**2022-2023 LCS Goals (revised 12-9-22)**

*Aligned with Michigan’s Top 10 in 10 goals, recent Board and administrative training, and K-12 professional development goals:*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal 1: Provide every child access to an aligned, high-quality curriculum from early childhood to post-secondary attainment – through a multi-stakeholder collaboration**  **with business and industry, labor, and higher education – to maximize lifetime learning and success.** | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Strategy 1.1** | **Students are supported through a quality curriculum birth through high school with specific checkpoints throughout their education.** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Benchmark 1.1.A** | *80% of LCS preschool aged students will be proficient on the kindergarten readiness assessment.* | | | | | | | | | |
| 100% teachers of pre-school aged students will:   * Implement best practice reading and math essential instructional practices in early literacy as measured by classroom observations * Identify student who are at risk of not meeting kindergarten readiness standards as measured by progress reports * Provide 100% of parents strategies to support student at home as measured by parent surveys Preschool aged students proficient on k readiness assessment   *(All local districts are responsible to “child find” in Michigan. Starting at birth to age 26 for students who are suspected of having a disability. Our programming aligns*  *With Preschool Curriculum Standards to include Creative Curriculum and Teaching Strategies Gold.)* | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement 1.1.A** | Preschool aged students proficient on K readiness assessment *(upper/lower case letters, sounds, number sense- count and recognize numbers 1-20)* | **Baseline Data** | | **% Improvement** | | **Measurement Tool** | | | **Frequency of Evaluation** | |
| Spring 2019 percent proficient | | 10% each year | | TSC Gold P**ercentage is based on the number of students meeting the benchmark.**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **2022-2023**  **Assessment** | **Checkpoint 1**  **Oct 29** | **Checkpoint 2**  **Feb 14** | **Checkpoint 3**  **May 21** | | Upper/lower case letters | 67%  Benchmark 5-54 | Benchmark 31-54 | Benchmark 41-54 | | Sounds recognition (any letter) | 62%  Benchmark 3-26 | Benchmark 14-26 | Benchmark 20-26 | | Counting | 71%  Benchmark 5-12 or beyond | Benchmark 13-21 or beyond | Benchmark 22-31 or beyond | | # Recognition (students can recognize any number between 0-20 or beyond) | 77%  Benchmark 1-4 | Benchmark 5-9 | Benchmark 10 | | Counting objects | 75%  Benchmark 3-7 or beyond | Benchmark 8-12 or beyond | Benchmark 13-20 or beyond |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **2021-2022**  **Assessment** | **Checkpoint 1**  **Oct 29** | **Checkpoint 2**  **Feb 14** | **Checkpoint 3**  **May 21 NA** | | Upper/lower case letters | 79%  Benchmark 5-54 | 76%  Benchmark 31-54 | 89%  Benchmark 41-54 | | Sound recognition  (any letter) | 57%  Benchmark 3-26 | 59%  Benchmark 14-26 | 71%  Benchmark 20-26 | | Counting | 78%  Benchmark 5-12 or beyond | 70%  Benchmark 13-21 or beyond | 70%  Benchmark 22-31 or beyond | | # Recognition (students can recognize any number btw 0-20 or beyond) | 84%  Benchmark 1-4 | 77%  Benchmark 5-9 | 89%  Benchmark 10 | | Counting objects | 89%  Benchmark 3-7 or beyond | 80%  Benchmark 8-12 or beyond | 82%  Benchmark 13-20 or beyond |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **2020-2021**  **Assessment** | **Checkpoint 1**  **Oct 29** | **Checkpoint 2**  **Feb 14** | **Checkpoint 3**  **May 21 NA** | | Upper/lower case letters | 66%  Benchmark 5-54 | 71%  Benchmark 31-54 | 72%  Benchmark 41-54 | | Sounds recognition (any letter) | 48%  Benchmark 3-26 | 65%  Benchmark 14-26 | 66%  Benchmark 20-26 | | Counting | 88%  Benchmark 5-12 or beyond | 77%  Benchmark 13-21 or beyond | 65%  Benchmark 22-31 or beyond | | # Recognition (students can recognize any number between 0-20 or beyond) | 86%  Benchmark 1-4 | 78%  Benchmark 5-9 | 63%  Benchmark 10 | | Counting objects | 88%  Benchmark 3-7 or beyond | 80%  Benchmark 8-12 or beyond | 77%  Benchmark 13-20 or beyond | | | | Fall,  Winter,  Spring | |
| **Benchmark 1.1.B** | *80% of 3rd grade students will be proficient in reading, 8th grade students in math, and 11th grade students in Evidenced Based reading and writing and math as measured by state adopted assessments* | | | | | | | | | |
