

WASC Self-Study Report

CMIS

November 16, 2016

Contents

1	Preface	3
2	Student/Community Profile and Supporting Data and Findings	4
3	Progress Report	5
4	Student/Community Profile Summary	6
5	Self-Study Findings	7
5.1	Organization for Student Learning	7
5.2	Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment	7
5.2.1	Current Educational Research and Thinking	7
5.2.2	Academic Standards for Each Area	11
5.2.3	Embedded Global Perspectives	14
5.2.4	Congruence	15
5.2.5	Student Work–Engagement in Learning	18
5.3	Support for Student and Personal Academic Growth	20
5.4	Resource Management and Development	20
5.4.1	Congruence	20

6 Schoolwide Action Plan	22
7 Appendix	23

Chapter 1

Preface

Chapter 2

Student/Community Profile and Supporting Data and Findings

Chapter 3

Progress Report

Chapter 4

Student/Community Profile - Overall Summary from Analysis of Profile Data and Progress

Chapter 5

Self-Study Findings

5.1 Organization for Student Learning

5.2 Curriculum, Instruction, and Assessment

5.2.1 Current Educational Research and Thinking

Indicator: The comprehensive and sequential documented curriculum is modified as needed to address current educational research and thinking, other relevant international/national/community issues and the needs of all students.

Prompt: *Comment on the effective use of current educational research related to the curricular areas in order to maintain a viable, meaningful instructional program for students. Examine the effectiveness of how the school staff stay current and relevant and revise the curriculum appropriately within the curricular review cycle.*

Findings

CMIS Leadership and Teaching Staff use curriculum that is comprehensive and sequentially documented that can be modified as needed to address current educational research and thinking, relevant international/community issues, and the needs of all students.

CMIS Leadership Team strongly believes that at the core of a rigorous, engaging, coherent curriculum are research-based standards. The CMIS Teaching Staff use multiple, comprehensive, and appropriately sequenced standards that

DEBUG

nocol
line 61

inform and provide the foundation of our curricular decisions (see section entitled, Academic Standards in Each Area).

The 2013-2014 academic year saw a great deal of change to the standards (which impact curricular decisions) as the CMIS Teaching Staff, with the support of the Leadership Team adopted new standards in ELA, mathematics, and science, as well as finalizing the adoption of all other content standards (i.e. physical education, social studies, health, fine arts, world languages).

The adoption of these standards, especially in ELA, mathematics, science, and 9-12 history reflect significant shifts in conceptual understanding of the content, have major implications on instruction and assessment, and illuminate real increases in depth of knowledge and rigor. All curricular decisions would have to be made based upon these new realities. Furthermore, CMIS has begun to view our adopted standards as the bedrock of all unit creation and planning. Standards also continue to help guide appropriate instruction and ensure rigor.

Because of these conceptual shifts, the 2014-2015 saw a strong focus on professional development topics relating to the difference between curriculum and standards, and the shared responsibility of the CMIS Literacy Standards. Teachers, community members, and administrators were involved in multiple discussions and the CMIS Leadership Team believed this was an appropriate starting point for teachers and community members to begin understanding the standards and curriculum.

Evidence

- PTG Curriculum, Professional Development Folder
<https://drive.google.com/a/cmisa.ac.th/folderview?id=0ByVFfrm0zf0lWE0yenprdkTGv1k&usp=sharing>

DEBUG

nocol
line 73

Findings

Because of the adoption of the CMIS Literacy Standards, a great deal of training during the 2014-2015 school year focused on the ELA standards. Currently, all curriculum decisions, including resource/curriculum purchasing, must adhere to our standards with fidelity. All reading and writing curriculum decisions are based on ensuring appropriate complexity, balancing informational text, reading in the disciplines, and academic vocabulary (for reading). Writing from sources and appropriate text types are required for writing curriculum decisions.

