends management by private or public entity other than the district for Manaugh Elementary School, based on an analysis of compiled data and documentation, as well as a site visit conducted May 17-18, 2017.

Evidence and Rationale:

The State Review Panel recommends management by a private or public entity other than the district because, although the school may be effective in some of the six areas outlined in the Education Accountability Act, it is demonstrably lacking in leadership and personnel capacity. The school has been rated as Not Effective in infrastructure that is adequate to support school improvement and Not Effective in readiness and capacity of personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate actions to improve student academic performance. In addition, the school is rated as Developing in leadership that is adequate to implement change to improve results. Building leadership has remained constant over the past four years, but the school has shown very little improvement in student academic growth or achievement.

While the school, with district support and working with the University of Virginia Partners for Leaders Turnaround program, has created a redesign plan with the potential to result in positive change, there is no implementation plan in place and no significant effort has been made in the past year to effectively address the areas of deepest concern: classroom instruction and student engagement and behavior. There is little evidence of effective instructional leadership, and the evidence shows that the school does not provide high quality instruction. Professional development has been provided in the instruction of the school’s literacy and math programs, but no follow-up is provided to monitor the effective implementation of those programs. The district does provide a data warehouse to store and consolidate data, but teachers have had little training in accessing or using data to inform instruction. Management by an external partner that uses research-informed strategies and has a proven record of success working with schools under similar circumstances would bring the urgency needed to create positive and dramatic change. An external entity could bring implementation skills and provide the capacity needed to oversee implementation that is not evident at the district level.

The school has been rated Effective in readiness and apparent capacity to engage productively with, and benefit from, the assistance provided by an external partner. The school district, Montezuma-Cortez 28J, has been part of the University of Virginia (UVA) Partners for Leaders Turnaround program for three years, and the Colorado State Board of Education recently approved a proposal for UVA to work as the district’s management partner to increase outcomes for students. Manaugh Elementary School has been a part of this partnership in sharing best practices around planning, and school leaders have attended UVA trainings. Through this program, the school has been assigned a “district shepherd,” a change that has shown some evidence of success according to school and district leadership.
The school has also collaborated effectively with the Colorado Department of Education (CDE) in the areas of school improvement and the development of the Unified Improvement Plan.

The State Review Panel does not recommend Innovation status, which is the request of the district, for several reasons. First, to be successful, an innovation school must have strong leadership. As described above, although there is positive intent, there is little evidence of effective leadership leading to dramatic change. Current leadership has not demonstrated the ability to lead the change needed and move the school off the accountability clock within a reasonable amount of time. Document review and site visit observations by the State Review Panel team found a lack of focus on effective professional development, particularly in the use of data to drive instruction. Discipline and behavior continue to be challenging, and student engagement is deficient. Onsite classroom observations by the review team revealed that few teachers are delivering effective rigorous instruction. In addition, as noted above, there are few indicators of improvement in place. In the five years the school has been in Turnaround/Priority Improvement status, student performance has shown very little progress. Finally, Innovation status provides schools the ability to implement more flexible and effective practices to meet the needs of their students through the waiver of certain local and state statutory and regulatory rules. Manaugh Elementary cannot identify any rules or policies the school requires be waived.

The State Review Panel does not recommend conversion to charter school status primarily because there is no evidence of capacity within the community to create a charter school. The district has indicated that there is a lack of community-expressed support for another charter school (Montezuma-Cortez currently authorizes three charters), and the lack of a viable, proven turnaround charter operator that is able and willing to engage in one-off rural turnaround projects in rural Colorado is a key barrier to successfully pursuing this strategy for Manaugh. The district is apparently able to provide the resources needed and has a beneficial relationship with the school. In addition, the school is working to build positive relationships with Native American parents that could be disrupted by the creation of a charter school. Finally, there is no evidence that a charter school would lead to improved performance.

The State Review Panel does not recommend closure as an option for Manaugh Elementary for several reasons. First, the school serves a unique population that is 50% Native American and lives in extremely high poverty. Elders of the community have a distrust of the school system that removed them to boarding schools as children, and school personnel have worked hard to begin to rebuild that trust. Closing the school would mean changes for Manaugh students that would disrupt that trust. The community would view closing the school as disrespectful. Additionally, while there are other elementary schools in the district, there are no other viable options for absorbing the students at Manaugh. Other district schools are far out of town, too small to absorb a significant number of students, or are also in Turnaround status.
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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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRP Site Visit Summary (complete using ratings from the following pages)</th>
<th>Capacity Level:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results.</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The infrastructure is adequate to support school improvement.</td>
<td>Not Effective</td>
</tr>
<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>Developing</td>
</tr>
<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>Effective</td>
</tr>
<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>Not Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is necessity that the school remain in operation to serve students.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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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><strong>1. The leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results.</strong></td>
<td>Capacity Level: [ ] Highly Effective [ ] Effective [X] 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>With support from the district, leadership is beginning to establish goals and implement changes to drive achievement gains.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership communicates a relentless commitment to the school turnaround.</td>
<td>• District leadership reported that they identified the need for a school redesign and started a redesign process. Both district and school leadership reported that the school received a Tiered Intervention Grant (TIG) to fund redesign work. Leaders stated that school leaders then established a design team to address school improvement. The team includes representatives of all stakeholder groups, including parents and the school leadership team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership makes data-driven changes to the academic program and organization to promote dramatic achievement gains.</td>
<td>• Review of the design team planning meeting schedule showed agendas that included discussions of the mission, vision, and values of the school; culture systems and structures; extended year calendar; academic systems; and visits to high-performing schools in other districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership conveys clear expectations for performance for all stakeholders, including leadership, teachers, students, and partners.</td>
<td>• Review of the Manaugh Redesign Plan-Ensuring All Students Succeed provided an overview of the redesign plan, which included a new mission statement developed by the design team: <em>Our mission is to provide a relevant, engaging and challenging education to ensure all our scholars demonstrate excellence.</em> The plan was based on four plan elements of a positive learning environment, operational excellence, academic excellence, and educator support. The plan as reviewed is very comprehensive in the approach to these elements, but does not include specific goals or benchmarks for implementation. When asked, school leadership indicated that a timeline for implementation of the plan would be developed during the summer of 2017.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• School leaders distribute leadership responsibilities to appropriate individuals or groups.</td>
<td>• Leadership first concentrates on a limited number of priorities to achieve early, visible wins.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2: Leadership establishes clear, targeted and measurable goals designed to promote student performance.</th>
<th>• There is regular progress monitoring of performance and implementation data and, as appropriate, results lead to elimination of tactics that do not work.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership communicates clear and focused goals that are understood by all staff.</td>
<td>• Benchmarks are used to assess progress toward goals; goals are adjusted as progress is made.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educators understand their responsibilities for achieving goals.</td>
<td>• Data on progress toward goals drives organizational and instructional decision making.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership maintains school-wide focus on achieving established goals.</td>
<td>• Leadership defined the first pillar — positive learning environment — as an environment where structures and processes are clearly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| • Leadership allocates resources in alignment with goals and critical needs. | }
Leadership and teachers reported efforts to distribute leadership responsibilities and indicated that the school leadership team includes one representative from each grade level, the dean of students, the Exceptional Student Services (ESS) Director, and the family and student advocate. Teachers indicated that the work of the design team has focused on the development and updating of the 90-day plans as well as the redesign plan. Teachers also stated that the makeup of the leadership team is being addressed in the redesign plan and that it will be smaller and will require prospective members to apply for membership.