| 100% of K-3rd grade teachers will:   * Assess students in MAP/NWEA 3 times per year , 1st one within 30 days of the start of school * Identify students who exhibit reading deficiency using MTSS criteria * Provide an Individualized Reading Intervention Plan (IRIP) within 30 days for these students, ½ day data day provided in addition to PLC time within the work day * Provide a documented IRIP and progress monitor in the form of running records and/or comprehension interview * Provide parents with written notification, strategies to support students at home, and take home reading program * Identify a professional development goal based on Early Literacy best practices as evident by administrative walk through supported by coaching plans   100% of 4-8th grade teachers will:   * Assess 4th-5th grade students in MAP/NWEA 3 times per year. 6th-8th students will be assessed fall and spring with an additional time in the winter if scoring below the 40% percentile in the fall. * Identify students who exhibit math deficiency using MTSS criteria and provide intervention. * Provide Guided Academics support as an elective in grades 6-8. * Provide Academic support through I-connect * Provide parents written notification and student progress updates   100% of 9-11th grade teachers will:   * Provide Guided Academics support as an elective. * Provide Academic support through I-connect * Provide parents written notification and student progress updates | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement 1.1.B** | 3rd grade students proficient in reading and 8th grade students proficient in math as measured by MSTEP.  11th grade students proficient in EBRW and math as measured by SAT. | **Baseline Data** | | **% Improvement** | | **Measurement Tool** | | | **Frequency of Evaluation** | |
| Spring 2017 | | 10% each year | | |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Measurement Tool | 2017% Prof | 2018% Prof | 2019% Prof | 2020% Prof | 2021% Prof | 2022%  Prof | | 3rdMSTEP  reading | 50% | 55% | 54% |  | 61% | 52% | | 3rd MSTEP math | 50% | 51% | 50% |  | 50% | 41% | | 8th MSTEP math | 21% | 24% | 29% |  | 29% | 28% | | 8th MSTEP  reading | 42% | 42% | 51% |  | 60% | 53% | | 11th grade SAT EBRW | 64% | 64% | 59% |  | 54% | 53% | | 11th grade SAT math | 37% | 34% | 34% |  | 29% | 30% | | | | June for MSTEP  Trimester for coach plans | |
| **Strategy 1.2** | **Ensure that every student has the opportunity to take meaningful steps toward their postsecondary career.** | | | | | | | | | |
| **Benchmark 1.2.A** | *80% of high school seniors will complete the FAFSA by the end of their final year. \*Senior year or 13th year for EC* | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement 1.2.A** | High school seniors will complete the FAFSA by the end of their final year. | **Baseline Data** | | **% Improvement** | | **Measurement Tool** | | | **Frequency of Evaluation** | |
| Class of 2017   |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | 415 stud | Submit | Complete | | June | 253  61% | 230  55% | | | 10% each year | | |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Graduating Year | # of students | % Submitted | % Completed | | 2017 | 415 | 61% | 55% | | 2018 | 366 | 62% | 57% | | 2019 | 336 | 60% | 57% | | 2020 | 336 | 61% | 58% | | 2021 | 368 | 50% | 47% | | 2022 | 376 | 44% | 42% | | 2023 |  |  |  |   13th year early college added in, not including the 12th grade early college or LHP students Class of 2020 (336) | | | December and May | |
| **Benchmark 1.2.B** | *100% of students will have successfully completed a college or career education course such as dual enrollment, enrolled in early middle college, Advanced Placement, and/or career/technical education by the time they graduate from high school.* Students will also be provided work based learning activities 6-12, connecting students with workers or experts in a variety of fields. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement 1.2.B** | Students enrolled in college or career education such as DE, EC, and/or career/technical education will earn credit. | **Baseline Data** | | **% Improvement** | | **Measurement Tool**  Schools will provide age appropriate career informational resources in grades K-12 and the opportunity to do each of the following:   * 1 or more experiences in fields of student interest/aptitude * K-12 discuss career options, interests, preparations with a counselor * Provide work based learning activities for grades 6-12, connecting students with workers or experts in a variety of fields. | | | **Frequency of Evaluation** | |