DEBUG

nocol
line 77

DEBUG

nocol
line 81

Evidence

- CMIS Understanding by Design Resources <https://drive.google.com/a/cmisa.ac.th/folderview?id=0ByVFfrn0zf0lfmUyZV9DbGoxZVhpVHphGdG9MeEt6MHZJaEtoT3VzTjM0bkk5NFQ5MVJldUU&usp=sharing>
- CMIS Understanding By Design Master List

Findings

Since curricular decisions should be made using clear standards and student outcomes as a guide, a new Curriculum Review Cycle/Resource Adoption strategic plan had to be developed and implemented. The most important elements of the Curriculum Review process are the specific evaluations tools, rubrics, and vetting instruments that have been developed and used to narrow down vendors and products for curricular and resource materials. CMIS Leadership also provides the necessary time and space required for teacher collaboration in vetting and evaluation of curricular items.

Science curriculum was the first content to be vetted and evaluated based upon the Curriculum Review Cycle; science curriculum was purchased during the 2015-2016 school year. As with ELA curriculum decisions, science saw significant conceptual changes with the adoption of the the Next Generation Science Standards. Because of this, CMIS Leadership, developed vetting and evaluation instruments to ensure curriculum and resource alignment with the standards, as well as rigor and student engagement. This year, Mathematics undertook the same curriculum vetting process and ELA/social studies will be reviewed next year.

In order to ensure that the resources we purchase outside of the normal adoption cycle are of the highest quality and they meet our three general criteria of: is it aligned to the standards? Is it rigorous? and is it engaging? Resource Request and Resource Renewal forms were developed and implemented.

Evidence

- "Teacher Dashboard." CMIS Curriculum. Chiang Mai International School, 22 July 2016. Web. 22 July 2016.

Findings

Science curriculum was the first content to be vetted and evaluated based upon the Curriculum Review Cycle; science curriculum was purchased during the 2015-2016 school year. As with ELA curriculum decisions, science saw significant conceptual changes with the adoption of the the Next Generation

DEBUG

nocol
line 86

DEBUG

nocol
line 95

DEBUG

nocol
line 99

Science Standards. Because of this, CMIS Leadership, developed vetting and evaluation instruments to ensure curriculum and resource alignment with the standards, as well as rigor and student engagement. This year, Mathematics undertook the same curriculum vetting process and ELA/social studies will be reviewed next year.

In order to ensure that the resources we purchase outside of the normal adoption cycle are of the highest quality and they meet our three general criteria of: is it aligned to the standards? Is it rigorous? and is it engaging? Resource Request and Resource Renewal forms were developed and implemented.

Evidence

- "Model Content Frameworks." Model Content Frameworks. PARTNERSHIP FOR ASSESSMENT OF READINESS FOR COLLEGE AND CAREERS, 2016. Web. 20 July 2016. <http://www.parcconline.org/resources/educator-resources/model-content-frameworks>

DEBUG

nocol
line 105

Findings

The CMIS Google Drive is the primary method of organizing and archiving of the curricular units. The Drive along with the the CMIS Teacher Dashboard, found on the school website, is a place where teachers can access these resources. The Dashboard also contains the CMIS Standards Blueprints. Teacher feedback and anecdotal evidence suggested that greater alignment of the UbD units to the standards would be possible if the teachers had a general blueprint or pacing guide to help them visualize and map the whole year of standards. Department and grade level teams began the blueprint work at the beginning of the 2015-2016 year. All core subjects, with the exception of K-5 ELA and mathematics, have been completed.

DEBUG

nocol
line 109

Evidence

- Resource Request Form <https://docs.google.com/a/cmisa.ac.th/forms/d/1hBKsxxgHpPSOTOMtUTsZBoVX2t3ztxeGVY4R4BVNeVL8/edit?usp=sharing>
- Resource Renewal Form https://docs.google.com/a/cmisa.ac.th/forms/d/1i6Enhitz2yJZh-10jL8jsJ2pFa7oRJCP0VcA50b_D6g/edit?usp=sharing

DEBUG

nocol
line 113

Findings

ELA blueprints posed a challenge as standards are addressed all year long. In order to address this challenge, small groups were scheduled for focused pro-

DEBUG

nocol
line 118

professional development using the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC) ELA Model Frameworks. Collaboration time was given to ELA teachers in grades 6-12 to complete this work. The CMIS Professional Development team has scheduled these same professional development opportunities for K-5 during the 2016-2017 school year.