Leadership and teachers reported that efforts to arrive at consensus for behavioral expectations have had mixed results during the 2016-17 school year. Both indicated that while consensus was eventually reached on hallway expectations, reaching that consensus took longer and was more difficult than expected. However, both also reported that through that effort, the school has developed a process to reach consensus.
Leadership and teachers reported that the leadership team created the 90-day plan for the first semester in August 2016 and updated it after mid-year assessment results were analyzed in January 2017.

Review of the current (2nd semester 2016-17) 90-day plan indicates that it includes three goals:

a. Identify specific gaps in reading, math, and behavioral skills/strategies and plan interventions and enrichment through implementation of a multi-tiered system of support (MTSS);

b. Set and maintain high expectations for students that will result in increased achievement and safety; and,

c. Increase achievement and growth at the core curricular level for each grade level through explicit instructional strategies.

The 90-day plan also includes specific measurable goals for student achievement and growth in math and reading. In addition, the plan includes school priorities regarding collaborative conversations and high expectations, action steps to implementing the plan, and progress indicators to monitor action steps and progress toward goals.

Teachers reported that 90-day plan goals were established by school leadership and the district. Teachers stated that the district sets end-of-year goals, and teachers set trimester goals based on interim assessment results.

District leadership reported that the school did not achieve goals set out in the current 2016-17 90-day plan because the goals were too ambitious and there was no process in place to implement the changes needed. Teachers reported that there is now a process in place to work on ambitious goals.

Leadership is beginning to establish clear expectations for student behavior, but not yet student learning.

Leadership and teachers reported that the school’s focus has been on behavioral expectations, beginning with hallway expectations and then on expectations for behavior in common spaces, such as...
bathrooms, the cafeteria, and playground. When asked about academic expectations, both groups provided inconsistent answers. Leadership indicated that teachers are expected to ensure that all students are learning, but teachers did not identify this as an expectation. When asked about performance expectations, teachers were unable to identify clear expectations. They indicated that one big goal was to “get better” and improve scores — that every child should succeed. They indicated that Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Research-based, Time-phased (SMART) goals had not been identified and that there was no consistency in expectations for teachers. Teachers identified possible expectations including following school behavior expectations, showing integrity in work, being present and doing the job, using data, and helping every child grow (especially in math and reading). Some teachers stated that they are expected to work together as a team.

• Leaders reported that teachers are expected to participate in SEED meetings that take place weekly during early release time each Wednesday. Leaders indicated that teachers are expected to come prepared with student work to analyze to determine student needs and create re-teaching plans based on assessment data analysis or data digs.

• Leadership indicated that they expect teachers to be collaborative and to contribute. Leaders also said they expect teachers to be willing to work to refine their practice. Leaders stated that they want to develop a culture of learning.

• Teachers reported that student behavior is “bad” with serious behavior problems. Some teachers reported being bitten, kicked, stabbed, and having things thrown at them. They stated that they send students to the office, but students receive inconsistent consequences and are sent immediately back to class. They explained that they receive feedback on the need to focus on behavior management in their classrooms but that they do not receive support or strategies to address this issue.

• Parents and students reported they feel the school is a very safe environment and an observation by the site visit team did not
reveal serious behavior problems. The team observed anti-bullying messaging posted throughout the school. The 90-day plan included information that the office behavioral referrals had been reduced by 33% for mid-year 2016-17 as compared to mid-year 2015-16.

- District and school leadership and teachers report that the current dean of students will move to a new position as assistant principal in the 2017-18 school year, enabling her to take more of an instructional and evaluator role. Leaders and teachers report that the school will hire a paraprofessional to address student behavioral issues. Teachers expressed reservations that this would be an effective means of alleviating behavior problems.
## 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 [ ] Effective [ ] Developing [X] Not Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Considerations:

#### 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 schools, 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 to teach 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.

### The district leads strategic efforts to improve the effectiveness of the academic program.

- District and school leadership and teachers reported that the district has hired a Director of School Improvement and Grants who acts as “shepherd” for the University of Virginia (UVA) Turnaround work. This includes monitoring the implementation of the 90-day plan and providing support and guidance to the school leadership. Leaders reported that the shepherd meets weekly with the principal for three hours to coach the principal and monitor implementation of the 90-day plan.
- District leadership reported that the principal has had the support of a district shepherd since the beginning of the district’s work with UVA. District leaders stated that the process has included setting specific goals, learning how to coach educators, and holding people accountable. District leaders indicated that shepherding would continue in the 2017-18 school year.
- District leadership reported that the principal and assistant principal are scheduled to attend the Relay Graduate School of Education Principal program, which will include a two-week summer session and four follow-up sessions during the 2017-18 school year.
- District and school leadership reported that the district provides a data warehouse (Alpine Achievement) to store and consolidate data. Leaders indicated that few teachers know how to access the data and the district plans to provide training. Some teachers reported that they do not have time to access the warehouse.
### 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).

### 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, and coordinated both 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.

- Teachers reported that the district provides reading and math coaches. The reading coach is full-time at the school. Teachers indicated that they appreciate the support of the coaches.
- Leaders and teachers reported that the district provides the reading instructional program, Success for All (SFA), and the math instructional program, Engage New York, both of which are used throughout the district. Teachers report that both programs are developed for schools with longer school years.