| June 2017   * *311/1263 students enrolled in college programs = 25%* * *195/1263 in Ed Tech = 15%*   \*\*\* Over their career we changed how we measured this goal. We realized we need to look at this goal overtime to be able to look at the cohort over three years to increase opportunities for students by the time they graduate. | | 3% annual improvement until goal is achieved | | * Transcript for DE, EC, and career/technical education to include LHS CTE programs in marketing and robotics  |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Class of** | AP | DE | EMC | Ed-Tech | # & % by class Non Duplicated | | 2018 (391) | 212 | 198 | 25 | 96 | 337/86% | | 2019 (407) | 210 | 159 | 56 | 119 | 356/87% | | 2020 (420) | 224 | 110 | 30 | 108 | 391/93% | | 2021 (379) | 199 | 85 | 28 | 96 | 297/78% | | 2022 (380) | 153 | 80 | 44 | 83 | 284/75% | | 2023 ( |  |  |  |  |  | | | | June graduation class | |
| **Benchmark 1.2.C** | *70% of students enrolled in Advanced Placement courses will earn a qualifying score.* | | | | | | | | | |
| 100% of AP teachers will   * Identify students who exhibit deficiency in the content areas * Implement best practice Tier 1 instruction to support greater numbers of students achieving master of content as measured by number of students passing and failing * Provide parents with written notification and strategies to support students at home if students are failing or at risk of failing * Identify a professional development goal based on best College and Career Readiness strategies as aligned with SAT | | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement 1.2.C** | 70% of students completing an AP exam will earn a qualifying score  \*Some student opt out but still take the exam at semester time | | **Baseline Data** | | **% Improvement** | | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** | |
| 2016-17: 43.2% earned a qualifying score | | 6% each year | | |  |  | | --- | --- | | AP exam year | % earning a qualifying score | | 2017-2018 | 48.1% | | 2018-2019 | 47.9% | | 2019-2020 | 57.5% | | 2020-2021 | 55.9% | | 2021-2022 | 57.7% | | 2022-2023 |  | | July | |
| **Benchmark 1.2.D** | *100% of students taking a virtual course through LCS will complete with a passing grade.* | | | | | | | | |
|  | 100% of Mentors will   * Attend annual mentor training * Attend annual curriculum meeting * Provide academic coaching for students who they support as mentor * Provide academic support for students in Virtual within their certified area * Provide strategies to support student success, both content area and support to be successful as an online learner * Respond to student / parent questions and concerns in a timely fashion (within 24 hours) * Maintain and document weekly, content specific, documented two-way communication with the student in accordance with Michigan Pupil Accounting guidelines * Manage curriculum system and prepare reports as requested * Grade / evaluate assignments and assessments as needed and within one week of student completion of work * Support pupil accounting requirements * Assign grades to students who they mentor * Progress reports sent home twice per semester   100% of Administrators will   * Analyze results to determine vendor success rates | | | | | | | | |
| **Measurement 1.2.D** | Students enrolled in a LCS virtual course will earn a passing grade by the completion of the course. | | **Baseline Data**  2019 School Year | | **% Improvement**  10% increase of passing grades each year | | **Measurement Tool**   * Final grades in PowerSchool * Mentor Contact Logs * Progress Reports  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | |  | **LCS**  **Jan % passing** | **LCS**  **June % passing** | | **2019** | 72% | 73% | | **2020** | **72%** | **72%** | | **2021** | **68%** | **73%** | | **2022** | **72%**  **(2344 courses)** | **76%**  **(2237 courses)** | | **2023** |  |  | | **Frequency of Evaluation**   * Semester grades * Fall and supplemental count * Progress reports * Year-end data | |
| **Strategy 1.3** | **Develop quality curriculum aligned to adopted standards to assure that all students graduate Career- and College-Ready that is clearly communicated to all stakeholders.** | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benchmark 1.3.A** | *100% of all K-12 units of instruction have KUDs aligned to appropriate standards as evidenced in lesson and unit plans.* | | | | |