The combined teamwork of all stakeholders: the CMIS Leadership Team, the community, outside research, vetted educational organizations, and, most importantly, the teachers themselves, ensure that CMIS staff at all levels stay current in educational research.

5.2.2 Academic Standards for Each Area

Indicator: The school provides a comprehensive and sequential documented curriculum that is articulated within and across grade levels for the improvement of programs, learning, and teaching.

Prompt: *Evaluate to what extent there are defined academic standards for each subject area, course, and/or program (e.g., online instruction) that meet state or national/international standards.*

Findings

CMIS Leadership and Teaching Staff strongly believe in the importance of the schools academic standards. CMIS Staff use a common understanding of academic standards:

Academic standards define the concepts, skills, and knowledge that students should know and be able to do in each curricular area, the level at which students are expected to demonstrate this knowledge, and grade-level expectations for performance. In a standards-based educational system, schools determine the benchmarks for student work that meet these standards, provide appropriate instruction, and use multiple assessment measures to identify the level of achievement for all students. This approach assists the schools in defining the quality accomplishment of the complementary schoolwide learner outcomes and the degree to which all students are achieving them. Standards do not describe any particular teaching practice, curriculum, or assessment method

Evidence

- Abbot, S. "Learning Standards Definition." The Glossary of Education Reform. The Great Schools Partnership, 2013. Web. 21 June 2016. <http://edglossary.org/learning-standards/>

DEBUG

nocol
line 130

DEBUG

nocol
line 136

DEBUG

nocol
line 140

Findings

CMIS provides a comprehensive and sequential documented curriculum that is articulated within and across grade levels for the improvement of programs, learning, and teaching.

CMIS teachers and students use multiple research-based standards for all grade levels and content areas. The CMIS Leadership and Professional Development Team use teacher feedback to address possible changes or modifications to the standards.

Adopted CMIS standards include: Common Core State Standards ELA* Common Core State Standards Mathematics* Next Generation Science Standards (NGSS)* AERO Standards (aligned to NCSS framework) grades K-8* National Standards for History (from UCLA) grades 9-12 C3 Framework (piloted 2016-2017)* AP Course Topics and Indicators National Coalition for Core Arts Standards (NCCAS) Computer Science Teachers Association Framework (CSTA) National Educational Technology Standards for Students (NETS) World Readiness Standards for Learning Languages Physical Education Model Content Standards for California Public Schools National Health Education Standards (Center for Disease Control) Standards for the 21st Century Learner (American Association of School Librarians) Wisconsin Model Academic Standards for Business

* standards are internationally benchmarked

Research indicates CCSS (both ELA and Mathematics), NGSS, and C3 are standards that are considered rigorous, world class, and allow for deeper engagement around fewer concepts/topics.

Evidence

- CCSS-FAQ, Setting Criteria, Myth vs. Fact, Research Supporting Key Elements of the Standards: Appendix A. <https://drive.google.com/a/cmیس.ac.th/file/d/0ByVFfrm0zf0lcjRFZWtWWUhvROU/view?usp=sharing>
- NGSS-Standards Background: Research and Reports <http://www.nextgenscience.org/standards-background-research-and-reports>
- C3-Appendix C: Scholarly Rationale for the C3 Framework (p.74) <https://drive.google.com/a/cmیس.ac.th/file/d/0ByVFfrm0zf0lVGRyNOVKZzVlLVE/view?usp=sharing>
- NCCAS-A Conceptual Framework for Arts Learning (p. 23) http://www.nationalartsstandards.org/sites/default/files/NCCAS%20%20Conceptual%20Framework_0.pdf