### School leadership is not yet effectively developing and retaining teachers and staff.

- District and school leadership reported that they are very focused on recruitment and retention of teachers. Leaders reported that district teachers are the lowest paid teachers in the region but that the district is attempting to compensate for that through a comprehensive benefits package. District leaders further reported that the district is attempting to provide slots for teachers in the district pre-school at reduced cost and to provide low-income housing, which leaders indicate is a big challenge. Leaders and teachers reported that district leaders attend teacher recruitment fairs at universities.
- District and school leaders reported that retention of quality staff is a problem and, although fewer teachers are leaving, the school is still starting over each year by training new staff. Teachers also indicated that retention has been a significant issue. Some teachers indicated that they felt the largest problem with retention is the unique population that the school serves and its location. As one teacher summarized, “Nothing prepares you for this. I thought I knew about poverty but I had no idea.”
- School leadership indicated that the district is writing a grant to assist with new teacher retention and has provided a district mentor who is non-evaluative and expected to provide support to any first-year teacher. Leadership also reported that the district...
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#### 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 does not yet provide effective instructional leadership.

- Leadership reported that leaders have not been consistent with providing teachers with feedback on brief observations. Leaders reported being focused on formal feedback tied to evaluations. Teachers reported that, although they create and turn in goals, they do not receive feedback on their goals.

- 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, and represent student data & use tools to help 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; frame questions for inquiry; analyze data, assessment literacy, use data tools and resources).

- Leadership indicated they are compliant with evaluations, but when asked, teachers said they had only been observed and evaluated in April and May.
- Teachers indicated, and review of professional development calendars confirmed, that professional development has been limited only to SFA and Engage New York, and took place in the first weeks of the 2016-17 school year. Teachers reported that they have asked for more professional development on what SEED time should look like and classroom management, but have received neither.
- School leadership reported that previously all professional development for Manaugh was provided by the district, but next year professional development will be determined by student needs and teacher skills for Manaugh.
- Teachers reported that there is no follow up to professional development and no modeling of the effective implementation of instructional programs. Teachers stated that they do get feedback from observations conducted by the district math coach. The reading coach also does observations but does not provide feedback. Teachers said there is no support system in place. As one teachers summarized, “There is no one in the building who can help me out.”

---
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• Teachers reported that students are grouped for literacy instruction based on Standardized Test for the Assessment of Reading (STAR) data, not on grade level. Teachers indicated that this means students are receiving below-grade-level instruction as their core literacy instruction, rather than appropriate reading intervention.
• Leadership and teachers reported that teachers are required to turn in lesson plans but do not receive feedback on them. Review of three optional lesson plan templates indicated that all require generally the same components, including a standards-based lesson objective and instructional strategies. Leadership indicated that leaders use the lesson plans when they observe a classroom.

The school does not consistently provide high quality instruction.
• The site review team observed eight classrooms in grades K-5. While the team observed behavior expectations as clear and understood by most students in 88% of classrooms observed (N=8), students were cognitively engaged in learning in only 38% of classrooms observed. For example, students were observed sitting and doing nothing, sleeping, or engaged in conversations not related to the instruction that was taking place. Observations indicated that students were generally compliant with little overt misbehavior.
• The site review team observed that agendas were posted in some classrooms, and observers noted smooth transitions between learning activities. The learning environment and learning time was purposeful and reflective of effective planning and guidance in 50% of classrooms observed; however, the site review team observed teachers providing students with clear learning goals and focused direct instruction in only 38% of classrooms observed. In most cases, students could not articulate how what they were being asked to do related to a learning objective.
• The site review team observed that classroom interactions were cooperative and promoted peer learning in 50% of classrooms. The
team observed interactions between students and teachers were generally respectful.

- The site review team observed a variety of instructional strategies and materials to engage all students in learning in 63% of classrooms observed. For example, students were observed playing a game in which each student set a clock face manipulative to the correct time as required by the game board. In another classroom, students were counting by tens to one hundred while hopping on one foot, and then counting backwards from one hundred by tens while hopping on the other foot. Other students were observed working on computers, playing multiplication board games, and working in small groups.

- The site review team observed that assessment results were used to make adjustments to instruction or the organization of students in order to address identified student needs in only 25% of classrooms observed. Timely, frequent, specific feedback related to student work was provided throughout the learning process to inform improvement efforts in only 13% of classrooms observed.

- When asked, school leadership indicated that the school has few English language learner (ELL) students, and most of them are identified because of a language other than English in the home. Leaders stated that ELL students receive computer-based language development instruction and that, while leaders expected sheltered instruction in classrooms, it was not strong.

- School leaders indicated that the school houses a severe needs classroom but provided no further information, and that classroom was not observed.

- School leadership and teachers reported that the school has a multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS). Teachers indicated that they believe an MTSS coordinator is needed to improve the effectiveness of the system. Some teachers stated that the system was a “fast-track” to identification for special education.

- Teachers reported that there were few interventions in place for struggling or at-risk students and that teachers were expected to provide intervention in the classroom for most students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>State Review Panel School Site Visit Feedback Form 2016-17</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>leadership reported that the school uses Burst Early Literacy</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention, but leaders feel it is soft on comprehension skills. This</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>intervention is administered by the reading interventionist.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Teachers reported that after-school tutoring is provided for 90**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>minutes four times a week by four teachers. Teachers indicated that</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>19-22 students attend regularly, generally because teachers have</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>asked parents to send them.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parents reported that after-school tutoring was effective and they**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>were appreciative of the referral and program.</strong></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>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 [ ] Effective [X] 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.

Educator’s mindsets and beliefs do not reflect shared commitments to student learning.
- School leadership reported that a critical piece of the design team work was creating the new school mission statement together. Leaders stated that the work helped the school identify what their values are.
- When asked, all teachers were able to verbalize the concepts included in the mission statement, but teachers reported individual missions when asked about values. For example, some teachers indicated their mission was supporting the whole child, which teachers described as creating an environment to support learning, have fun, and engage curiosity. Others stated their mission was to make students workforce-ready and responsible for their own learning.
- When asked for the benefits of working at Manaugh, some teachers identified the ability to have student loans forgiven if they stayed five years. Other teachers said they loved the school, the students, and the opportunity to make a difference in the lives of students. Still others cited positive relationships with the staff or the desire to be near family.
- Parents reported that teachers are wonderful and bend over backwards for the students. Parents stated that their students love the teachers and all teachers are known by all students.
- Review of survey results from a January 2017 survey related to UVA work confirmed that educators reported an individual commitment to working with the school, but a shared vision or commitment was not evident. For example, when asked to define

#### 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 or small schools).
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.

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.

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

Although there are structures in place for collaboration, they are not being utilized effectively to ensure improved instruction and student progress.