| 100% of teachers will:   * Utilize collaboration to align unit instruction to KUD * Demonstrate KUDs in lesson plans by determining learning target, success criteria, lesson implementation, and common formative assessments * Address gaps Ex. State assessment skills required * Access grade level or department KUDs in public folders to use for planning * AP teachers will align KUD to College Board AP Standards * Pre AP teachers will identify AP standards and align with curriculum   100% of administrators will:   * Monitor department KUD alignment * Foster a shared ownership in development of KUD * Review quality of alignment * Provide department/grade level and individual teacher feedback   Develop a process for vertical alignment collaboration | | | | |
| **Measurement 1.3.A** | Units of instruction have KUDs aligned to appropriate standards as evidenced in lesson and unit plans | **Baseline Data** | **% Improvement** | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** |
| Spring 2017 | Goal: 100% unit completion each year | Unit documents in Public Folders | Department Chair meetings three time a year – fall, winter and spring |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Goal 2: Implement, with strong district and building leadership, high-quality instruction in every classroom through a highly coherent, learner-centered instructional model where students meet their self-determined academic and personal goals to their highest potential.** | | | | | |
| **Strategy 2.1** | **Implement district, building and individual professional development goals to foster Deeper Learning competencies/experiences across content areas.** | | | | |
| **Benchmark 2.1.A** | *100% of teachers will apply K-12 Essential Instructional Practices to include Disciplinary Literacy integrated in specialized texts properly—in ways that would lead to sophisticated interpretations appropriate to those disciplines.* | | | | |
| **Measurement 2.1.A** | Essential Practice Documents:   * Birth to Age 3 * Prekindergarten * Grades K-3 * Grades 4-5 * Grades 6-12 * Learning Coach * Schoolwide   Disciplinary Literacy:  Students need to approach reading texts properly and appropriate to the discipline with a knowledge of a discipline and its purposes, content, and methodologies/Disciplinary Literacy | **Baseline Data** | **% Improvement** | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** |
| Teachers and administrators will participate in Instructional Rounds and use the data to inform building MICIP and district goals. Each building will have a minimum of 3 goal areas to focus on throughout the course of a school year. | 50% of building goals met | Instructional Round Goals and teacher and administrator survey data collected during the debriefing of each round.  Monthly Leadership Plan for Systemic PD form submitted by the principal | June to June |
| **Benchmark 2.1.B** | *100% of students will have daily access to technology for classroom use and utilize identified online virtual platforms for receiving evidenced based instruction.*  District will: Conduct an annual technology department audit to analyze info structure, staff and students devices - Develop a 10 year budget plan - Develop a 5 year professional development plan for staff, students and parents | | | | |
| **Measurement 2.1.B** | Year 1 2020-21:  Replaced network switches, wireless, firewall, and Uninterruptible Power Supply (UPS)  Replaced aging teacher desktops with laptops  Used grant funds to purchase 5 Smartboards  Trained new tech coaches in use of SmartBoards  Extensive online PD  Purchased several online applications to assist with delivery  Year 2:  Secondary, Elementary, Year Round Tech Coach  50 SmartBoards placed throughout the district  Para training  Year 3:  Technology Coaches for training, additional Smart Boards and each building is one to one | **Baseline Data** | **% Improvement** | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** |
| |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | | 5 year plan | Total student population | Face to Face/Virtual | Number of student devices | Number of student devices ordered annually | Percent of Info structure complete to support 1 to 1 devices | | 2020-21 | 4735 | 3574/1161 | 2377 | 900 Replaced 500 outdated | 0 | | 2021-22 | 4548 | 4193/355 | 2888 | 1000 | 100% | | 2022-23 | 4427 | 4120/307 | 5500 Met Goal | 1250 | Met | | 2023-24 |  |  |  |  |  | | 2024-25 |  |  |  |  |  | | To improve student device availability, improve network reliability, and network security | Technology department audit | Fall to Fall each year for five years |