DEBUG

nocol
line 167

Findings

In order to address the prior visiting team observation that some teachers did not feel that they understood the standards, CMIS has provided professional development for the CCSS ELA and NGSS. Starting from the critical conceptual shift found in the CCSS that literacy is a shared responsibility of ALL staff, K-12, all contents, the CMIS Leadership Team devoted a majority of 2014-2015 to unpacking and analyzing the newly adopted ELA standards with the whole staff. Since ALL teachers have literacy standards, the professional development ensured that teachers not only focused on their own grade-level standards (i.e. ...within the grade level), but also worked with the anchor standards that addressed vertical progression of outcomes (i.e. ...across grade levels).

UbD plans, mid/end of year assessment, peer reflection, and administrative observational walkthroughs are all methods to ensure instructional fidelity to the standards.

As mentioned earlier, CMIS Leadership Team believe that all curricular decisions should be based on three basic questions: is it aligned to the standards, is it rigorous, and is it engaging? During the 2015-2016 school, the CMIS Middle and High School Science department, representative teachers from K-5, and CMIS Leadership team vetted and evaluated science materials using CMIS developed rubrics and instruments based upon EQuIP (Educators Evaluating the Quality of Instructional Products) Rubric. The outcome was the purchase of FOSS Kit science materials that met and exceeded our criteria for grades K-5. FOSS Kits for science have been purchased and CMIS will continue to provide time and assistance to help teachers utilize and implement this curriculum resource.

This year, mathematics curriculum was reviewed and and resources were vetted. Through the use of Instructional Materials Evaluation Tool (IMET) developed by Achieve the Core, the K-5 group adopted two resources that aligned strongly with the standards and the instructional shifts in mathematics (Focus, Coherence, and Rigor). The first resource from Great Minds Inc. is entitled Eureka Math. Eureka Math not only aligns with the standards, it provides appropriate coherence, focus, and rigor. The second resource vetted and purchased was My Math published by McGraw Hill. Again, the adoption committee found good alignment to the standards and the instructional shifts. Both programs provide a balance of rigor- application and conceptual knowledge in Eureka and procedural skills in My Math.

Curricular decisions are also made as a result of our professional development. After CMIS workshops on the CCSS conceptual shifts and with discussions with teachers, it was determined that the school lacked appropriately complex informational text in grades 9-12. Because of this discovery, plans and

DEBUG

nocol
line 174

funds were set aside to purchase informational text.

AP courses have appropriately aligned (in rigor and complexity) textbooks and resources.

Course and grade level blueprints have also been developed to use as a guide for vertical and horizontal integration discussion and collaboration to determine if modification is necessary. Areas that have been discussed are standards overlap, skill/content gaps

5.2.3 Embedded Global Perspectives

Indicator: The school leadership and certificated staff ensure that global education concepts, perspectives, and issues are embedded within the curricular areas.

Prompt: *Examine the curricular documentation and observe the delivered curriculum to determine the extent to which there is integration of global concepts, perspectives, and issues.*

Findings

The CMIS Leadership and Teaching Staff ensure that global education concepts, perspectives, and issues are embedded within the curricular areas.

CMIS Leadership and Teaching Staff wanted to describe evidence that goes beyond the traditional list of events that international schools normally cite for embedding global perspectives. Though CMIS Leadership, teaching staff, and community still organize and implement an International Day which rotates with Thai Day (i.e. every other year); other major events events such as Model United Nations and National History Day are also scheduled. Each of these events showcase and celebrate our unique place on the globe and our diverse community. There is also evidence of more routine and thoughtful examples of how CMIS promotes and embeds global perspectives.