- School leadership reported that teachers meet weekly during Wednesday early release time for SEED meetings, which is professional learning community (PLC) time. Leaders indicated that protocols for organization of the meeting are provided, and teachers follow group norms and protocols. Leaders stated that teachers are expected to collaborate on analyzing data, designing instruction and re-teaching, and backwards planning during this time.
- School leaders and teachers reported, and review of the SEED calendar confirmed, that SEED meeting time is one hour and 45 minutes, but time for actual SEED work (i.e., analyzing student work and assessment data, planning for re-teaching) is limited to 45 minutes. School leadership and teachers indicated that remaining time is used for other purposes, including School Wide Assistance Team (SWAT), Solutions Team (committees addressing specific school issues), and staff meetings. Teachers reported that during the current semester, participants have only discussed the redesign plan during SEED time. The SEED calendar revealed that out of 26 total sessions, only nine were totally devoted to reading, math readiness, and data-driven instruction.
- School leadership and teachers reported that there is daily common planning time in the schedule for each grade level, and this was confirmed by review of the master schedule. However, leaders reported no clear expectations for the use of this time,
including expectation for common planning. Some teachers reported that they do use the time to plan together as a grade level, but others stated that they do not. Teachers indicated that the time is frequently co-opted by other meetings, special education staffing meetings for special needs students, or the need to cover other classrooms.

### The school is beginning to engage the community and families in support of student learning and school improvement efforts.

- School leadership reported that parent involvement is challenging. Leaders stated that many Native American families, about 50% of the student population, are intimidated by, and do not trust, the schools. Leaders and teachers reported that many children are being raised by grandparents who were sent against their family’s will to boarding schools as children. Leaders further stated that many non-Native American parents feel the school has too much poverty, is only for Native American children, and thus do not want to send their students. Leaders explained that they are working to change the school’s reputation and that it is a priority to convince parents that their children belong there.

- Leadership reported that the school counselor is a social worker and is acting as a family and student advocate. Leaders reported an increase in family interactions because the counselor has reached out to families and connects with them to provide support and resources, including food, mental health services, laundry, etc. Leaders stated that the counselor is also the ear for frustrated parents.

- Leaders reported that parent involvement meetings have been held concerning homework and uniforms and have had some attendance. Leaders stated that two parent-teacher conferences each year have 75-80% attendance. Leaders also described an annual “Gallery Walk” displaying student work around a particular theme that draws many family and community members.
- School leadership, teachers, and parents reported that the school is working to engage parents more deeply in the redesign process through a Parent Involvement Committee (PIC), which is part of the Design Team. Stakeholders also reported an effort to revive a Parent Teacher Association (PTA), which is underway.
- Some teachers reported holding parent nights. Others indicated they make positive phone calls and talk to parents at student pick-up. Teachers indicated that teachers with longevity have more success with parents but that some teachers feel too overwhelmed to follow up with parents.
- Parents reported that the school communicates with them through monthly newsletters, letters sent home with students, and stickers on students as reminders. Parents indicated feeling satisfied that the school was attempting to address concerns, but said that some parents are unhappy about proposed changes, particularly in the length of the school year. As part of the school redesign, leadership is proposing a longer school year.
- Leadership and teachers reported that main office staff has been the main connection point with families and a resource for teachers. Leaders indicated that two members of the school staff speak Spanish and can provide translation when necessary.
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 [X] Effective [ ] Developing [ ] Not Effective</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Considerations:

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.

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.

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.

The school collaborates effectively with existing external partners.
- District leadership reported that the State School Board of Education approved the University of Virginia (UVA) Turnaround Program as the district’s managing partner, and the school is partnered with UVA through that partnership. District and school leaders reported that through the UVA program, they are able to share best practices around planning for implementation. The principal and assistant principal have attended UVA training.
- School leadership reported working in partnership with the Colorado Department of Education (CDE), particularly in the areas of school improvement and the Unified Improvement Plan (UIP).
- School leadership reported partnering with the San Juan Board of Cooperative Educational Services to provide special education services and the services of a school psychologist.

Leadership is responsive to feedback.
- District leadership reported that the principal has been very receptive to coaching from the district and actively seeks guidance from the Director of School Improvement and Grants who is shepherding the school.
- District and school leadership reported that the school has received feedback from UVA on 90-day plans and applied that feedback in revisions.
- A review of the revised 2017 UIP indicates that the school implemented changes based on feedback received from CDE and removed personally identifiable information.
### 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>Claims &amp; Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership identifies turnaround strategies and implements programs/initiatives designed to improve student performance.</td>
<td>Capacity Level: [ ] Highly Effective [ ] Effective [ ] Developing [X] Not Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership makes decisions regarding continuation or discontinuation of programs/initiatives based on this analysis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership establishes systems and structures to support regular and ongoing monitoring.</td>
<td></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.**

- 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.

**Leadership has not demonstrated an ability to effectively monitor and produce positive returns on state investment.**

- District and school leadership reported that the principal and district shepherd identified the need for a redesign focused on school systems, and that the need to revamp systems and structures at the school is getting in the way of school progress.
- When asked, school leaders were unable to identify the impact of any program or initiative the school has undertaken on student performance. Leaders indicated that the principal does “spot checks,” or informal, observational checks for effectiveness. For example, she checks on student writing skills to determine the effectiveness of writing professional development. When asked how often this had occurred this year, leaders responded, “maybe two so far this year.”

**Students do not demonstrate sufficient academic progress over time.**

- Review of the 2016 School Performance Framework (SPF) showed that the school has moved from Turnaround status in 2015-16 to Priority Improvement in 2016-17, due primarily to improved student growth.
- End-of-year interim assessment data for Dynamic Indicators of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) and Standardized Test for Assessment of Reading (STAR) school assessments indicated that most grade levels (with the exception of Kindergarten) did not meet their targets for either achievement or growth.
- Teachers report that many students are significantly below grade level, citing as an example 2nd grade students who could not identify letters.
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.
- 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.
### 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>6. There is necessity that the school remain in operation to serve students.</td>
<td>[X] Yes [ ] No</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.

**Although the school has developed a new mission statement, it is not yet driving school improvement efforts.**

- School leadership and teachers reported that a new mission statement was created as part of the redesign process. The new mission statement is: *Our mission is to provide a relevant, engaging and challenging education to ensure that all of our scholars demonstrate excellence.*
- When asked about the mission of the school, stakeholders could not articulate it. Many teachers described having students workforce- and college-ready, which is attributed to the old mission statement.
- Parents reported discussing pulling students from the school but indicated they have come to love it and believe it is the best place for their children.
- Per a review of the school’s redesign plan, the plan acknowledges the need to address the unique population — both the challenges and the assets it brings.