| **Strategy 2.2** | **Ensure that all students have access to individualized instruction and feedback based on assessment data, both formative and summative.** | | | | |
| **Benchmark 2.2.A** | *100% of buildings will implement MTSS in grades K-12 that is high-quality to include evidence-based instruction delivered to students as evidenced by annual MTSS Program Evaluation.*  100% of K-12 teachers will   * Analyze student data during data days to determine and plan interventions * Utilize formative assessment to modify instruction as evidenced in lesson plans and administrative walk through * Utilize formative assessment data to provide student feedback and support individual student goal setting as evidenced by K and D checklists * K-5 teachers will utilize running records and/or comprehension interview for students identified as needing tier 2 or 3 supports in reading as evidenced by intervention plans and documentation * 6-12 teachers will utilize Guided Academics, iConnect and/or before or after school for students identified as needing tier 2 or 3 supports as evidenced by intervention documentation. * Students scoring in the following NWEA percentile   + 40th-21st percentile and below ranking will receive individualized instruction within the classroom.   + 20th percentile and below will receive individualized instruction within and outside of the classrooms. | | | | |
| **Measurement 2.2.A** | Each building will use the MDE Program Evaluation Tool to score their building using a 4 point rubric, 4 being the highest rating.   * 4 Proficient * 3 Partially proficient * 2 Basic * 1 Low/beginning | **Baseline Data** | **% Improvement** | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Program Evaluation requirements | District Average  June 2020 | District Average  June 2021 | District Average  June 2022 | | Readiness | 2.86 | 2.86 | 2.86 | | Knowledge and Skills | 2.71 | 2.71 | **3.14** | | Opportunity | 2.86 | 2.86 | **3.00** | | Implementation with Fidelity | 2.88 | 2.86 | **3.00** | | goal score of a 3 | Program Evaluation Tool | June |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategy 2.3** | **Provide an integrated system of guidance to develop and support district and school leadership competencies, to accelerate student achievement** | | | | |
| **Benchmark 2.3.A** | *100% of administrators will self-assess, develop growth goals, and monitor progress based on district adopted evaluation systems as evidenced by evaluation documentation* | | | | |
| **Measurement 2.3.A** |  | **Baseline Data** | **% Improvement** | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** |
|  |  | School Advance | Fall to Spring |
| **Benchmark 2.3.B** | *100% of teachers will self-assess, develop growth goals, and monitor progress based on the Framework for Teaching/Danielson evaluation system as evidenced by evaluation documentation* | | | | |
| **Measurement 2.3.B** |  | **Baseline Data** | **% Improvement** | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** |
|  |  | Framework for Teaching/Danielson | Fall to Spring |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benchmark 2.3.C** | *100% of students in grades 9-12* *earn credits to be on track for their high school diploma* | | | | |
| **Measurement 2.3.C** |  | **Baseline Data** | **% Improvement** | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** |
| |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Class of 2025** | | | | |  | Number | On-Track | % | | Spring 2022 (9th) | 386 | 341 | 88% |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Class of 2024** | | | | |  | Number | On-Track | % | | Spring 2021 (9th) | 429 | 367 | 86% | | Spring 2022 (10th) | 406 | 316 | 78% |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Class of 2023** | | | | |  | Number | On-Track | % | | Spring 2020 (9th) | 409 | 372 | 91% | | Spring 2021 (10th) | 405 | 317 | 78% | | Spring 2022 (11th) | 391 | 307 | 79% |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Class of 2022** | | | | |  | Number | On-Track | % | | Spring 2020 (10th) | 414 | 356 | 86% | | Spring 2021 (11th) | 399 | 314 | 79% | | Spring 2022 (12th) | 406 | 383 | 94% |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **Graduated Classes** | | | | | Grade Level | Number | On-Track | % | | Class of 2021 | 405 | 379 | 94% | | Class of 2022 | 406 | 383 | 94% | |  | **Grade 9 (Minimum 9 credits)**  **Grade 10 (Minimum 21 credits)**  **Grade 11 (Minimum 33 credits)**  **Grade 12 (Minimum 45 credits)** | Spring to Spring |