Most importantly, and generally overlooked, are our adopted standards. Of the core courses (ELA, Mathematics, Social Studies, and Science), all four set of standards are internationally benchmarked. This benchmarking ensures CMIS students are exposed to global perspectives. As Achieve (2014) states about our adopted ELA and Mathematics standards, As part of the Common Core State Standards Initiative, Achieve helped collect and analyze standards from a number of countries. These studies helped inform the choices made by the writers of the common standards. For Next Generation Science Standards, Achieve stated: The overall goal of Achieves study on international standards is to inform the development of the NRC framework and next-generation science standards.

DEBUG

nocol
line 195

And finally, College, Careers, and Civics Framework (C3) states: ...standards (including C3) suggests that all standards should be rigorous, world class, and internationally benchmarked, while also allowing for deeper engagement around fewer concepts/topics. CMIS Leadership feel confident that as we remain focused on aligning appropriate standards to our assessments, lessons, and instruction, we can be assured that we are providing standards with a global perspective As illustrated in other sections, standards play a central role in planning, guiding, and developing curriculum. The counseling and student support departments provide multiple, targeted lessons on global perspectives. Units such as The diversity of our Leadership Team and Teaching Staff ensure multiple perspectives, concepts, and issues are embedded in CMIS lessons and discussions. Diversity of not only nationality, but age, gender, and experiences makes CMIS a dynamic and engaging global workplace.

The library provides books on multiple global issues and from a wide variety of perspectives and diverse nationalities.

Evidence

- "International benchmarking is important from a national perspective to ensure our long-term economic competitiveness." Achieve. 2012. Web. 06 May 2016. <http://www.achieve.org/international-benchmarking>
- "International Science Benchmarking Report Taking the Lead in Science Education: Forging Next-Generation Science Standards Executive Summary." International Science Benchmarking Report. Achieve, 2010. Web. 20 May 2016. <http://www.achieve.org/files/InternationalScienceBenchmarkingReportExecutiveSummary.pdf>
- USA. Kentucky Department of Education. Office of Next Generation Learners. 704 KAR 3:303, Kentucky Core Academic Standards (First Reading). Web <https://drive.google.com/a/cmisa.ac.th/file/d/0ByVFf0m0zf0lNWh1X2w5NV9uN1U/view?usp=sharing>

DEBUG

nocol
line 214

5.2.4 Congruence

Indicator: There is congruence between the actual concepts and skills taught, the academic standards, and the schoolwide learner outcomes.

Prompt: *Evaluate if there is congruence between the actual concepts and skills taught, the academic standards, and the schoolwide learner outcomes.*

Findings

CMIS Leadership and teaching staff ensure congruence between the actual

DEBUG

nocol
line 225

concepts and skills taught, the academic standards, and the schoolwide learner outcomes through a variety of methods.

Much of the professional development and teacher work for the past two years has focused on unpacking the literacy standards as all teachers are responsible student success in reading, writing, and speaking/listening. As we focused on understanding the standards, certain structures were created to ensure fidelity to concepts/skills, standards, and SLOs.

First, was the continuation of the Understanding by Design unit development initiative begun in 2013-2014. The traditional UbD template ensures that teacher/designers address in Stage 1: established goals, skills and knowledge, essential questions, and understandings. Stage 2: assessment, and Stage 3: learning plan. Though CMIS teachers used this general UbD template to ensure alignment with these essential, researched-based elements of UbD, a handful of modifications were added to the template to ensure congruence between our skills/knowledge, our adopted standards, and the SLOs; see Table 5.1 below.

Established Goals	Separate out Primary and Secondary Standards	CCSS/NGSS/C3 were created to be integrated. K-12 focus on creating rich learning experiences that address multiple standards
Assessment/Learning Plan	Formative Assessment Section	Formative assessment was an integral part of professional development. Section created to provide place for teachers to practice.
Learning Plan	Learning Activity/ Experience Alignment	Teachers were asked to explicitly align the standards to the learning experience. If not possible, they were asked why that activity was important.
Learning Plan	Close Reading	Anchor standard 1 asks students to read closely. Close reading is an outcome important to students in grades K-12.
Learning Plan	Complexity Level	Shift 3 of CCSS ELA requires a staircase of complexity. Appropriate complex text for each grade level is essential to complete this shift.
Topic Section	SLO	Teachers and Leadership felt strongly that the most effective way to teach SLOs was implicitly, through the UbD units.