#### 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.**

- All stakeholders, district and school leadership, teachers, and parents reported that the school serves a unique population that is 50% Native American and in extremely high poverty. All acknowledge that school currently has an extremely poor reputation aligned with the school population.
- District leadership reported that there are no other options that would serve students better. One other district elementary school is in turnaround status; two others are significantly
distant from the school and outside the community; and the remaining higher performing school is too small to accommodate the school’s student population.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SRP Summary (complete using ratings from the following worksheets)</th>
<th>Capacity Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results.</td>
<td>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The infrastructure is adequate to support school improvement.</td>
<td>Developing</td>
</tr>
<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>Developing</td>
</tr>
<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>Effective</td>
</tr>
<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>Effective</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. There is necessity that the school remain in operation to serve students.</td>
<td>Yes</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  
- [ ] No  
- [X] Not sure, more information is needed. Specify the additional information required. [Review of the 90 day plans](#)

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

Manaugh Elementary School is located in Cortez, Colorado and is one of four elementary schools in the Montezuma-Cortez school district. According to the Unified Improvement Plan (UIP), the school serves 275 students in grades K-5, 50% of whom are Native American, 19% Hispanic, and 29% white. 86% of the school’s population qualifies for free and reduced-price lunch. The school is in the fifth year of priority improvement/turnaround status, having improved from turnaround status the last two years to priority improvement status on the 2016 School Performance Framework. Data from the 2016 CDE School Performance Framework indicates that the school is rated as Does Not Meet in Academic Achievement, but as Approaching in Academic Growth.

The UIP acknowledges the school’s status and, while describing some improvement, recognizes that both growth and achievement must improve. It identifies the priority performance challenge facing the school as English language arts and math achievement and growth. Root causes for this challenge are presented as a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) that is not effective, tier 1 instructional practices that are inconsistent and lack rigor, and lack of a culture of high expectations for students academically and behaviorally. The school has developed an action plan for the implementation of four major improvement strategies, which include refining the MTSS system, improving tier 1 instruction and engagement, establishing a culture of high expectations for both academics and behavior, and engaging in comprehensive school reform; however, the action plan fails to present a well-designed, detailed plan for implementation of strategies that would have the potential to create dramatic change.

Based on the evidence available, it appears that school performance is beginning to trend upward, and there is potential for dramatic change in student achievement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Areas that should be explored more deeply through an on-site visit:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. 90-day plans: How are the plans developed, implemented, and monitored? Review plans for 2016-17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Is the school part of the Relay Turnaround program? Who is the district shepherd, and how often does that person meet with school leadership?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. What is the protocol for those meetings?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. What access do teachers have to assessment data?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. How do teachers diagnose each individual student’s learning needs? What tools, systems, and structures are in place?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. How is Dynamic Indicators of Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS) benchmark assessment correlating to third grade ELA achievement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. How many Kindergarten students attended preschool before entering Kindergarten?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. What are the specific interventions used for Tier 2 and 3? How is progress monitored?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What data did the school use to determine that “tier 1 issues” were a root cause of poor student performance?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The 2016-17 Unified Improvement Plan (UIP) detailed an action step to “design a comprehensive school reform plan for 2017-18.” What is the plan and how will implementation of the plan be monitored?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The 2016-17 UIP listed the action step, “implement an extended school year”, that includes additional professional development days and instructional days. What is the plan for the extra days?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. The 2016-17 UIP listed the action step, “foster and deepen parent engagement.” What is the plan? How will this be accomplished? How will implementation be monitored and measured?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. The 2016-17 UIP listed the action step, “create a professional development (PD) plan.” What is the plan? What is considered “deep PD”? What is the coaching plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Are structures in place for professional learning communities? Do teachers have the opportunity for structured and shared planning time?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. How is the school district involved in ensuring student achievement and school improvement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. What evidence is used for flexible groups and how are they being monitored?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.

### Capacity Level Rubric

<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. The leadership is adequate to implement change to improve results.</td>
<td>Capacity Level: [ ] Highly Effective [x] Effective [ ] Developing [ ] Not Effective [ ] Unable to Assess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1: Leadership acts as a change agent to drive dramatic achievement gains.</td>
<td>• Leadership communicates a relentless commitment to the school turnaround. • Leadership makes data-driven changes to the academic program and organization to promote dramatic achievement gains. • Leadership conveys clear expectations for performance for all stakeholders, including leadership, teachers, students, and partners. • School leaders distribute leadership responsibilities to appropriate individuals or groups.</td>
<td>• Evidence of leadership driving impactful change. (Major Imp. Strategies &amp; Action Plan) • The degree to which leadership has been continuous over time or change(s) in leadership utilized to activate change. (see HR data) • Manaugh Elementary School is located in Cortez, Colorado and is in the Montezuma-Cortez School District. It is identified as 5th year Priority Improvement on the 2016 School Performance Framework (SPF). In the prior two years of SPF rating, the school was identified as Turnaround. The school district has been part of the University of Virginia (UVA) Partners for Leaders turnaround program for three years and the Colorado State Board of Education recently approved a proposal for UVA to work as the district’s management partner to increase outcomes for students. • The UIP indicates that the principal has been at Manaugh for five years and the Dean of Students for two years. According to the school website, the principal has been employed by the school district since 1991 and is a graduate of Montezuma-Cortez High School. The principal is also part of the UVA program. • The UIP identifies an Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) that is representative of grade levels and departments within the school along with the principal and dean of students. • The UIP describes the school population as 50% Native American, 19% Hispanic, and 29% White. 86% of students qualify for free and reduced-price lunch. • According to the 2016 SPF, the school “does not meet” academic achievement targets (10 of 40 points); is “approaching” in academic growth (30 of 60 points); and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“meets” test participation rate targets for all assessments. It also indicates that the school “did not meet” academic targets for the following subgroups: All Students; Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible; Minority Students; Students with Disabilities; and students previously identified for Reading to Ensure Academic Development (READ) Plan. It further indicates that the following subgroups were rated “approaching” on academic growth: All Students, Free/Reduced-Price Lunch Eligible, and Minority Students.