|  |
| --- |
| **Goal 3: Develop, support, and sustain high-quality collaborative processes that improve teacher performance and student achievement** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Strategy 3.1** | **Provide professional development and guidance for implementation of effective professional learning communities** | | | | |
| **Benchmark 3.1.A** | *100% of teachers will contribute to professional learning community focused on four questions; what do we want students to learn? How are we going to assess what they know? What are we going to do if they aren’t learning? What will we do if they already know what we are teaching?* | | | | |
| **Measurement 3.1.A** |  | **Baseline Data** | **% Improvement** | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** |
|  | 100% participation | PLC meeting minutes | June |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Benchmark 3.1.B** | *100% of principals and learning coaches will have coaching cycle plans to include student-centered, measurable goals and measurement (assessment) methods aligned to cycle goals and content standards. 100% of learning coaches will monitor the impact of coach cycles on student achievement. Administrative walk through observational data will measure instructional practice transfer of goals.* | | | | |
|  | **Non-negotiable elements of coaching:**   1. District and Building Visions for Coaching, co-developed and revisited/revised as needed and clearly communicated to stakeholders. 2. Stakeholder understanding of coaching model and associated practices, guidelines and parameters, which is facilitated by the principal and coaches. 3. Building Coach Plan developed by the principal, with consideration of observation data, student achievement data and building needs/goals. 4. Coaching Cycle Plans co-developed by the coach and teacher(s) through planning conversations, which are kept throughout the cycle by the learning coach. 5. Weekly Coach/Principal meetings with meeting log/notes. 6. Principal Walk-Through Data and Follow-up on coaching. 7. PD, Collaboration and Support for and among coaches. 8. Data Collection | | | | |
| **Measurement 3.1.B** |  | **Baseline Data** | **% Improvement** | **Measurement Tool** | **Frequency of Evaluation** |
| 111 total coaching cycles in 16-17  192 total coaching cycles in 17-18  210 total coaching cycles in 18-19  100 Coaching Cycles as of mid-year 19-20  238 Coaching Cycles as of end of year 21-22     |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | **Coach Cycles with Measurable Goals** | **Coaching Cycles that Included a Method to Measure Impact on Achievement** | **Of those with Measurement Method, Cycles Demonstrating Positive Impact on Student Achievement, based on pre- to post-cycle data** | **Instructional practices Implemented as a Result of Coaching Cycle that Transferred into Classroom Practice Outside the Coaching Cycle, based on walk-though/observational Data** due at the end of the school year | | **Baseline: Spring 2017** | 50% | Not measured | Not measured | 50% | | **Winter 2018** | 92% | 86% | 98% | Not measured mid-year | | **Spring 2018** | 95% | 93% | 99% | 85% | | **Winter 2019** | 98% | 98% | 94% | Not measured mid-year | | **Spring 2019** | 99.5% | 99.5% | 95% | 81.5% | | **Winter 2020** | 100% | 100% | 99% | Not measured mid-year | | **Spring 2020** | 100% | 100% | 99% | Covid | | **Winter 2021** | 99% (new coaches) | 100% | 97% | Not measured mid-year | | **Spring 2021** | 100% | 100% | 99% | 86% | | **Winter 2022** | 100% | 98% | 98% | Not measured mid-year | | **Spring 2022** | 100% | 99% | 99% | 85% | | 100% coach cycles have measurable goals  100% coach cycles have measurement methods aligned to cycle goals and standards  100% of coach cycles demonstrate a positive impact  75% or higher coaching goals are observed in walkthroughs | * Teacher observation Form C * Building coach plans * Learning coach cycle plans * End of year coach cycle documentation | Winter and Spring   * Monitoring: Quarterly/ By Trimester with coach cycle plans, and twice yearly collection and collaborative examination of data points. |