Table 5.1: test caption

Secondly, CMIS Leadership and Teaching Staff have implemented the Data-wise Process. Using this process, CMIS has created school data teams of teachers

and administrators who make use of performance data and other information to target educational questions to pursue, identify major gaps in student understanding, identify target areas called learner-centered problems (LCP), reframe learner-centered problems as problems of practice (POP), target solutions to problems of practice, and write action plans pinpointing how broadly solutions will be implemented, how they can be implemented and adapted across grade levels and content areas, and on what timelines they will be carried out.

CMIS Leadership and Teaching Staff used 2014-2015 ISA data to develop a CMIS specific schoolwide LCP, created a schoolwide POP, each department created a strategy to address the POP, and assessed throughout the 2015-2016. Based upon teacher feedback and achievement data, the 2016-2017 year Datawise program was modified to allow each department to determine their LCP and POP based upon department specific data. The departments Datawise plan is currently being implemented. By using the Datawise process, the CMIS Leadership the Teaching Staff have ensured academic outcomes (i.e. standardized test data) are used to make instructional decisions that were based upon students skills/ concepts, and standards.

Looking at student work

Review the SLOs during teacher orientation (2016-2017) and plan implementation for review with students

Evidence

- McTighe, Jay, and Elliot Seif. "A Summary of Underlying Theory and Research Base for Understanding by Design by Jay McTighe and Elliott Seif." A Summary of Underlying Theory and Research Base for Understanding by Design by Jay McTighe and Elliott Seif. Jay McTighe Educational Associates, 2002. Web. 4 Apr. 2016. <http://jaymctighe.com/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2011/04/UbD-Research-Base.pdf>
- Nel has photos
- Houdett, Kathryn Parker, Elizabeth A. City, and Richard J. Murnane. Data Wise. Cambridge: Harvard Education, 2013. Print. <http://isites.harvard.edu/icb/icb.do?keyword=datawise&pageid=icb.page555331>

DEBUG

nocol
line 274

5.2.5 Student Work–Engagement in Learning

Indicator: The schools examination of representative samples of student work and snapshots of student engagement in learning demonstrates the implementation of a standards-based curriculum and the schoolwide learner outcomes.

Prompt: *Evaluate to what extent the examination of representative samples of student work and snapshots of student engagement in learning demonstrate the implementation of a standards-based curriculum and the addressing of the schoolwide learner outcomes.*

Findings

CMIS Leadership and Teaching Staff engage in the examination of representative samples of student work and snapshots of student engagement in learning that demonstrates the implementation of a standards-based curriculum and the schoolwide learner outcomes.

DEBUG

nocol
line 285

CMIS Teachers continue to use student work to make informed instructional decisions. CMIS Leadership has implemented multiple research-based instruments to examine student work to ensure alignment to student learner outcomes and CMIS standards; also to ensure effective collaboration. Professional discussions about looking at student work balance professional development about how and why looking at student work is important and the opportunity to examine student work. CMIS continues to discuss the importance of looking at data critically, without judgement, over interpretation, keeping it private, or taking it personally. To address this need, research journals were read and discussed.

CMIS Teaching Staff have used the adapted Longfellow Slice as well as CMIS teacher created protocol-called the CMIS Slice (in development). CMIS Leadership uses norms from National School Reform Faculty and Annenberg Learners Critical Friends Group. Student Learner Outcomes were also examined in context of examining student work. Data from these discussions indicates that student learner outcomes could be more explicitly addressed in student work. Also, a teacher and leadership discussion suggests that CMIS teachers and students would benefit from utilizing one examining student work protocol to be consistent.

The Student Support department consistently use student samples to assist students in meeting or exceeding the academic standards.