- The UIP includes extensive data describing both state and local assessment that indicates that although achievement continues to be significantly below state expectations, there has been improvement and student growth is rated is Approaching, which is reflected in local assessment results.
- The plan presents a sense of urgency regarding improvement of both growth and achievement and indicates that the school is engaged in a whole school redesign process, which is described as including a comprehensive plan for creating systems to foster a “Positive Learning Environment”. It further states that this will include a clear system to “Define, Teach and Expect/Reinforce” school-wide expectations for academic and behavior and a process to ensure implementation will result in improved student achievement.
- The UIP presents prior year targets for achievement, growth, and English language development and indicates which were met and unmet. Data presented shows that, although targets were not met, there was improvement in most areas. Growth data especially shows improvement, but the school acknowledges that students are not yet growing at a rate adequate to meet state expectations.
- The UIP reported that 2015-16 READ act targets were met, as were targets for Dynamic Indicator of Basic Early Literacy Skills (DIBELS). No other academic growth target was met. In addition, English Language Development targets were not met.
- The UIP identifies one systemic priority improvement

<p>| 1.2: Leadership establishes clear, targeted | 1.2.1: Leadership communicates clear and focused goals that are understood by all staff. | 1.2.2: Educators understand their responsibilities for achieving goals. | 1.2.3: High, but realistic goals are set. | 1.2.4: Benchmarks are identified |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>and measurable goals designed to promote student performance.</th>
<th>Leadership maintains school-wide focus on achieving established goals.</th>
<th>Plan and narrative convey a sense of urgency.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership allocates resources in alignment with goals and critical needs.</td>
<td>Leadership has established systems to measure and report interim results toward goals.</td>
<td>Clear roles and ownership of action steps are identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.3: Leadership analyzes data to identify and address high priority challenges, and to adjust implementation of the action plan.</th>
<th>Leadership communicates data trends and issues, ensures timely access to data, and models and facilitates data use.</th>
<th>Evidence that goals are based on data re: past performance. (see data analysis/narrative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leadership openly shares results and holds staff accountable for results and effective use of data.</td>
<td>Leadership first concentrates on a limited number of priorities to achieve early, visible wins.</td>
<td>Focus on a limited number of changes. (see Priority Perf. Challenges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership communicates data trends and issues, ensures timely access to data, and models and facilitates data use.</td>
<td>There is regular progress monitoring of performance and implementation data and, as appropriate, results lead to elimination of tactics that do not work.</td>
<td>Resources are allocated for new programs or identified action steps.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership openly shares results and holds staff accountable for results and effective use of data.</td>
<td>Leadership first concentrates on a limited number of priorities to achieve early, visible wins.</td>
<td>Data on progress toward goals drives organizational and instructional decision making. (see Action Plan)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership communicates data trends and issues, ensures timely access to data, and models and facilitates data use.</td>
<td>There is regular progress monitoring of performance and implementation data and, as appropriate, results lead to elimination of tactics that do not work.</td>
<td>Data on progress toward goals drives organizational and instructional decision making.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Challenge in English language arts and math in both achievement and growth, which are persistently below state expectations; however, it points out reduced numbers of students in the “does not meet” category and improvement to Approaching on the SPF growth category.

- The UIP action plan identifies four major improvement strategies that directly address the identified root causes of the school’s performance challenges:
  - Multi-tiered System of Support Refinement
  - Establish a consistent culture of high expectations for students
  - Improve tier 1 through instructional and engagement strategies
  - Engage in comprehensive whole school reform

- The action plan presented does not provide specific, detailed steps toward implementation of the major improvement strategies that may be outlined in the 90-day plans. The school website only includes a 90-day plan for the first quarter of the 2015-16 school year.

- The UIP acknowledges the following root cause: that a culture of high student expectations is not in place and that staff
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.4 Leadership establishes high expectations for student learning and behavior.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The school holds high expectations for academic learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educators set high expectations for learning and clearly convey these to students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Educators convey that students are responsible for raising their performance and encourage their participation in learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Leadership ensures that school’s physical environment is clean, orderly, and safe.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements of climate and culture are identified and addressed in the plan(s). (see Data Narrative, Root Cause Analysis, Action Plan, TELL data)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>assumptions about the capabilities of the school’s challenging population results in less than rigorous instruction. In describing the major improvement strategy to establish a consistent culture of high expectations, the school indicates that it will create systems to foster a positive learning environment. The action plan indicates that this will include school-wide values; school-wide expectations; and a community that celebrates diversity and welcomes and supports all students and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 2015 TELL survey data indicated significant improvement from 2011 and 2013 in teacher perceptions of student behavior, particularly in the areas of administrative support for teachers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On the TELL survey, 66.7% of the respondents agreed, “my school is a good place to work and learn.” Even though this was below the state average of 84.8% agreement, it was a 23.2% increase from the 2013 administration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On the 2015 TELL survey, 70.6% of the teachers agreed that the faculty and leadership have a shared vision. This was an increase from the 2013 TELL survey when only 40% of the teachers agreed with the statement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On the TELL survey, nine statements address teacher leadership. Eight of the nine statements increased in the level of positive agreement from 2013 to 2015. The statement “teachers in this school trust each other” increased dramatically over the two-year period from 20% agreement in 2013 to 66.7% agreement in 2015. Although there was significant improvement in the percent of teachers agreeing with the positive statements, the percent of teachers agreeing was below the state average in all statements in the teacher leadership domain of the survey.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• On the 2015 TELL survey, 88.9% of the teachers agreed that the “school leadership makes a sustained effort to address teacher concerns about managing student conduct.” This was above the state average of 72.5% agreement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 schools, and make it accessible for instructional staff to utilize. | Evidence of district involvement. (see Data Narrative, Action Plan) |

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.  
  o PD is informed by ongoing analysis of student performance, instructional data, and educators’ learning needs.  
  o PD requires teachers to demonstrate their learned competency in a tangible and assessable way.  
  o 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 regularly monitored, evaluated, and improved. | - 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) |
| 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). |
| --- | --- |
| 2.4: School leadership provides effective instructional leadership. | • School leaders ensure that the school implements a coherent, comprehensive, and aligned curriculum.  
  o School leaders ensure that curriculum, instruction, and assessments are aligned with state standards, each other, & coordinated within/across grade levels.  
  o 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.  
  o School leaders ensure the curriculum is periodically reviewed and revisions are made accordingly.  
• School leaders provide meaningful feedback on teachers’ instructional planning and practice.  
  o Leaders regularly provide meaningful feedback on instructional planning.  
  o 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.  
  o Teachers have easy access to varied, current, and accurate student and instructional data.  
  o 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; frame questions for inquiry; analyze data, assessment literacy, use data tools and resources). |
|  | • Evidence of school communication with staff. (see Data Narrative, Target Setting, Action Plan, TELL data)  
• Record of compliance.  
• 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) |
|  | • The UIP action plans do not identify or provide a clear description of the professional development to be provided to the staff to support the implementation of the plan and the improvement of student achievement through specific, detailed action steps. For example, the description of one action steps states, “Provide training and ongoing coaching for staff of data tools to ensure best implementation data driven instruction,” but the action step does not specify how that training and coaching is to be delivered.  
• The UIP action plan includes several steps involving professional learning activities in effective instruction and core curriculum, and the plan indicates that the school is receiving additional support in implementation of Success for All reading and Engage New York Math. It also includes a step to increase classroom observations to provide staff with effective feedback and provide training for teachers in data tool management; however, there is no implementation benchmark to assess the effectiveness of this step.  
• As described in the major improvement strategies, the school will receive “restart” training and ongoing coaching to improve implementation of Success For All reading and Engage New York Math. It also includes a step to increase classroom observations to provide staff with effective feedback and provide training for teachers in data tool management; however, there is no implementation benchmark to assess the effectiveness of this step.  
• The UIP includes refinement of systemic Data-Driven Instruction (DDI) process as a root cause supporting the identification of major improvement strategies, and it indicates that a systemic approach to ensure data-driven instruction and assessment — including progress monitoring — will continue. This includes instructional planning conversations based on data by grade level. It also states that the school will refine the practice of data analysis and action planning to increase student achievement. The UIP action plan, however, does not describe specific structures for professional standards for delivering instruction.  
• The UIP includes refinement of systemic Data-Driven Instruction (DDI) process as a root cause supporting the identification of major improvement strategies, and it indicates that a systemic approach to ensure data-driven instruction and assessment — including progress monitoring — will continue. This includes instructional planning conversations based on data by grade level. It also states that the school will refine the practice of data analysis and action planning to increase student achievement. The UIP action plan, however, does not describe specific structures for professional standards for delivering instruction.  
• The UIP includes refinement of systemic Data-Driven Instruction (DDI) process as a root cause supporting the identification of major improvement strategies, and it indicates that a systemic approach to ensure data-driven instruction and assessment — including progress monitoring — will continue. This includes instructional planning conversations based on data by grade level. It also states that the school will refine the practice of data analysis and action planning to increase student achievement. The UIP action plan, however, does not describe specific structures for professional standards for delivering instruction. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.5: The school provides high quality instruction.</th>
<th>n/a</th>
<th>Not possible to assess from Document Review alone.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>progress monitoring, the sharing of student data, and the revision of instructional practices based on each student’s performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The UIP implementation benchmarks included in the action plan do not provide a means of measuring the effective implementation of professional learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The 2015 TELL survey results indicated that only 41.2% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that professional development is evaluated and results communicated to teachers, but 50% agreed or strongly agreed that follow-up for professional development is provided, and 88.2% agreed or strongly agreed that the professional development provided enhances teachers’ abilities to improve student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The UIP identifies several internal communication and leadership structures, including Leadership Team, MTSS Solutions Team, School-Wide Assistance Team, and Design Team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• According to 2015 TELL survey results, 76.5% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that leadership communicates adequately with faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The UIP states that the school is in the fifth year of implementation of SFA, which it describes as a comprehensive reading research-based framework for instruction. It further states that the school is in the third year of implementation of the district math curriculum, Engage New York. The school was part of the Eagle County Math/Science Grant partnership that provided math coaching in the math curriculum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. There is readiness and apparent capacity of personnel to plan effectively and lead the implementation of appropriate action to improve student academic performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State Review Panel Criteria</th>
<th>Look-Fors</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 3.1: Educators’ mindsets and beliefs reflect shared commitments to students’ learning. | n/a | • The action plan indicates that the school administrative team will complete a summer Relay program and join a year-long cohort to support professional learning, but there is no further description of the involvement in the Relay program.  
• There is no specific evidence of structures for collaborative activities (e.g., professional learning communities); however, the action plan references School-Wide Assistance Team (SWAT) discussions to plan and implement remediation for students and grade-level instructional planning meetings. Collaborative meeting times or purposes are not referenced.  
• On the 2015 TELL survey, only 66.7% of the teachers agreed with the statement “teachers work in professional learning communities to develop and align instructional practices.” This declined from the 2013 administration when 82.6% of the teachers agreed with this statement.  
• On the 2015 TELL survey, 83.3% of the teachers agreed that “teachers are provided supports (e.g., instructional coaching, professional learning communities) that translate to improvements.” This was an increase from the 2013 administration when only 56% of the teachers agreed with this statement. |
### 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)

- The UIP provides evidence of instructional coaches for reading and math instruction, but it does not describe the support provided by these coaches.
- The data narrative states that the UIP and the internal 90-Day Plans are developed by the Manaugh ILT and presented to Manaugh parents for feedback.
- As a root cause of low student achievement and growth, the UIP references a Multi-Tiered System of Supports that is described as not working at a level to ensure student success and support. The action plan includes, as an improvement strategy, the refinement of the MTSS system to address providing time to enable teachers and other staff to collect and analyze data to appropriately identify students in need of support, and provide effective collaboration structures and ongoing progress monitoring. Several action steps support implementation of this strategy, but implementation benchmarks do not provide a means of measuring effective implementation.
- The UIP action plan identifies the development of an extended school day program for the 2017-18 school year to provide additional support for students.
- The UIP narrative states that some grades K-3 students are receiving “systematic interventions,” but it does not identify these interventions.
- The UIP indicates that a Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) system is in place and that the school uses the Schoolwide Information System (SWIS) to collect data on behavioral referrals and disaggregate reporting.
- The action plan includes several steps focused on improving student behavior through identifying school-wide expectations for behavior and providing training for teachers and students in those expectations.
- The UIP indicates that the school houses a severe physical and learning disability classroom as well as site support for a behavioral day treatment facility. It states that many students have high social-emotional needs and many families are in...
### 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.

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

### Evidence of internal and external stakeholder involvement in development and implementation of UIP – for example PLC’s, building leadership teams.

- Structures for remediation, RTI, tutoring, or other data-driven supports are present. (see Action Plan)

### 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.

### The UIP states that parent involvement is a challenge at Manaugh. It indicates that 75% of parents attend parent-teacher conferences and states that the new role of Student and Family Advocate will be important in engaging families in parent support and accountability groups, which it describes as seeing success in the fall of 2015.

### The Manaugh school website includes a parent newsletter, the Manaugh Messenger, that provides updates to parents and community, including a parent meeting to be held on March 30 and a Parent Gallery Night on April 27.