Evidence

- Some Guidelines for Learning From Student Work Adapted from HO-RACE, November 1996, p.2.
- Purpose of the Adapted Longfellow Slice (aka the CMIS Slice)
- Swanson, Kristen, Allen Gayle, and Mancabelli Rob. "Eliminating the Blame Game." Educational Leadership 73.3 (2015): 68-71. ASCD.org. Web. 3 Mar. 2016.
- MacDonald, Elisa. "WHEN NICE WONT SUFFICE Honest Discourse Is Key to Shifting School Culture." Journal of Staff Development 32.3

DEBUG

nocol
line 295

(2011): 45-51. Learning Forward. Learning Forward. Web. 22 Nov. 2015.

5.3 Support for Student and Personal Academic Growth

5.4 Resource Management and Development

5.4.1 Congruence

Indicator: There is congruence between the actual concepts and skills taught, the academic standards, and the schoolwide learner outcomes.

Prompt: *Evaluate if there is congruence between the actual concepts and skills taught, the academic standards, and the schoolwide learner outcomes.*

Findings

CMIS Leadership and teaching staff ensure congruence between the actual concepts and skills taught, the academic standards, and the schoolwide learner outcomes through a variety of methods.

Much of the professional development and teacher work for the past two years has focused on unpacking the literacy standards as all teachers are responsible student success in reading, writing, and speaking/listening. As we focused on understanding the standards, certain structures were created to ensure fidelity to concepts/skills, standards, and SLOs.

First, was the continuation of the Understanding by Design unit development initiative begun in 2013-2014. The traditional UbD template ensures that teacher/designers address in Stage 1: established goals, skills and knowledge, essential questions, and understandings. Stage 2: assessment, and Stage 3: learning plan. Though CMIS teachers used this general UbD template to ensure alignment with these essential, researched-based elements of UbD, a handful of modifications were added to the template to ensure congruence between our skills/knowledge, our adopted standards, and the SLOs; see Table below.

Secondly, CMIS Leadership and Teaching Staff have implemented the Data-wise Process. Using this process, CMIS has created school data teams of teachers and administrators who make use of performance data and other information to target educational questions to pursue, identify major gaps in student under-

DEBUG

nocol
line 309

standing, identify target areas called learner-centered problems (LCP), reframe learner-centered problems as problems of practice (POP), target solutions to problems of practice, and write action plans pinpointing how broadly solutions will be implemented, how they can be implemented and adapted across grade levels and content areas, and on what timelines they will be carried out.

CMIS Leadership and Teaching Staff used 2014-2015 ISA data to develop a CMIS specific schoolwide LCP, created a schoolwide POP, each department created a strategy to address the POP, and assessed throughout the 2015-2016. Based upon teacher feedback and achievement data, the 2016-2017 year Datawise program was modified to allow each department to determine their LCP and POP based upon department specific data. The departments' Datawise plan is currently being implemented. By using the Datawise process, the CMIS Leadership the Teaching Staff have ensured academic outcomes (i.e. standardized test data) are used to make instructional decisions that were based upon students' skills/ concepts, and standards.

Looking at student work

Review the SLOs during teacher orientation (2016-2017) and plan implementation for review with students

Evidence

- McTighe, Jay, and Elliot Seif. "A Summary of Underlying Theory and Research Base for Understanding by Design by Jay McTighe and Elliott Seif." A Summary of Underlying Theory and Research Base for Understanding by Design by Jay McTighe and Elliott Seif. Jay McTighe Educational Associates, 2002. Web. 4 Apr. 2016.
- Nel has photos
- Houdett, Kathryn Parker, Elizabeth A. City, and Richard J. Murnane. Data Wise. Cambridge: Harvard Education, 2013. Print.

DEBUG

nocol
line 327

Chapter 6

Schoolwide Action Plan

Chapter 7

Appendix

List of Figures

List of Tables

5.1 test caption	17
----------------------------	----