### The 2015 TELL survey results indicated that 88.9% of teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the school does a good job of encouraging parent/guardian involvement, and 94.1% reported that they “Provide parents/guardians with useful information about student learning”. However, only 22.2% agreed that parents support teachers, and only 11.1% felt that the community is supportive of the school.

### The UIP indicates parent and community involvement in the redesign of the school as the major improvement strategy of comprehensive whole school reform. The local newspaper, The Journal, included an article on March 23 describing the school reform efforts and indicating that parents are involved and that the school is hoping more parents will join.

### The UIP data narrative states that a social worker was added to the staff to address the social-emotional needs of students and to provide support for family engagement.

### A specific parent involvement plan was not included in the UIP. Reference was made to parent engagement in the fourth major improvement strategy. The action was “create a system to foster and deepen parent engagement in student success,” but this system was not described further.

### According to the UIP, the school employed a parent advocate to more fully engage families in the school. The UIP reported an active parent involvement committee.
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>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1: The school collaborates effectively with existing external partners.</td>
<td>• The school seeks expertise from external partners, as appropriate (i.e., for professional development, direct support for students).</td>
<td>• The partnership with the University of Virginia is referenced and included in the UIP, but it does not include a specific description of roles and responsibilities for that partnership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2: The school leverages existing partnerships to support of student learning.</td>
<td>• The school maximizes existing partners' efforts in support of improvement efforts.</td>
<td>• The UIP also describes partnerships with providers of professional learning (i.e., Success For All reading) to provide coaching and professional learning activities specifically to improve teacher instruction and student learning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3: Leadership is responsive to feedback.</td>
<td>• Leadership seeks feedback on improvement plans.</td>
<td>• The UIP describes a partnership that has just ended with the Eagle County Math/Science Grant consortium, which provided coaching support for teachers in math.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Capacity Level:** [ ] Highly Effective [X] Effective [ ] Developing [ ] Not Effective [ ] Unable to Assess
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-Fors</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.1: Leadership monitors the return on investment of specific improvement initiatives, and uses that data to inform decision-making.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership identifies turnaround strategies and implements programs/initiatives designed to improve student performance.</td>
<td></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>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.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership makes decisions regarding continuation or discontinuation of programs/initiatives based on this analysis.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership establishes systems and structures to support regular and ongoing monitoring.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.2: Leadership has demonstrated an ability to produce positive returns on state investment and uses resources effectively.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs and initiatives are designed to support turnaround efforts and have demonstrated results.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Evidence of the results of previous initiatives. (see Data Narrative, Target Setting, data dashboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership seeks resources aligned to its improvement efforts and programs/initiatives with high academic return on investment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any additional resources received (i.e., specialized grant funding) are aligned, strategic, and showing evidence of results.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leadership treats resources flexibly, and implements focused improvement efforts with a focus on early wins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.3: Students demonstrate academic progress over time.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students demonstrate progress on internal measures linked with the school’s promotion or exit standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Achievement and growth data trend up. (see Data Narrative, Target Setting, data dashboard)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The performance of student subgroups on state assessments demonstrates that the school is making progress toward eliminating achievement gaps.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students meet proficiency and grade-level targets across subjects and grade levels on norm-referenced benchmark assessments and state assessments.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Results of interim assessments show progress. (see Data Narrative, Target Setting)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched cohorts of students who score proficient or advanced (or equivalent) on state assessments maintain or improve performance levels across continuous enrollment years.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The percentage of all students performing at proficient or advanced (or equivalent) on state assessments increases over time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• 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.

- According to data from the Colorado Department of Education published as “Achievement Percentile Rank Report: TCAP to CMAS PARCC Comparison,” the school ranked in the 1st or 2nd percentile in Reading on the 2013 TCAP, the 2014 TCAP, and the 2015 CMAS PARCC. When reported by grade level, grade 4 showed the highest ranking with 8th percentile in 2015.

- According to data from the Colorado Department of Education published as “Achievement Percentile Rank Report: TCAP to CMAS PARCC Comparison,” the school ranked in the 1st or 2nd percentile in Math on the 2013 TCAP, the 2014 TCAP, and the 2015 CMAS PARCC. When reported by grade level, grade 3 showed the highest ranking with 11th percentile in 2013.

- According to data from the Colorado Department of Education published as “Achievement Percentile Rank Report: TCAP to CMAS PARCC Comparison,” the school ranked in the 1st percentile in TCAP Reading-PARCC English Language Arts on the 2013 TCAP, the 2014 TCAP, and the 2015 CMAS PARCC. When reported by grade level, grade 4 showed the highest ranking with 8th percentile in 2015.

- A study of the SPF shows an up-and-down pattern over the past six years. The rating improved from 2014 to 2016 from Turnaround status to Priority Improvement. The SPF rating and the percent of points for each year is listed below.
  - 2010: Improvement – 55.5% of points
  - 2011: Priority Improvement – 31.3% of points
  - 2012: Priority Improvement – 41.4% of points
  - 2013: Turnaround – 25.1% of points
  - 2014: Turnaround – 25.1% of points
  - 2015: (not computed)
  - 2016: Priority Improvement – 40.0% of points
    (Improvement status requires 42% or above)

- The UIP presents local assessment data that appears to indicate improvement in some areas, although students are still not achieving at or near state expectations.

- The school has presented targets for academic achievement and growth and behavior that appear to be ambitious but achievable. For example, the school has set the goal of increasing the percentage of students scoring at the “meets
| expectations” level on English Language Arts CMAS from 8% to 16%, and has identified interim assessments that will allow staff to monitor progress toward those targets. |
### 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) | • The school website states the school’s mission as: *Manaugh Elementary exists to ensure that our students experience the power of learning and set challenging goals that motivate them to be work force or college ready.*  
• The Colorado Department of Education data describes the school population as 50% Native American, 29% White, and 19% Hispanic. 86% of students qualify for free and reduced-price lunch. According to the UIP, 90% of the new Kindergarten population is below expectations in vocabulary and background knowledge. According the UIP, the school district is bordered on the west by two Indian reservations, the Ute Mountain Ute and the Navajo.  
• Manaugh Elementary is one of four elementary schools in the Montezuma-Cortez School District. Of the other three, one is in year 3 Turnaround status, one in Performance, and one in Improvement due to low participation. The school currently in Improvement is located 10 miles from Manaugh in a rural area. The school in Performance status is located less than a mile from Manaugh but would be unlikely to absorb all Manaugh students. There is also a nearby charter school with much smaller enrollment that is rated as Performance. It appears that other school options available for Manaugh students are limited if the school were to close. |

| 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) | • 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. |